OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

7-8 EDWARD VII., 1907-8

VOL. LXXXVI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWELFTH DAY OF MAY TO THE TENTH DAY OF JUNE, INCLUSIVE.

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

ERRATA.

VOL. V.

Col. 9191, 5th line from top, delete "MR. R. L. BORDEN" and insert "SIR FREDERICK BORDEN."

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 12, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to a question of privilege. In the Halifax 'Herald' I find a report of an interview between an alleged prominent labour leader of the Railway Employees Organization and myself, which is entirely inaccurate. The interview is given as follows, under large headlines:—

It is a well-known fact that an interview was held recently between J. J. Hughes, Liberal member of parliament for Kings, Prince Edward Island, and a prominent labour leader of the railway employees' organization, when the former unhesitatingly expressed himself as utterly opposed to any sort of labour organizations and would not give his support to measures emanating from them if brought up in the House of Commons on their behalf.

PROBUS.

Tennyson says:

That a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies,
That a lie which is all a lie may be met and fought with outright.
But a lie which is part a truth is a harder matter to fight.

This is exactly the case in regard to this interview.

On my way from Ottawa to Prince Edward Island at Easter I met a man who claimed to be a labour leader and an organizer of railway employees. He told me that he belonged to the United States, and that he was going to Prince Edward Island to organize a union of the government railway employees to demand shorter hours of labour, and asked me whether I would support such legislation if it were introduced in parliament. I told him I would not promise in advance to support any legislation. I said that I doubted whether the hours of labour of railway employees were excessive, and one of my reasons for so doubting was that for every vacancy that occurred in the government railway service there were from one to a dozen applications; that I did not think so many young and middle-aged men would be so anxious to enter the service if the hours of labour were unduly long or the wages unduly low; that I did not think the hours of labour of the railway employees were any longer, if as long, as those of the farmer, the fisherman, the store-keeper, the clerk in stores, the mothers of families in poor and moderate circumstances, the editors and other workers on newspapers, the members of parliament, the ministers of the Crown and the thousands of people who had to work for a living and obtain it as best they could.

He then asked me if I were opposed to labour unions and brotherhoods, and I answered 'No,' providing they were formed for the purpose of improving the social, the physical, their material and the moral well-being of their members by every legitimate means; but that I was opposed to such unions and brotherhoods if their object was to force from parliament legislation unduly favouring themselves at the expense of the rest of the community; that the labour unions and the railway brotherhoods had exactly the same rights in this country that all other classes of persons had, but not one right more; that under our constitution and laws no class of men in Canada could suffer injury or wrong without receiving speedy and ample redress, and therefore we could settle all our troubles and difficulties without the assistance or advice of foreigners; that, in my judgment, our labour unions and railway brotherhoods were quite capable of managing their own affairs without the interference of professional agitators from the United States; that there was one kind of legislation I would promise to support in advance, and that would be legislation to prevent him and men like him from coming into this country to stir up trouble where none existed and to manufacture grievances.

He informed me that he would come in to Canada as often as he wished and comport himself as he wished; that the labour unions and brotherhoods of this country were strong enough to crush any member of parliament who opposed their views, and he would see that my words and attitude were reported in the proper quarter.

I presume, therefore that the report in the Halifax 'Herald,' which has been copied

into the Charlottetown 'Examiner,' is the result of the threat of my Yankee friend.

The newspapers of Canada should be above misrepresenting the views of public men on important public matters.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must limit himself to a statement of fact.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I am just finishing. Sir, for the sake, possibly, of a little passing political advantage, and they should be above encouraging Yankee agitators to come into this country to make trouble. It will be a sad day for us when we will not be able to manage our own affairs without employing and encouraging such men.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

'LA PRESSE' AND THE FRENCH LANGUAGE.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I desire to call the attention of the House to an article which appeared in 'La Presse' on the 11th May instant, under the heading: 'That meeting at the Monument National.' The article is directed against me as a member of parliament and against the privileges of this House. It reads as follows:

It is now clear that this sudden cry for the French language in the administration of railways, is nothing but a nationalist manœuvre organized in view of the elections. At the Monument National neither Conservative nor Liberal leaders were present. And although, for the purpose of soothing public opinion, it had been everywhere proclaimed that the English element was favourably disposed in the matter, the audience refused to listen to the Hon. Mr. Dandurand, who came expressly for the purpose of making known these favourable dispositions. The conciliatory offers of the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific and the Northern Railways were such as would demolish the whole fabric of the nationalist conspiracy: hence the necessity of crying them down. Such indeed are the tactics which Mr. Lavergne himself has adopted. At the second reading of the Bill in question, the 18th March, 1908, Sir Wilfrid Laurier had made the following statement:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Bill as a whole appears to me to embody a sound and equitable principle, but I think that in some respects its application may be too broad. My hon. friend's object is to give the public increased facilities for the transaction of business, and it must be admitted that simple justice requires that those who do not speak English should be enabled to transact business in the language they understand. . . I have no objection to the second reading, subject to the amendments which may be suggested later on.

(The motion was carried and the Bill read a second time.)

Mr. J. J. HUGHES.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. When will it please the House to discuss the Bill in committee?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At the next meeting of the House.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Occasions for discussing this Bill in committee are becoming very rare, and if we do not take it up to-day we may not find an opportunity of doing so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The matter is of importance to the railway companies and my hon. friend will understand that it is fair that they should take communication of the Bill and see whether they desire to oppose it. There are certainly excellent things in the measure, but the government should not undertake to have it carried before the railway companies have been heard.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. They have made no opposition so far.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If they have no objection I certainly have none myself.

We are reluctant to attribute secret intentions to public men; but we have a right to point out the natural consequences of known facts. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's offer made things too easy for the member for Montmagny and his Bill would not have created the slightest sensation. The first thing that took place after this debate was the famous petition of Catholic young men published a few days later, without waiting to ascertain the fate of a measure so auspiciously introduced. There is nothing in 'Hansard' or in the Votes and Proceedings of the House to show that Mr. Lavergne made any effort to advance his Bill a stage. How is it that a member whose specialty it is to put questions to the government on every possible and impossible subject, should have neglected to call their attention and that of the House to the real or imaginary obstacles behind which he sheltered himself, without explaining their nature, at the meeting of Friday night last? If from any quarter there had been an effort to prevent the Prime Minister from carrying out the promise he made on the 18th March last, the loquacious member for Montmagny might have made use of his tongue to point it out. Nobody ever heard anything about it. It would be vain for him to allege that form of parliamentary procedure by which every day is devoted to government business; such restrictions did not exist in January, when on the 28th of that month the Bill was read for the first time. In fact, the government took precedence over public Bills on Wednesdays from the 25th March, and on Mondays, from the 2nd April. We cannot state from memory when they took up Thursdays, but it was probably later. He let more than two months elapse between the first and second readings. But the quiet adoption of the measure could not have accomplished its object better than those most reasonable letters read by Hon. Mr. Dandurand on behalf of the different companies. What was required was an organized provocation which might render its adoption impossible. Saviors and heroes had to be improvised; but they have killed the Bill in order to create a grievance.

The article then drifts into an appeal to Liberal principles. I need not insist upon that part. Nor would I seek for

Liberal principles in 'La Presse,' a paper that has sold itself to every party and has been the bed-fellow of each regime in turn.

The first portion of the article is absolutely untrue. It is clear from the journals of the House that, at the time of the second reading, I was ready to proceed and that it was only at the request of the hon. the Prime Minister that I consented to delay the second reading. I was always present at my seat, whenever the Bill might have been called, and had an occasion offered, I would have requested to proceed. From the 28th January to the 2nd April, the dates mentioned by 'La Presse,' I was always at my seat ready to proceed on the second reading; and I appeal to the Prime Minister himself as to the truth of what I say.

As to the statement of 'La Presse' that at the meeting of Friday last at the Monument National there were no Liberal leaders, I will say that several Liberal members had been invited, amongst others the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Gervais) who is now in his seat and who had consented to address the meeting. There were also the hon. members for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) and for St. Ann's (Mr. Walsh), also the member for l'Islet (Mr. Paquet), invited as a Conservative.

I might summon the editor of the paper to the bar of the House for false representations and falsehoods. I will not do so because I respect my colleagues too much to bring into their presence that aged prostitute, that old barrel of cognac.

Some MEMBERS. Order, order. Withdraw.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I am called to order, but I have absolutely nothing to withdraw.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—INVESTIGATION BY MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I desire to ask the government if there is any objection to having copies of the evidence taken before the commission presided over by Judge Cassels laid on the table of the House from day to day. That course was adopted with regard to some other commissions—I think the Insurance Commission was one. It would seem desirable that it should be followed in the present case.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am not aware that our attention has been called to that point. I do not know whether the order of the House called upon the commission to report from time to time or not. I think that if that was the order of the House, the commission would be willing to exercise its powers. I will look into the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not intend so much to suggest any report from the Commissioner, but to have a copy of the evidence taken from day to day laid on the table of the House.

Sir. WILFRID LAURIER. That matter will be considered.

PROPOSED DIVISION OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask :

1. Whether the government is aware that a vigorous campaign is being conducted in the northern constituencies of Ontario in the present provincial election, for the separating of the northern portion of Ontario from the remainder of the province, and the creation of a new province from such northern districts of the province.

2. Is the government aware that this campaign is being supported and carried on upon representations made in the platform, that the Prime Minister of Canada has asserted that if seventy-five per cent of the people representing the territory desire to be separated from Ontario and desire that such territory be constituted a new province that effect will be given to such petition, and proceedings taken by the government for the formation of a new province out of that northern portion of Ontario, commonly called 'New Ontario' ?

3. Was any such representation, or similar representation made by the Prime Minister, or any of his colleagues or any one else having authority, to speak on behalf of the government?

4. What, if any, representations have been made to the Prime Minister, or to the government, as to the desire of forming a new province out of the northern portions of Ontario, commonly called 'New Ontario,' if so, by whom, and when were they made and what answer is being made by the government ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) asks me if the government is aware that a vigorous campaign is being carried on in the northern part of the province of Ontario for the separation of that part of the province from the rest. I have to say to my hon. friend that I am not aware that a vigorous campaign, or any campaign, is being carried on to that end. The matter is almost wholly new to me. I think I received a letter to that effect, but I have expressed no opinion upon it and certainly never stated anything of the kind attributed to me in the question of my hon. friend.

SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK AS MEMBER OF THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Has the Prime Minister any information to give

the House concerning a statement published in the press that Chief Justice Fitzpatrick has been appointed to represent Canada at the Hague Conference and that Newfoundland has consented to accept him as their representative at same conference?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that I cannot give to-day the official information to which my hon. friend is entitled. A treaty has recently been signed between Great Britain for Canada and Newfoundland and the United States concerning questions which have been pending for some time between the United States and Newfoundland. I cannot say that Chief Justice Fitzpatrick has been appointed a member of the Hague Tribunal, but I believe it would be satisfactory to all Canadians if such were the case.

Mr. SPROULE. If there are papers in connection with this matter, would the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) be willing to lay them on the table?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At present we are in communication with the Colonial Office and the Foreign Office to have all the correspondence with regard to this treaty and to other treaties brought down, and I hope I shall be able to bring it down at an early day. I may say that if it were convenient to the House we could bring down two of these treaties soon.

ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES AT SOREL.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I desire to ask if Mr. Ernest Roy, formerly sub-superintendent of the Sorel shipyards, and whose conduct in regard to his position between himself and the Crown in the Department of Marine and Fisheries has been inquired into by Commissioner Gaudet, is still in the employ of the department, and, if so, whether the minister proposes that a further and more thorough inquiry should be made into the allegations made against Mr. Roy, and if it is to be carried on by Mr. Commissioner Cassels ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I do not think that Mr. Roy is permanently employed by the department. He was employed last year to superintend some work at Sorel, but I do not know whether his employment is permanent or not. I cannot tell, therefore, whether he is still working for the department. I will make further inquiry. As to the other question, I shall be glad when I give instructions to have the evidence copied and I will be very glad to lay it on the table.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister direct that a copy of the report in English be laid on the table ? The report laid on the table yesterday was in French.

Mr. SPROULE. I may explain that the practice with regard to these reports is to bring them down from the department in the language in which they are, and it is for the House of Commons to have them translated if it wishes to do so.

Mr. BERGERON. Might I suggest that the translation should be made at the same time as the copy. The report covers 895 pages. It would take to the end of the session to get it copied. If the translation goes on at the same time, we may have the report before us before the session ends.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not for the department, but for the House to see that it is translated. I will call the attention of the clerk to the matter.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Aylesworth for the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act and the proposed amendment of Mr. W. J. Roche thereto.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) opposite, in the closing sentences of the address with which he opened the opposition's side of this debate, appealed to me personally against the provisions of the Bill now before the House which relate to the preparation of lists in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia and the unorganized districts of Quebec and Ontario. He appealed to me, as I understood him, in the name of fairness, of natural justice, of broad equity against the Bill which he characterized as an intensely partisan measure.

Sir, to such an appeal it would be, I consider, my duty under all circumstances to give a respectful hearing, but I must say at once to my hon. friend that I hold myself entirely responsible for the Bill which is now before the House. We introduced it for what we considered to be good and sufficient reasons, and I rise at this moment to endeavour to show to the House and to my hon. friend what these reasons were ; perhaps before I conclude I may also appeal to my hon. friend, in the name of fairness, in the name of natural justice and broad equity, against certain intensely partisan laws. I do not pretend, Mr. Speaker, that I am better than my fellow men, but I do not believe that I am worse. I am a plain man and deal with a plain question in a plain way. I have no hesitation in saying that I am a partisan, but, in all fairness to myself, I do not believe that I would willingly and consciously strike below the belt in order to take an unfair advantage of an opponent; yet, I repeat, I am a partisan, and I have sufficient experience of political life in this coun-

try to know that very often the judgment of a partisan may be blinded and warped. I understand fully, I think, the motive of the opposition which has come to this Bill from gentlemen on the other side of the House, and especially from the members from the province of Manitoba. They dread the effect of the law of their own province if it is to be administered not by officers appointed by the government which would be the case if this Bill were to become law. Let me say to my hon. were to become law, let me say to my hon. friends on the other side of the House, yes, let me appeal at once to their sense of fairness, justice and equity, that there are men on this side of the House who dread the effect of that law if it is to continue to be administered, as it has been, by officers appointed by our opponents as will be the case if this Bill or some other Bill is not passed by this House. Those who oppose this Bill in this House at this moment, dread it in anticipation; those who support it dread the effect of the existing law of Manitoba not in anticipation, but from past experience, and if we are to approach this question without any equivocation, but in justice between man and man, it reduces itself to this that you gentlemen on the other side of the House do not want to go before the country on electoral lists prepared by your opponents and we on this side of the House do not care to go to the country on electoral lists prepared by our opponents. Sir, this seems to me to be the true question, to be the true position and the problem which is now before us. The principle which shall regulate and determine the franchise, whether it shall be controlled by Dominion authorities or by provincial authorities, is a question upon which there has always been a deep line of cleavage between the two parties in Canada. We on this side of the House, the Liberal party, have always maintained that unless there be strong reason to the contrary the lists should be prepared by the provincial authorities, whereas gentlemen on the other side of the House have held the unqualified opinion that under all circumstances the lists should be prepared by the parliament to which the members of this House have to be elected. The opinions held respectively by the two parties have been more than once set before this House by motions which speak for each party. In 1885, when the Franchise Bill was introduced, I was entrusted by my friends with the duty of moving the first amendment, setting forth the principle under which we thought the franchise ought to be regulated and administered. I moved this motion, which was a party motion, and which spoke our mind upon this subject:

> In the opinion of this House it is preferable to continue the plan which has been adopted ever since confederation of utilizing for the elections to this House the provincial franchise and voters' lists.

Many similar motions have been passed from time to time, but this one properly and very accurately, I think, describes the position we then took and have maintained ever since. When the repeal of the Franchise Bill came up for discussion in 1898, a gentleman then a member sitting on the opposite side, Mr. Powell, of Westmoreland, moved this amendment:

> That this House, while desirous of reducing the expense of the preparation of the lists, so far as may be practicable, considers that no system of franchise will be satisfactory which does not preserve federal control over both the basis of the suffrages and the voters' lists.

There, Sir, you see, in concrete form, the respective opinions held by the two parties on this important question. Throughout this debate the members of the opposition have piled quotation upon quotation in order to prove and maintain, at least to their satisfaction, that in introducing this Bill, which in certain provinces and under certain conditions provides that the franchise shall be regulated by this House, that we are in doing this inconsistent, that we are going back upon our record and departing from the policy we have always maintained. This criticism in view of the attitude which has been taken by those who make it at this moment, seems to me, if I may say so without offence, singularly inane. I could understand this criticism, if those who made it were to maintain the policy which they have always maintained. Their policy was and always has been that this House should keep the control over the franchise and over the lists, and when this Bill was presented, taking the control not over the franchise, but partially over certain lists, I cannot understand that these gentlemen can utter the reproach of inconsistency. If we are inconsistent, what are they themselves? If we are departing from our principles, what are they doing? They have always maintained that this House should keep control over the lists. If we were to say that we were going to adopt that principle, I could understand their criticism, but instead of that, their whole claim at this moment is that we are inconsistent. Sir, is it not a fact that in 1885 the Conservative party crammed down our throats a system whereby the lists were taken from independent officers and placed in the hands of officers appointed by themselves, and, therefore, according to the ethics that now prevail, partisans? Yet, Sir, in 1885, though we fought that measure as effectively, as vigorously as I think a measure ever was fought, we never thought of resorting to a refusal of Supply; we never thought of resorting to disorganization of the public service, and if in such questions there be a reason to refuse Supply, we had then ten times more reason than there is at this

moment, because in that case the measure which was introduced was to take the preparation of the list from municipal officers and to place in the hands of men appointed by the government of the day.

Now Sir, passing to another view, not far, however, removed from this one, may I be permitted to say that personally I think my vanity is somewhat flattered by the course which the debate has taken. My vanity is somewhat flattered because the debate has shown that my poor utterances, delivered from time to time in this House, have been diligently scanned and scrutinized by hon. members on the other side of the House. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) have given evidence by their utterances that they have consumed some of the midnight oil in perusing what I may have said on this question from time to time in order to obtain an expression of opinion in favour of the view which they support at this moment. And in the accomplishment of this task, they have, I submit with all humility, but with sincerity, shown more ingenuity than ingenuousness. Everybody knows how misleading it is to take a sentence from a speech or from a writing of any kind without any reference to what precedes or follows, and how the man who is quoted may be thereby made to say the very reverse of what he meant. To give an example, a single example, upon this question, I will recall the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in which he made this quotation from a speech of mine delivered in 1898. In 1898 I spoke as follows :

But I would not have hesitated to accept the franchise provided by a Conservative legislature in Quebec, because, though there were many things in that franchise, on the whole, to which I would have objected, still as it satisfied the province it would have satisfied me. It is in the same way as regards other provinces. It is possible that the control of the several provinces may pass into the hands of the Conservative party; still on a question of this kind I am quite disposed for my part, to accept the franchise prepared by the legislature, whether Liberal or Conservative.

There the quotation ended. The same quotation was made the same night by the hon. member for Prince Edward and there also the quotation ended. Now, Sir, if my hon. friend the leader of the opposition had read a little farther he would have found that that sentence was qualified and singularly qualified in view of the present debate. By this quotation the effect is attempted to be produced in the House and to be produced in the country, where thousands of copies of the speech of my hon. friend are sent broadcast, that I affirmed that under all circumstances, without any exception, the provincial lists ought to be adopted. But, if my hon. friend and if the hon. member for Prince Edward had read the sentence immediately following, the House would have heard this :

But, if the day comes when a fraud is committed against this parliament, when legislation of a hostile character is brought forward in the legislatures, then it will be always open for this parliament to resume its own powers, and to enact a franchise law of its own.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition and my hon. friend from Prince Edward also quoted extensively from the opinions delivered in that debate by the then Solicitor General, Mr. Fitzpatrick, but as far as I know and as far as I have been able to find in their speeches, I do not see this quotation, I do not see this expression of the Solicitor General.

The principle of the whole Act——

Said Mr. Fitzpatrick on that occasion.

—is that we intend to adopt the provincial franchises as the basis of the franchise for the Dominion. That is our intention. It is idle for my hon. friend to assume, or to suppose that we assume, that the provincial franchises existing to-day will continue for all time. I cannot follow the argument of hon. gentlemen on the other side who say that we dispossess ourselves of control over our franchise. We do not do anything of the sort; we simply adopt for the present the franchises of the provinces. But if at any time the provinces should do anything that we consider detrimental to the interests of the Dominion, we are entirely free, we do not tie our hands for all time, to make any change that we think proper. We do not dispossess ourselves of our control over the franchise.

Mr. FOSTER. What page is that ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is on page 3952 and the preceding quotation is at page 4015. And yet, it is difficult to believe that my hon. friend from Prince Edward and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition did not read these sentences, or did not see them. If they tell us that they did not see them it will be a sad comment upon their diligence, and if they tell us that they saw them it will be a sad comment upon their fairness. Neither did I see any quotation of an expression in the line which I have just stated and which was delivered upon the same occasion. An hon. member of the House, in that same debate, spoke as follows:

My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will suggest to me, I suppose, that if the provincial legislatures alter their enactments from time to time we have the power to correct those enactments so far as they are applicable to elections to this parliament; and I concede that at once to be the case; but what does that amount to? It means simply that we have to keep a watch over the principal legis-

latures and check their enactments from time to time. That simply brings us back to the principle that we ought to deal with this matter ourselves. But even if we do adopt the provincial law I would suggest that we should not go beyond saying that the provincial enactments, as they exist at present, and the basis on which the voters' lists are now made up in the different provinces, shall be the basis on which we shall proceed in the future. I do not see why we should pledge ourselves now to the wisdom of what any provincial legislature may pass in the future.

Who was that member of the House ? He was then a member of the House, and is still a member of the House, who spoke in that way. That language was spoken by my hon. friend who was then the senior member for Halifax and who is now the leader of the opposition. I congratulate my hon. friend upon the soundness of the principle which he advocated then. I do not find any fault with him for having so spoken. His views were sound ; I wish I could say the same to-day. He recognized a principle which had been affirmed by Mr. Fitzpatrick and which had been affirmed by myself and accepted by this side of the House. We held to the opinion that the preparation of the lists should be left in the hands of the provincial authorities ; still, we had, in the language of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, to keep watch over the provinces and if we found that conditions arose which would not be fair to this House then it would be our duty to resume our powers and to have the lists prepared by ourselves. Now, having laid down what appears to be the principle held by the two parties which should guide us in any emergency which should occur, I have to say that at this moment, in my humble opinion, a condition of things has arisen in the province of Manitoba which calls, and imperatively calls, for legislation by this House.

I place myself in the judgment of the House, nay, I place myself in the judgment of those gentlemen on the other side who have spoken in this debate when I as-rt,—in view of the facts which it shall be my duty to place before the House,—that we would be recreant to the duty we owe to ourselves and to the people of this country if we did not face the situation and pass the legislation which the condition of things now existing in Manitoba imperatively demands. There are, if I mistake not, forty or forty-two local constituencies in the province of Manitoba and the lists are prepared, not as in the east for each municipality in the constituency, but for the whole constituency. There are, therefore, lists for forty or forty-two local constituencies and there are only ten Dominion constituencies, and consequently when an election takes place for this House it becomes imperative to condense these forty-two lists into ten. That is a serious work, it is work which involves a good deal of consideration but it is work that has to be done. The question is : who should do it ? It has been observed by some members on the other side that there are not only in the province of Manitoba but in other provinces local constituencies the boundaries of which overlap the constituencies for the House of Commons. That is true, but it has never presented a serious difficulty elsewhere because in Quebec and Ontario, and also I believe in some of the other provinces, the lists are prepared for each municipality and in many instances for each polling division and under such circumstances there is no difficulty in adjusting the local lists to the federal constituencies. But in the case of Manitoba, under the conditions which prevail there, when the boundaries of the federal and the provincial constituencies overlap, the task of separating the voters' lists becomes one of serious difficulty. We thought we had provided for this in the Act of 1904 when we provided that this duty should be cast upon the returning officers. Section 25, revised statutes of Canada, says :

> Where any provincial polling division, as constituted at the time of the receipt by the returning officer of the writ for an election, lies only partly within the electoral district for which such election is to be held, the part thereof within such electoral district shall, for the purpose of that election form a separate polling division, or it may be attached by the returning officer to an adjoining polling division; and the returning officer shall, as soon as possible after the receipt of the writ, prepare from the existing voters' list a separate voters' list containing the names of the persons entitled to have their names placed on the list for such part of such polling division.

The duty thus entrusted to returning officers proved to be of exceptional magnitude in Manitoba, and if I may use the expression, some of the returning officers shirked the duty and called upon extraneous aid to help and assist them in its performance. Some of them called upon Mr. Leach, who was Liberal organizer for that province. Now, I am free to say that it was certainly injudicious, most injudicious on the part of these returning officers to call for the services of the Liberal organizer of the province, because suspicion would arise at once that the work would be done unfairly. I say it was injudicious but I do not say it was at all criminal. There was nothing wrong in calling on the services of Mr. Leach if the work was properly, fairly, honestly and accurately done. If, on the other hand, the work was not fairly, accurately, or honestly done it mattered not who was called upon, the crime would exist. Now, some gentlemen on the other side of the House have taken the position, and they have ever maintained it in this debate,

that the returning officers and Mr. Leach in thus adjusting the local lists to the boundaries of the federal constituencies acted in a dishonest manner and disfranchised hundreds, nay, thousands of electors. In fact, in order to characterize their indignation at this allegation of dishonest work on the part of the returning officers and Mr. Leach they have coined a new expression and described it as the thin red line. It is not altogether a new expression, but these gentlemen have given a new sense to the old expression 'the thin red line' which for the last two centuries has described the formation of the British army going into battle. So, in this later day we have two meanings for the expression: The thin red line. Before I proceed further let me say that with regard to this phase of the question my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) was very emphatic, very pronounced and very precise. The hon. gentleman made a very able speech in this debate for which I give him full credit, but able as it was it was even more ingenious than able. In this connection, however, the hon. gentleman made a statement which I think is not to his credit as I believe it is altogether unfounded. After having stated that the lists had been confided by the returning officer to Mr. Leach, the hon. gentleman said ('Hansard' 9299):

When these lists were returned to the returning officer it was found that scores and hundreds of names were scored out by means of the thin red line, not, as I say, confined to border constituencies, but two-thirds of them were polling divisions within the limits of the local constituencies. We are told that it was a necessity to do this. Every Liberal on that side of the House has tried to leave the impression upon this House and the country that the interference took place in connection with polling subdivisions in the interior of these local subdivisions. Their whole argument was to leave the impression that only because of overlapping was there any necessity for the thin red line, and that the thin red line was operated only in those particular instances. I challenge anybody to prove that it took place only in those border constituencies. In my own constituency there was very little overlapping, just a small portion of three municipalities, one of which is in the unorganized district. And still there was 1,900 names through which the red line operated. I am not going to say that those 1,900 names were absolutely disfranchised. It was impossible for me to tell. We did not have an investigation in the constituency of Marquette, and why? I knew the returning officer was an honourable man, he was a personal friend of my own, and he himself could not stoop to anything of this character. Where he erred was in transferring, by the direction of somebody, the voters' lists for the constituency to the Liberal organizer. The latter did the work, he did the disfranchising.

Now, I call the attention of my hon. friend to these words:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

'The latter did the work; he did the disfranchising.'

Here and now I take complete and absolute issue with the statement of my hon. friend. I deny altogether that he has any proof against Mr. Leach that Mr. Leach disfranchised anybody.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, Sir, here and now is the time for both sides to discuss this matter and discuss it we shall. I do not say that Mr. Leach may not have been guilty of some error. That is quite possible. But to say that Mr. Leach or the returning officers deliberately, wilfully disfranchised hundreds, nay thousands, of electors, there is no evidence of such a charge; and, Sir, the proof which I have to give of the assertion I now make is that whenever and wherever those who made this charge against Mr. Leach and against the returning officers were called upon to give their evidence, they failed absolutely in the task. There was a committee of this House appointed two years ago to inquire into these matters. On that occasion this House adopted this motion:

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Acts relating to the election of members of this House, and into the practice and procedure in connection with election petitions, and to consider what changes are desirable therein, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

The members of this committee were: Mr. Aylesworth, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Greenway, Mr. Stockton, Mr. Ingram, Mr. Macdonald, of Pictou, and Mr. Barker. This committee had power to send for persons and papers. They sent for persons to investigate what? To investigate the alleged frauds which were said to have taken place in Manitoba. They sent for whom? They sent for Mr. Knott, the counsel who had been charged with the prosecution of Mr. Leach and the returning officers. They sent for papers—what papers? The papers in connection with the electoral lists in Manitoba. In this committee there were some friends of ours who sit on the other side of the House. There was Mr. Ingram, who is no more in this House, who was a very fair man, but a strong partisan and a good fighter. I say to his credit that no fairer man, in my estimation, ever sat in this House than Mr. Ingram. There was Dr. Stockton, a most honourable man, as everybody knows, and whose loss we certainly deplore. There was my hon. friend from Hamilton—if I may give his name, Mr. Barker, a very fair man and a good fighter, and I think not a man to neglect any advantage that might come to his party. The Conservative members of that committee went into that fight to unearth

something ; and, judging by the eagerness that has been displayed by gentlemen on the other side of the House—I will not say to invent a scandal, but to find a scandal, I do not think, if there had been a scandal there to be unearthed they would have neglected such a splendid opportunity. I do ont think my hon. friend from Hamilton would have neglected to show how guilty these Grits could be, and what dishonest acts they could perform. But, Sir, there is more than this, much more—the government of Manitoba prosecuted these men. It indicted Mr. Leach ; it went into the business very eagerly. But time went on, and on, and on ; and as time went on, the courage of those who had been so eager to expose villainy seems to have gone down and down and down until at last it oozed out at the soles of their boots. The accuser had to press for a trial. It was not the accuser who pressed the indictment to a close ; it was the accused who at last peremptorily asked that they should be tried ; and when the time came for the trial, what took place ? This is what took place : the prosecutor, the Attorney General of Manitoba, declined further to prosecute. Now, what reason could there be why the Attorney General of Manitoba should decline to prosecute such a damnable action as the disfranchising of hundreds and thousands of men ? I will give the reason, as stated by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) ; and certainly, in my humble judgment, no one is more competent to give the reason, because my hon. friend has taken a deep interest in this matter. This is how he spoke, and his language will be found at page 8313 of 'Hansard' :

> Now, I am asked by the hon. member for Pictou, 'Why were these cases dropped?' What have we read in the Liberal press ever since this question arose in 1904? Persecution ! Persecution on the part of the provincial government of Manitoba against these poor officials who had done nothing wrong. So it has been stated, but I do not think they will state it again. We were told that these officials were being persecuted. They were taken from court to court until they were brought to the Court of Appeal. And there it was decided that they were wrong, that they had no right to make these new polling subdivisions, and no right to treat the lists as they did. What was the use of going on when there was a decision of that kind, in the face of which such actions cannot be repeated? Had we gone on, the charge of 'persecution' would have been hurled still more viciously against the Conservatives. But another reason why these cases were dropped was that the Dominion government had turned this into a political question by sending Mr. E. L. Howard to represent the party in these cases. Would it be possible to get a jury that would not be a political jury with the Dominion government defending the accused? I think this is a sufficient answer to the hon. member for Pictou. Had the cases gone on we should have heard much more from the Liberal representatives and the Liberal press the accusation that we were persecuting these returning officers.

This is all the excuse that was given for not going on with this prosecution. Let me call once more to the attention of the House this salient reason which was given by my hon. friend from Marquette for not prosecuting :

> They were taken from court to court until they were brought to the Court of Appeal. And there it was decided that they were wrong, that they had no right to make these new polling subdivisions, and no right to treat the lists as they did. What was the use of going on when there was a decision of that kind, in the face of which such actions cannot be repeated?

So, Sir, if these men were not prosecuted, it was simply because of the magnanimity of the Conservative party. These men were told not to sin again. What ?—the men who had been guilty of disfranchising thousands of electors ? But, Sir, that is not the charge against these men now. It is not pretended by my hon. friend from Marquette that these returning officers acted dishonestly ; but still, though they were simply innocent victims, they were brought to the bar of a criminal court, and had to defend themselves. But what about Leach? Is it also through magnanimity that Leach has not been prosecuted ? My hon. friend said there was no use of having a prosecution, you could not get a verdict before a jury. It would have been difficult, I admit, to have got a verdict before a jury if the charge had been reduced to the statement that the returning officers had acted not dishonestly but simply in an improper conception of the law. But are we to be told that there is a jury in the province of Manitoba who would acquit any man who was guilty of stealing the franchise from his fellow men ? I do not believe that. I am sure that the plea that it would have been useless to go before a jury because the Dominion government had retained the services of Mr. Howard to defend the accused, does not apply to Mr. Leach. Did the Dominion government secure the services of anybody to defend Mr. Leach ? Did the Dominion government secure the services of Mr. Howard to defend its own officers—the returning officers who, according to the expression of my hon. friend, had acted unwisely but not criminally ? But if no charge was made against Mr. Leach, I conclude it was because none could be made. If Mr. Leach had been guilty of having disfranchised thousands of electors, it would have been the duty of every citizen of Manitoba to bring a charge against him in order to punish him for such practices and prevent them in the future. It would have been the duty of the government of Manitoba and of the Conservative party, and, I may add, it would have been still more their pleasure. If therefore

Mr. Leach was not brought to trial, if the Attorney General of Manitoba filed against him a nolle prosequi, if the Attorney General said he would not proceed against him, the only conclusion we can draw is that Mr. Leach was absolutely innocent of the infamous accusation brought against him.

In the face of such a condition of things, it is at least unfair, and, if it were not for my hon. friend from Marquette, I would say unmanly to try to fasten such epithets on Mr. Leach as are heaped daily upon his head, when those who accuse him had not the courage to make good their accusations. But even though this is the case, Mr. Leach is daily assailed and even in this House every day his name is held up to obloquy. And when, some time ago, he was appointed by this government to superintend the distribution of seed grain, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that if he had known that Mr. Leach was to be appointed to such a duty, he would have hesitated before voting the money for the seed grain.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my right hon. friend approve of what Mr. Leach did ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When I am shown that Mr. Leach did anything wrong, I shall not approve it ; but up to this time this has not been shown. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot escape by this tangent. Assertions have been made against Mr. Leach ; but when Mr. Leach asked for the proof and when the opportunity was given to make the proof, neither my hon. friend nor any of his friends brought the proof against him.

May I say something personal to myself. When I heard the statement made by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) —who, I know, is a strong partisan just as I am, and perhaps a little more—I could not believe that he could make such a statement unless, in his own heart and conscience, he thought he had cause to make it. I acquitted him altogether of any intention of consciously doing that man any wrong. Nevertheless he was accusing him ; and when I heard so strong a statement from my hon. friend, I thought I would make some personal inquiry to ascertain what was the character of Mr. Leach. I took some pains to ascertain what was his character, and I must say that the opinion given me by everybody—at least by those with whom I communicated—was that he was a perfectly respectable man. But Mr. Leach has since been acting in the capacity to which he was appointed a few weeks ago in connection with the distribution of grain. There have been some complaints that the grain was not, every part of it, of good quality. I may say that it was not purchased by Mr. Leach but by Mr. Castle—a man, I understand, who is absolutely above reproach. I was given communication of a newspaper in connection with my inquiries, and in that newspaper I read the following :

After a few weeks, however, the farmers from various points in the province began to raise objections to the seed which was delivered to them, and for which they were compelled to sign a lien on their next year's crop before they could examine it. Mr. Leach in a prompt way, arranged for an exchange in several cases and consequently much publicity has been avoided. The fact remains, however, that Mr. Cassels has not been doing what is right by the farmers, and if they had been forced by Mr. Leach to accept the grain given them it would have been a very bad thing for the country.

What is this newspaper which thus speaks of the work done by Mr. Leach, whose nomination was assailed by my hon. friend? It is a Conservative newspaper published in the city of Regina.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the name of the paper ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 'The West.' Passing now to another aspect of the question, I have to observe that this condition of things is a very serious one.

Mr. FOSTER. Which condition ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The condition which prevails in Manitoba with regard to the adjustment of the lists in the constituencies. We thought the work could be done by the returning officers but, as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice said the other day, no one will undertake to-day the duties of returning officer. The task is such that the returning officer would have to submit to the same risks which he took in 1904. Unless we have a change in the law, the returning officer will be in the same peril in which he was in 1904. Suppose we should have an election to-morrow, the lists go to the returning officers as they are, without having been adjusted to the federal constituencies, and the returning officer would have the work thrust upon him of doing this, and he would have the same peril.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my right hon. friend make it clear what his conception of the duties of a returning officer is ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall try to make it clear to my hon. friend. The constituencies are forty-two in number and there are forty-two lists. When a returning officer receives the lists, say of Lisgar or Selkirk, he will receive the lists, not of the constituency of Lisgar or Selkirk, but of all the parts of the local constituencies which are included in Lisgar and Selkirk for the Dominion elections. The boundaries of these constituencies——

Mr. FOSTER. Dominion constituencies ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, the boundaries of the Dominion constituencies

will include part of local constituencies. One part of a local constituency will go into one Dominion constituency and another part into another. Therefore the lists must be adjusted. There must be a red or a black line passed through the names which are not in the constituency for Dominion purposes. Somebody must do that work of adjusting the local lists to the Dominion constituencies by erasing the names which are not in the Federal constituency and adding others which ought to be in the lists. This was the duty entrusted to the returning officers by the Act of 1904 and which they must perform again when we have another Dominion election.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, so far as I follow my right hon. friend, this rearrangement has to be done in the case of polling divisions which are divided by the boundaries of Dominion constituencies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly. We are agreed upon that. Who then shall do this duty? We did entrust it to the returing officer, but we would not do so now. On this point, for my part, after having conferred with my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and my colleagues, we are ready to accept the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) in his speech the other day. My hon. friend quoted the law passed by the legislature of Manitoba subsequently to the last election and then went on in this way:

I tell the Prime Minister that there would not have been the slightest objection to the manner in which the last elections in Manitoba were conducted had the law been observed. I tell the Prime Minister candidly that if he wants to prevent a recurrence of the carelessness of transferring names, and if he wants to prevent the disfranchisement of electors by means of transferring where there is overlapping, the only thing he has to do is to adopt the provision of the provincial Act and employ a county court judge to do that dividing. That will get over every complaint that has been made and it will obviate the necessity of the thin red line. Let the county court judge do the transferring where there is overlapping, let him appoint each one of these separated places as a separate polling division as the provincial Act enacts, let him do the dividing of the lists and there will not be a single complaint from Grit or Tory in the province of Manitoba.

The Act to which the hon. gentleman refers says:

In the event of territory comprised within or partly comprised within an electoral division being changed and included in another electoral division, or other electoral divisions, whether newly created or not, a judge of one of the county courts divisions of the province to be nominated and appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall subdivide the names appearing on the list of electors, as so finally revised, according to the altered boundaries or limits, and make a complete list of electors for the electoral divisions affected, as aforesaid, and appropriately divide the names of electors and allot the territory between suitable polling subdivisions as shall, in the opinion of such judge, be just and equitable.

I must say that the provision of this Act of the legislature of Manitoba seems to be fair. We are disposed to accept it. But we cannot do this except by legislation, and legislation of this parliament. And I say to my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) that, if this would be agreeable to Grit and Tory alike, for my part I am quite willing to take this means of giving satisfaction to Grit and Tory alike. But my hon. friend should have had some consistency in his speech. After making this offer. he has moved an amendment which practically defeats the object he has in mind.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. Because if the amendment is carried, there can be no reference to judges to allocate the names.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Because the Bill will be defeated.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But, will the right hon. gentleman permit me a moment? I made the same suggestion in the first speech that was made on this Bill on this side of the House. I pointed out that the difficulty is not confined to Manitoba, and stated that we were willing to accept the provisions of the Manitoba law as general legislation applicable to all Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But I have this to say to my hon. friend—that this difficulty arises in Manitoba, and elsewhere it does not arise.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Because everywhere else the lists are prepared by the municipality.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But that cannot make any difference in the division of the lists.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Did the hon. gentleman ever hear of any difficulty elsewhere? For instance, there was at one time a case in Quebec—I think it has been rectified since. The parish of St. Guillaume, which was in Yamaska for the local, was in Drummond and Arthabaska in the federal, and yet there was no difficulty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There need be no difficulty where the law as it stands is honestly carried out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, that red line is too thin altogether. There was no difficulty in that case, because you have

only to take the list of the parish as it stands, and transfer it from one polling division to the other. But, in Manitoba, where the lists are not made by municipalities or by polling divisions, but for the whole constituency, it is absolutely indispensable that there should be somebody, in case of overlapping, to allocate the names according to the divisions. However, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said, to have that bisecting done. all you have to do is to have the names allocated to one division or the other. Now, we will not quarrel over that. I understand that the proposal is acceptable——

Mr. FOSTER. Let us be perfectly clear. The right hon. gentleman has nothing further to say with reference to the polling divisions which are not divided by the boundaries of the constituencies?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the polling divisions are not divided by the boundaries of the Dominion constituencies, I do not see any necessity for intervention; it is only where they are divided, so far as I can see, that the necessity for intervention arises.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Before the right hon. gentleman leaves that point, as he has admitted that he sees no reason for interference where the polling subdivisions are entirely within the Dominion constituency, what defence has he to offer for the interference in the last election?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My answer is that I am not aware that anything of that kind took place.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I simply say that it has not been brought to my attention and I do not know about it. I can only say that, if it were so, I am surprised that the prosecutions were not carried out to a final issue.

Now, Sir, so far, we agree that there is a measure of relief which would give satisfaction to both Grits and Tories alike. That is a point at which it is satisfactory to have arrived. The question, however, does not rest there. On this side of the House there is an intimate conviction that the lists in the province of Manitoba are very unfair to the political party to which I belong. The members from Manitoba who sit on this side have given what seem to me conclusive evidence on that point. I have looked into the Manitoba Act. In many respects, it is a commendable Act. But, in my humble judgment, the Manitoba Act has a radical defect in this. that it places the whole machinery of the revision of the lists in the hands of the Governor in Council.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It does not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some exception is taken to my statement. I rather welcome this. Let us discuss the point. What I say is that, under the Act as it is at the present time, there is one thing that is permanent, settled for all time. The registration board, as constituted by the Act, is composed of the county judges of the province, which board appoints the revising officers. But who appoints the registration clerks ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Revision is what you were talking about, not registration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We are talking about both, because both go together. Who appoints the registration clerks? The government of the province of Manitoba. Who fixes the registration districts? The government of the province of Manitoba. Who fixes the revision districts? The government of the province of Manitoba. On this point, I have only to call attention to section 22 of the Act, which is as follows :

22. Annually, on or before the first day of May, the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall, by order in council, authorize the issuing of a proclamation (form 1 in the schedule to this Act) setting forth:

(1) That it has been determined to add to, correct and revise the list of electors;

(2) The names and post office addresses of the persons appointed by such order in council to act as registration clerks in the respective electoral divisions of the province, for such purposes;

(3) The date or dates on, the place or places at, and the hours between which applications for registration and the correction and striking off names of electors will be received and shall be concluded in each electoral division.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the right hon. gentleman excuse me? Perhaps he will read section 61 also.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will go further than my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner) asks. I will read not only section 61, but section 42 and section 65 also.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Read the whole Act. We will stand by the whole Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well. Here is section 61 :

In order to give full and due effect to the powers of the board, the said board may provide for any proceeding. matter or thing for which express provision has not been herein made, or for which only partial provision has been made; or, where it shall be found that the time allowed to do any act is insufficient and an alteration or extension of such time, and any alteration of dates consequent thereon, shall appear to be necessary, the board may declare that such alteration may be made, and thereupon the same shall be made and take effect accordingly.

This is the power of the board. As I understand it is to extend the time and to

do anything else they think proper to carry on their work.

Section 42 contains this also :

In case, by reason of interruptions or other emergency a sitting of the registration clerk is not commenced on the proper day, or is interrupted after being commenced and before the closing thereof, the registration clerk shall resume the registration on the following day and so on from day to day within the hours hereinbefore limited, until the registration sittings have been opened and kept open without interruption, and with free access to persons desiring to be registered, for the full number of days provided in the proclamation to be issued under the provisions of this Act. The times limited for the registration of electors shall be directory only, and any mistake or miscarriage in respect thereto shall not invalidate the list of electors of any electoral division.

This seems to be perfectly fair. I have nothing to say against it. On the contrary I would altogether commend it. It provides that if the registration clerk, within the time allotted to him by the proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor, has not sufficient time to hear all the applications or to erase names or to do all the work he is commanded to do, he can extend the time.

I would call the attention of my hon. friend who has interrupted me to section 65, subsection 11 :

The revising officer shall also receive and deal with the applications of all persons to be registered as electors who shall be present at the time fixed for the closing of the court of revision, notwithstanding that the time so fixed shall have elapsed.

Section 42 relates to the duties of the registration clerks ; section 65 relates to the duties of the revising officer. There is a marked difference between the two. I do not know whether it is intentional or accidental, I suppose perhaps it is only accidental, but if it is accidental it has worked serious mischief to some people. Whereas the registration clerk can according to section 42 extend the time not only to receive applications, but to erase names and correct the list in every particular, section 65, subsection 11, gives power to the revising officer to extend the time for receiving applications, but not for the erasing of names. I do not say that this is not accidental, but at all events I understand that whereas the registration clerk could and did on more than one occasion extend the time to receive applications and to erase names, the revising officer would, under certain circumstances on certain occasions, extend the time to receive names, but refused to extend the time for erasing names. Upon this we have the testimony of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) who stated that to his knowledge, in his personal case, in order to have certain names erased which he could not get erased because the time had expired, he had to bargain with his opponents in order to get a certain number, although he could have doubled the number if the time had been given. But be this as it may, I point out to the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche), who are both conversant with this Act, that though I find in this Act power given to the revising officer, though I find power given to the registration clerk to extend the time, I see no power given in this Act to extend or change the locality where the registration is to take place. The Act, section 22, says distinctly, that :

The Governor in Council shall fix the date or dates on, the place or places at, and the hours between which, applications for registration and the correction and striking off names of electors will be received and shall be concluded in each electoral division.

I speak subject to correction, as I have not given to the study of this Act all the time I would wish, but in my hasty perusal of it I did not find anywhere that the registration clerk or the revising officers have the power to extend the locality in which the registration is to take place. The order in council says that the registration shall take place at this locality, it shall take place at Beausejour, but you cannot extend it to Lac du Bonnet. It must take place there, and there alone. Is that fair, is that right, is that according to justice? The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) the other day gave an example of its unfairness. He stated to the House that in a certain place, which turned out to be Beausejour, the revising officer, finding that a certain number of men in another settlement in the same registration district, called Lac du Bonnet, could not come to register their names, took upon himself to go to Lac du Bonnet, to extend the place and there he registered the names of thirty qualified electors ; and he stated further that when this registration list was brought to the Attorney General's office the names were simply contemptuously torn from the list and these men were disfranchised. When the hon. member for Lisgar made that speech the other day the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) hastily rose to his feet with this interruption :

Would the hon. member for Lisgar be fair enough to state that Judge Walker, the chairman of the registration board, reported to the government that this officer had held a court of revision illegally, after his certificate had expired.

Yes, Judge Walker actually said that officer was acting illegally. It was contrary to the law of Manitoba—but it was in accordance with natural justice. It is unfortunate that the law of Manitoba and the law of natural justice are not on a par. It was against the law of Manitoba,

but I ask, in all fairness of my hon. friend from Marquette, should this be against the law of Manitoba? Will it be said that such a law should be maintained and are we in this House powerless to remedy such an outrage against duly qualified electors? Shall it be said that although the law of Manitoba will not allow justice to be done under such circumstances we have to sit still and allow these men to be disfranchised? That is the position in which we are placed and that is one reason why we came to the conclusion that we had to take some action this year.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) stated the other day, and his statement was repeated by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), that in 1904 an Act had been drafted to deal with the province of Manitoba, that the Act had been printed, not only drafted, but printed. I wondered at the time if my ears did not deceive me when such a statement was made. If such a Bill had been prepared I would have known something of it, and I have to say here that no Act was drafted in 1904 but the Act which was brought down by the Minister of Justice and which became law. No such Act as has been suggested by the hon. member for Souris and the hon. member for Marquette even was contemplated, although the suggestion may have been made.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does the Prime Minister say that no Act was contemplated, no Bill was drafted?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No Act was contemplated by the government and no Bill was prepared, that I say most decisively.

Mr. STAPLES. Was such a Bill prepared in 1903?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So far as my memory goes, I say with all candour to my hon. friend that no Act was prepared in 1903 or 1904 except the Act which was brought down in 1904. I may say, and why should I not say, that my friends from Manitoba represented to me at that time, as they did since, that the Act of Manitoba was very unfair towards them, especially in the manner in which it was administered. This year we have thought, however, that we should listen to the representations made to us upon this subject. I consulted the Minister of Justice, I consulted my colleagues, and we determined to bring down the Bill that we have to-day, not, Sir, that we are absolutely wedded to that Bill, not that we are not prepared to receive amendments from our friends, not that we are not ready to try to improve it and amend it so as to give satisfaction, in the very words of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche), to Grit and Tory alike. But, Sir, I ask my hon. friends if they will not admit that although the legislation which today exists in Manitoba and the manner in which it is administered may be satisfactory to the Tories, it is not satisfactory to the Grits—and that is the reason we have introduced this legislation.

Now, Sir, my hon. friends will tell me that they do not want this legislation. They are absolutely opposed to it because the legislation which we bring forward would place the preparation of the lists, in so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned, in the hands of officers appointed by this government. That is their objection. Let us be frank with one another upon this question. Let us meet on principles which we can all appeal to and which we can all accept. My hon. friend from Marquette and other hon. members on the other side of the House do not want this law to be passed, because, if it were to be passed, it would give the preparation of the lists, not to their own friends, but to our own friends. Now, Sir, will it surprise them very much, if they have no confidence in us, that we should not be burdened by much confidence in them? If they think it is unfair that the lists upon which they want to go to the election should be prepared by their opponents do they think it is fair that the lists upon which we would have to go to the election should be prepared by our opponents? Can we not agree therefore to devise a law which will remove the control of the elections both from the Grits and the Tories so as to give satifaction to both Grits and Tories? That is the proposition which I have to make to my hon. friend from Marquette and to all the other hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House. The other day the hon. member for Marquette stated that the lists as prepared were perfectly honest and as evidence of his earnestness in the matter he quoted this article from the 'Telegram' of Winnipeg in which $25 is offered to every man who presents proof that, being a qualified elector, his name has not been put upon the list:

> The 'Telegram' will pay the sum of $25 to any elector in the province of Manitoba who is not already on the voters' lists who is refused registration if he applies in the regular manner and is legally qualified to vote under our law. Should any claim or claims be made under this offer each case to be referred to Hon. C. J. Mickle, leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition in the Manitoba legislature, from whose decision there shall be no appeal. Should any award be made, one half the amount is to be paid to the elector who has been refused registration and the other half to the Winnipeg General Hospital.

If my hon. friend is so confident of the honesty and accuracy of the lists prepared by this revision perhaps he will agree with me that it would be more in accordance

with the fitness of things if the elector who has been deprived of his vote, whose name has not been placed upon the list, instead of receiving $25, should have an opportunity of having his name placed upon the list. My hon. friend, I suppose, will agree to that ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The 'Telegram' newspaper cannot very well place him upon the list.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The 'Telegram' cannot place his name on the list, but this parliament can amend the law so as to give him his vote. Will the hon. gentleman agree to that ? That is the proposition I have to make. The judge who is empowered to adjust the lists will be entrusted with the work of correcting all errors which may have been committed in the preparation of the lists in Manitoba.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The right hon. gentleman says that the lists are now prepared by partisan officials of the provincial government. Does he refer to the registration clerks or the revising barristers ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To the registration clerks.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Will the right hon. gentleman point out some of the abuses committed by the registration clerks ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is no use of making a declaration if you cannot prove it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My answer is simply this : If the lists upon which this House is to be elected are to be prepared by officers appointed by this government, would you call them partisan officials ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would like to point out to the right hon. gentleman that the registration clerks do not prepare the lists ; they accept the affidavits of the elector who makes application for personal registration. The registration clerk cannot put the elector's name on the list without an affidavit.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is simply another way of looking at the question. I will put the question again. It is a play upon words and nothing else. If this Bill becomes law and if the registration clerk is appointed by this government will my hon. friend be satisfied ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I will if you apply the same law to every province in the Dominion. We are not going to be singled out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will not apply the same law to the other provinces of the Dominion, because in the province of Ontario and the other provinces the lists are prepared by the municipal officers.

Mr. LANCASTER. The lists are not prepared, where there is registration, by the municipal clerks, but they are prepared by the registration clerks.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) is in error. I do not know the province of Ontario as well as he does, but in rural Ontario the lists are prepared by the municipal councils.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is no registration in rural Ontario.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no registration in rural Ontario. In certain cities there is registration, but it is a drop in the bucket. There are only a few cities in which there is registration. In rural Ontario the lists are prepared by municipal councils.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where there is registration in Ontario the registration clerks are appointed by the provincial government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Possibly. We do not touch them. My hon. friend does not find fault with that. But, I say this to my hon. friend from Marquette : He proposes that we shall apply the same principle everywhere, but I say that elsewhere the lists are prepared by the municipal authorities.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The right hon. gentleman has not answered my question. Will he point out abuses committed by the registration clerks and unfairness towards their opponents.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have only to refer my hon. friend to the speech of my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Jackson), to the speech of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) and to the speech of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway). These are the evidences that I have. I have to say this to my hon. friend ; he will take my suggestion for what it is worth, he will accept it or not accept it, but I think we shall have a fair basis upon which to prepare the lists for the election, without any suspicion on the part of anybody, if the lists are prepared altogether under judicial authority.

Now, Sir, I have said enough with respect to the province of Manitoba. I come now to the other provisions of the Bill. The Bill was prepared with an object and upon a general principle and that principle was that wherever there is no municipal registration or municipal preparation of the lists we shall entrust the preparation of the lists to the authority provided for by this Bill. I listened the other day to the speech of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in so far as this provision related to Quebec. I must say that I listened to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier with a mingled feeling of curiosity and pain. My

hon. friend was at once alarmed and bellicose. He was alarmed because he saw in the unorganized districts of Quebec visions of Syrians, Italians, and other foreigners being put on the lists along the line of the Transcontinental railway. I think my hon. friend need not be alarmed upon this question. It is said that beauty is in the eye of the gazer. It looks very much as if scandal was very much in the eye of the gazer. Scandal exists in the imagination of my hon. friend and he believes that we have a sinister motive in view. If this Bill were passed and if authority were given in the unorganized portions of Quebec to have the lists prepared how could the Grand Trunk Pacific come into play ?

Where would it be ? Would it be the county of Montcalm, or of Joliette or of any of these counties which extend to the Hudson bay, or would it be beyond the mountains? How could the registration officer or the revising officer go to the line of the Transcontinental Railway in order to make a list? I do not think that argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is very serious, but he made a plea to maintain our system and with that idea I am very much in accord, when the system is right. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) argued that in the province of Quebec there is no unorganized territory, because if a territory is unorganized it is placed under the jurisdiction of a county council. Let me explain to the hon. gentlemen from other parts of Canada that our municipal system in Quebec is the same as in Ontario; we have local councils in every municipality, our municipalities are townships, villages and parishes, and the mayors of all the local municipalities are the members of the county council. But there is a provision in our municipal code, peculiar to that code so far as I am aware. which says that if there is in any county a territory which is unorganized it is placed under the supervision of the county council. That is a very wise provision, but I do not think it can be construed to the length my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) would construe it. I understand that the county council has jurisdiction over all municipal matters which are to be found within the code—for instance, if the unorganized territory in any of these counties needs roads, the county council would deal with that, or if there is a by-law to be passed in favour of the prohibition of the liquor traffic the powers of the municipal council would apply to that. But I fail to see within the four corners of the municipal code any provision which gives to the secretary-treasurer of the municipal council the duty of making electoral lists in those territories, and in our province these lists are prepared by the secretary-treasurer under the supervision of the council. This power is not given to them under the municipal code but by the Election Act, which says :

The secretary-treasurer of each municipality shall, between the 1st and 15th day of the month of March, annually make in duplicate subdivided for each polling subdivision a list in alphabetical order of all persons who according to the valuation roll then in force in the municipality for municipal purposes appear to be electors by reason of the real estate possessed or occupied by them in any manner within the municipality or by reason of being otherwise qualified as set forth in article 9.

Does my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) believe that this article which places on the secretary-treasurer of local councils the duty of preparing these lists, can be applied to the secretary-treasurer of the county councils. I have very serious doubt as to that. I have not had an opportunity yet of conferring with the Minister of Justice on that question, but if my hon. friend's view is correct I will be more than pleased ; if his view is correct the province of Quebec would be beyond the jurisdiction of this Act and that should be satisfactory to him as it is to me.

With regard to the other provinces I do not think I should say much more.

Now, revising the whole question it is beyond doubt that we should have an election law; that we should improve the electoral Act, that we should give satisfaction to public opinion which has imperatively demanded a new election law. Viewing the debate as it has proceeded up to the present, I think I can say that no system of preparing the lists will be satisfactory to this side or to the other side if it is to be made for party purposes either by the Dominion government or by any provincial government.

Mr. BOYCE. In view of the very grave irregularities which have been pointed out and proven with regard to the making up of voters' lists in the unorganized territory of Ontario, would the right hon. gentleman suggest whether there is to be any improvement in the law ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I stated a moment ago, if it be agreeable to my hon. friends on the other side I am disposed to leave the preparation of the lists in northern Ontario, not to any partisan officer, but to place it altogether under the control of the judges. That I am prepared to do.

Mr. BOYCE. What judges ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will come to that when we are in committee. I shall be only too glad to receive the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce). I am not entering into this with any preconceived opinion; I am disposed to receive the suggestion of my hon. friend and perhaps I will be glad to avail myself of his services. We are all interested in this question. In conclusion I have simply this to say—my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has

appealed to me and I also appeal to him. I appeal to him in the name of fairness, of broad equity, of natural justice, to help us to frame an Act which will place the whole machinery of the preparation of the lists under judicial authority so as to give satisfaction to Grit and Tory and so that when an election takes place sooner or later the voice of the people absolutely untrammelled may be given expression to. That is the position which we take and that is the position which we place before the House and before the country.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend has not said anything about the ballot.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On that question I must say that in my opinion very little justice has been done to my hon friend the Minister of Justice. There is no such intention as has been attributed to my hon. friend to try and tamper with the secrecy of the ballot. What we have in mind is to prevent if possible a recurrence of what has taken place when the voice of the people in certain elections has been baffled and set aside by the intervention of mere technicalities. I have to say that upon this point and upon every other point of this Bill we are prepared to receive suggestions, to amend the Bill if necessary so as to give effect to the policy contained in it, which is the secrecy of the ballot without stifling the voice of the people as pronounced by them. Should we say that it is impossible to prevent what has taken place in certain constituencies; should we say that we cannot frame an Act which will preserve the secrecy of the ballot and at the same time to prevent a recurrence of such a thing as that a man who has been honestly elected to this House by the people could not take his seat ?

Mr. ALCORN. Has the right hon. gentleman mapped out or has he in mind any modus operandi by which his new lists will be made altogether under judicial authority.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think so. I think we will be prepared to do so at the proper time when we are in committee.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, the debate upon this Bill has been proceeding now well on into the second week, and up to the present time we on this side of the House have been noting particularly the evidence and testimony adduced which might be considered a sufficient basis upon which the very drastic legislation contemplated in this Bill has been founded. The evidence and testimony upon which to base legislation of this kind ought to be, I think, more than hearsay and more than mere assertion. Now, whether we are right or wrong, from the time the Minister of Justice took his feet to explain this Bill until the last gentleman on that side of the House finished his speech last evening, I am free to say for myself that the evidence and the testimony has been of the most unreliable, illusory and unsatisfactory nature. I am on my feet to declare that if you submit the speech of the Minister of Justice to a critical analysis, what with the actual misrepresentation of facts, what with the hearsay and allegation of what might have been or what might not have been, take those all out, and you have scarcely anything left, in that speech. I had thought to submit a little analysis of it, even at the risk of repeating what was so well done by my friend Dr. Schaffner, from Souris, last night; but it was done to a very thin House. Then we have the hon. gentleman from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), who was an actor in the legislative and political history of Manitoba, from whom we ought to have had precept upon precept and line upon line and proof for every assertion. Boil down the speech of my hon. friend from Lisgar, and you reduce it in the main to a mere froth of assumption and of hearsay. Then I followed very closely that most remarkable exhibition, the speech of the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole). I understand that that hon. gentleman does not propose to go back again to Winnipeg to ask for the suffrages of the people. If this last performances of his in this House can have any weight, ought to be taken into consideration, is it too much for me to say that I think the people of Winnipeg may well be congratulated? Then, I listened, and read after listening, the speech of the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford), and I defy any one to take that speech and thoroughly analyse it, and find any large basis of fact in it. And to-day I have listened to the speech of my right hon. friend the leader of the government, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, just fresh from that speech, where is the body of proof given by my right hon. friend upon which to base a grievance sufficiently large and sufficiently grave to justify this House in adopting this drastic legislation which he has proposed. If there had been an investigation into alleged grievances in Manitoba, with reference to the work of the registration clerks or with reference to the work of the revising officers, and if out of that investigation, carried on fairly, reasonably, and according to terms of law, there had been presented to this House sufficient evidence that a fraud was being perpetrated, that a hostile attitude was being taken by the legislature of Manitoba towards this Dominion government with reference to one-half of its people allied to his party, then, Sir, he would have had good ground upon which to base drastic legislation, and then the proviso stated by my right hon. friend and alluded to by my hon. friend at my side (Mr. R. L. Borden), that such a state of circumstances might arise in a province, in its attitude and in its action towards a

party in this House, which would justify some action on the part of this House. But, Sir, we have had no investigation, we have had no proof; we have had simply assertion of the most allusory and unsatisfactory kind. Against all that I put this one consideration, and it is a consideration which I put to the man on the street, to the man who is unpartisan, to the man who simply wants to be fair, and I put it to my right hon. friend. It is this: You have a party in the province of Manitoba, the Liberal party of that province; they are your supporters in this House; without their action you would not have a Liberal supporter from the province of Manitoba. That party has its home and its existence in that province of Manitoba. It is vitally interested in provincial politics as well as in Dominion politics—may we not say more interested in provincial politics than in Dominion politics? Your party of men in the province of Manitoba is to-day well officered, intelligent, has its organs of public opinion to express its position and to expose its grievances if it has any. In the House of Winnipeg to-day you have one of the best men of the Liberal party, I think, the Hon. Mr. Mickle, who represents that party in the province of Manitoba. He is an old politician; the history of politics in that country is contemporaneous with himself; he has worked through it, lived through it, knows of it as an active partaker in the political life of that province. If this condition of things exists in the province of Manitoba, it exists as a tyranny and oppression of the Liberals as far as they are concerned provincially just the same as it does as far as they are concerned federally. Is that not absolutely true? Are we to consider that, if those grievances, if those acts of oppression, tyranny and fraud, are absolutely true, the Liberals of the province of Manitoba sit down quietly under that state of things, and neither through their organs of public opinion—I would not say so much about that—nor through their representatives in the provincial legislature have they made any move of warfare, opposition or amendment with reference to that state of things?

Take a concrete example and it serves here splendidly. There was your representative from Winnipeg—doing what? A gentleman in the provincial legislature because cognizant, more than a year ago, of an alleged dirty and dastardly attempt to put 450 foreign voters on the naturalization lists and on the voters' lists for the province of Manitoba—in the city of Winnipeg, if I remember right. That is knowledge which comes to him. He knows it because he paid for it or gave his cheque to pay for it. He knows it because he procured those affidavits, because he read those affidavits, because he was alongside Rudneski and the other gentlemen who swore to the affidavits. He bought the live carcass more than a year ago, but up to the present day he has not presented the animal to the provincial legislature. But he hands over the dead carcass to the selected purveyor of that sort of thing the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr Bole), and that member brings into this House the carcass, ill smelling and decayed, on a silver salver and presents it to my right hon. friend, and he calls it sweet meat. What does my hon. friend think of that? With what applause was not the reading of those affidavits received—those affidavits which the hon. gentleman who procured them and paid for them, and had for more than a year in his possession, did not dare offer at home. But a thousand miles away was the theatre where they could be presented to the applause of the right hon. gentleman and all honourable Liberals who support him in this House. I am willing that this matter be judged by that simple proof. Show me a vote among the provincial Liberals in the province of Manitoba, show me a debate in the provincial legislature in Manitoba, show me a grievance ventilated in that legislature, show me a single amendment proposed in that legislature, show me one move made by honest thinking men there with regard to those grievances which press down so severely on the party opposite. There is a challenge to my right hon. friend. Let him point out one protest in the local legislature of that province. My right hon. friend cannot do it. But he is willing to take these old, decayed and dastardly affidavits, brought into this House, as the proof upon which he comes with this radical legislation and proposes to carry it through willy nilly. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr Bole) read affidavits from these men; and on the very face of them, they were men who were absolutely without conscience and without principle because they swore that they did everything that was illegal and wrong with reference to the naturalization and the putting of names on the lists, and they did that for pay. That is the herd with which the hon. member for Winnipeg runs. That is the herd with which my right hon. friend runs. For he himself applauded the reading of those affidavits. I saw him applauding. Affidavits of that kind brought down 1,000 miles from the scene of the transaction, where they were ashamed to deploy it, and those men's affidavits put up here to traduce throughout the whole Dominion of Canada, by being spread on the records of the Dominion, honourable men and honourable officials in the city of Winnipeg, in the Manitoba government and in Manitoba public life! That I leave with gentlemen who have such peculiar ideas of their position and rights in this House as the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole). And it is the saddest of things for me to know that that was applauded by my right hon. friend and by other gentle-

men on that side of the House. Now how do you explain the absolute inaction under this tremendous pile of grievances and wrong—inaction absolute and positive of the Liberal party in local affairs in the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba? Has my righ thon. friend any explanation to give? Is there any explanation of it? If there is an explanation, is it not this, that the men who are closest to it know that there is nothing in it, and the men that are furthest away, it is thought can be bamboozled by reckless statements? At Winnipeg where the people live, in Manitoba where they know this sort of talk the assertion would not go down. That is the reason it is not employed there. The distance is the reason it is employed here. More than that, will my right hon. friend deny that the Hon. Mr. Mickle has stated in the local legislature that the present Manitoba law is fairly good legislation and the best they have had in that province in his political experience? There is your local leader—will my right hon. friend give any credence at all to this local leader in the Manitoba legislature? Or will he rather take the Rudneski affidavits, brought by the hon. member for Winnipeg, as a proof, against the word of the leader of his party in the local legislature?

We have waited a long while for legislation with reference to an election law. It has been long promised and is much needed. It has been looked for widely. At last it comes down, and when it comes down, what is it? Take the speech of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). For all that fell from him, this Bill consists absolutely of one clause and one only. That is the clause for taking over the franchises of Manitoba and British Columbia and the unorganized territories. In his speech the Minister of Justice gave more than three quarters of his time to section number 1 of this Bill and very cursory attention, if any, to the other sections.

What is this Bill when we come to look at it? It is remarkable for what it does not include. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) briefly enumerated what it does not include that it might have included. No provision is made for simultaneous polling, that is, that all the constituencies of the Dominion, with the possible exception of the Yukon, shall have polling on the same day. The present method is an abuse. There is no reason why the polling should not be simultaneous. But the Minister of Justice was too busy with section 1 of this Bill to think about the simultaneous polling. And what about the other flagrant abuse practically carried on by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) of allowing a constituency to remain unrepresented indefinitely in this House because of partisan and political difficulties which remain to be cured? Is it not an outrage upon the rights of the people, upon all principles of good government, that an electoral unit should remain unrepresented in this House for a longer time than is actually and reasonably necessary to bring about an election? There is nothing in this Bill to make it necessary that by-elections shall be held within a reasonable time, or to provide that, if there be more than one vacancy, the elections shall take place simultaneously. There is nothing of improved machinery, either as regards methods or appointees, with the exception of one or two technical improvements, as, for instance, in the service of writs in election protests and so on. There is nothing to prevent that abuse, which has been growing under this government, of using government officials as active political partisans. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) made, I think, a very great slip the other night, a slip which shows that he at least, whatever may be true of the government as a whole, has not the least idea of the principle involved or of the gravity of this matter. What is the fact of the case? The fact is that the government use their officials, dressed in its authority—and every Dominion official has a certain authority by virtue of being a Dominion official—to help their party in their election contests, making of the officials, in many cases, almost permanent electioneering clerks. The Minister of the Interior tried to excuse one case by saying that, though he had one Dominion official with him in an election contest, the official was not a permanent employee, or was paid a very small salary. The salary has nothing at all to do with the matter, in my estimation. The gravamen of the charge is that the official is dressed in government authority and yet represents the party in power. It makes no difference whether he receives $300 a year or $3,000 a year; the bad principle is in allowing that kind of influence to be exerted. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has been profuse in professions. With the assistance of his supporters he has helped to carry unanimously in this House a resolution that officials should not be allowed to take a partisan part in elections. Yet there is nothing in this Bill to carry that out—profession and profession only; when it comes to the practical fulfilment of the professions here in this Bill, simply nothing is done. How about that growing evil, that growing scandal in this country, of using public works and promises of expenditure of public money in special cases at by-elections or otherwise in order to influence the voters in favour of the government? Everywhere, in properly constituted countries, this is considered a wrong. It is a growing and grievous wrong in this country, yet there is nothing in this Bill to prevent it. The examples which we have had within the last two years of the use made by ministers and others of that kind of in-

fluence have been so gross, so unconcealed that the independent press of this country has launched its vigorous opposition against it, and thinking men all over the country are condemning it more and more. Yet where is the clause in this Bill that applies to that? Then, Sir, there are no adequate penalities for certain election crimes such as have been shown to exist through the action of the courts within the last year or two. And, more than that, there is no effective power to carry the election law into effect, so that these crimes declared to be crimes by the law shall be exposed and the evil-doers punished.

I have said that there are two or three satisfactory technical amendments. But one change that is made seems to allow a method of legal corruption. The Bill—whatever may be meant by it—authorizes incorporated companies for political purposes only to distribute alms without incurring the penalties of the law. There is a vista opening before us; there is a provision of wonderful possibilities. We have no explanation of it from any hon. gentleman who has spoken on the side of the government. We do not know what it means, but it seems to be a peculiar proposition and one that may lead to great abuses. Then we have in this Bill an attack upon the secrecy of the ballot. After seven days' debate, after the clause had been attacked right and left, the first light that we are given upon it is the statement made by the Prime Minister that his Minister of Justice did not mean what the clause says; That is what the right hon. gentleman's statement amounts to. And he says the Minister of Justice has been very unfairly criticised in the statement that this means a departure from the secrecy of the ballot. The section says :

> Provided, however, that no ballot paper shall be rejected on account of any writings, number or mark placed thereon by any deputy returning officer.

That is as wide as it can be made. It covers any kind of combination or series of combination. It opens the way for the purchase of votes, because it provides a method by which the vote can be identified. Any deputy returning officer of the calibre of hundreds of deputy returning officers of whom we have had experience in this country could, under that plenary power, make it possible for the party that he stands in with—and he is a partisan appointee—to make their negotiations upon the basis of absolute certainty and to have the ballots marked so that they can be absolutely identified and that payment can be arranged for with absolute certainty that it can be known whether the goods are or are not delivered. The very fact that this provision is in the Bill will raise fear in the mind of every dependent, of every poor man who would rather conceal the way in which he votes, the man who labours for a corporation or for a master who would try to influence his vote—that there is no use, that it is impossible for him to escape, that his ballot will be identified and the way in which he votes will become known. That is the first thing. But the second thing is what I have spoken of, that it opens an organized, trustworthy and certain method of clinching the wrongful negotiations that take place for the purchase and sale of votes.

My right hon. friend says that the minister has been unduly criticised. What criticism could there be ? The minister himself never opened his mouth upon it, he did not explain it, his explanation is in the clause and the clause, I have read. What we suppose is that the clause means what it says, and if it means what it says it certainly is open to criticism of the most stringent and vehement kind. The Bill does something else, it provides for a partisan division of electors in divided polling subdivisions. That remark is absolutely true as far as the Bill goes, as far as the arguments to support the Bill up to this date go, because every gentleman who has spoken on that side has gone upon the Bill and has approved of the Bill, the whole Bill and nothing but the Bill. To-day my right hon. friend says that he will delete partisanship entirely from the redistribution of voters and will have the redistribution conducted entirely by county court judges. That is not the Bill, but why did the right hon. gentleman, if that was the intention of the Bill or his intention, waste the time of this House for seven long days, keep back the business of the country at this late time of the session, imperil the wages of working men and civil servants all through this country and then, at this late day, announce that he has agreed to delete partisanship from that portion of it ? We agree absolutely in this, that if it is necessary, as it is, to have overlapping polling subdivisions distributed—I agree to that, we all agree to that—any reasonable legislation which is non-partisan and competent legislation will receive the support of this side of the House so far as that delimination is concerned. My hon. friend who leads the government said that on Tuesday last.

Mr. BERGERON. Who leads the opposition ?

Mr. FOSTER. The government soon to be—stated that in explicit language and yet for these whole eight days the debate has gone on and it is only at this late moment that the right hon. gentleman concedes the point. We agree to accept the concession. It was our principle laid down at the first and we congratulate the right hon. gentleman on acceding to the justice and reasonableness of the demand which has been made in that respect.

I put two questions to my right hon. friend in order that we may be clear upon this. This overlapping is to be interpreted as referring to the polling subdivisions which are cut by the boundary of the federal constituency and to no others ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. And this work contemplated in that first section is to apply to that kind of polling division and to no other ? There we are agreed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The astounding thing about it, and what makes me discount my right hon. friend's proof, or what he thinks is proof and evidence sufficient to make this legislation necessary, is that my right hon. friend has sat in this House for eight days, has listened to the whole discussion and did not know until this afternoon, and may be does not know yet, for he says he does not, that the returning officers in 1904 went beyond the overlapping polling divisions and redistributed the polling divisions which were absolutely within the boundaries of the federal constituency and that two-thirds of the cases in which they interfered were polling divisions of that kind and not polling divisions which were intersected by the boundary of the Dominion or federal constituency. More news for my right hon. friend probably. No prosecution was launched against a returning officer in Mantoba for what he did in 1904 in so far as his action was concerned alone with an overlapping polling division. The returning officers were prosecuted because they went beyond the power given by the Dominion Act, and, after having distributed the overlapping polling divisions, went to work and redistributed large numbers of the polling divisions in Manitoba which were not overlapping and which they should not have touched. My right hon. friend will find that to be true. How could they institute a prosecution against your returning officer if he did simply and only what your Act authorizes him to do ? What your Act authorized him to do was to distribute the names in an overlapping intersected polling division. For that Manitoba brought no prosecution, the prosecutions were for interference with polling divisions inside a constituency which were not intersected at all.

Mr. CLARKE. Where did they distribute those inside ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Lord knows. They distributed them all through, they took off one and added to another all over the province and the hero Leach, to whose defence my right hon. friend came this afternoon, the hero, the moral reformer, Leach, who did this work largely as Liberal organizer for the returning offiers, swore in his testimony that he took good care, mighty good care that the Liberal-Conservatives did not know what they were doing and did not get on the track of the redistribution that was made. My right hon. friend will not question that ; it is in 'Hansard.'

I ask my right hon. friend to think for a moment of the situation of things in 1904 in connection with that business of the thin red line, as he calls it—I ask him to sense the position. He gave orders under the law to the returning officers to distribute the overlapping polling divisions, that was legal, they had a right to do it. Does he consider that it was right that when the returning officer received the King's Printer's list which was for him and his deputy returning officers alone, he should send it, or take it to the rooms of the Liberal organizer of the city of Winnipeg, give the list into his hands for days, tell him to do practically what he liked with them, and then when it was finally received from Mr. Leach's office, without looking through or certifying to himself in any respect that that list had not been wrongly tampered with, use it as the official list ? Does he consider that was proper ? That is the gravamen of the red line business. What would you think if within the province of Ontario you were to send out the King's Printer's list to the returning officers and that these returning officers around about the city of Toronto should bring those lists in to the Liberal organizer of the province of Ontario, Mr. Inwood, deliver them over into his hands, and if there was the same overlapping in the province of Ontario, have him do the redistributing secretly, stealing a march on his opponents and then simply use the lists that had been arranged in Mr. Inwood's office. How would he consider action of that kind? He would believe with me that it would raise a revolution in the province of Ontario. It was absolutely that and nothing else than that that Leach did. But Mr. Leach was not an officer of the Dominion government quoad the electoral lists. It was the returning officer who put these into the hands of Mr. Leach who was the criminal. Mr. Leach is a man of judgment and common sense. Does the right hon. Prime Minister think that it is the highest type of man who takes hold of lists, given to him by a returning officer, sworn to keep these lists and to certify to them himself, sworn to do what is necessary in the way of rearranging the voters' lists, does my right hon. friend think that it is indicative of a finely spirited and finely conscienced man, one to make a hero of, who, as organizer for the province of Manitoba, would take these lists and erase and add to them, do it through the whole province of Manitoba, and do it to the detriment of the party to which he is opposed, taking good care that they shall not know

anything of what he is doing? I want to ask the right hon. gentleman if he thinks that is the right kind of a man and the right kind of a spirit or if that is a thing for a high spirited and honourable man to do. Surely politics is not one vast trickery. Surely an honourably minded man would have said to this deputy returning officer, Duggan: I cannot do anything with your lists; I have no right to; you are the man to make these rearrangements; go to work and rearrange your own lists. An honourable man would have said that. But, this gentleman leapt at the chance, took to himself the lists. made erasures and changes absolutely disfranchising voter after voter, and he was the means by which the present hon. member for the constituency sits in this House by his present majority of ten. My right hon. friend denied that Mr. Leach disfranchised a single man. Well, technically my right hon. friend may be right. Leach could not disfranchise a man, he had not the power, but, if, through the co-operation, the willing co-operation of Duggan, he manipulated the list so that man after man, Conservative after Conservative, was left off from his proper polling place and therefore could not and did not get his vote in, what does it amount to in the end ? It amounts to the disfranchisement of every man whose name was striken off that list. Technically you may say that Mr. Leach did not disfranchise him, technically you may say that the returning officer disfranchised him, but Leach was the representative of the returning officer and he possessed the knowledge which enabled him to do this work that Duggan himself could not have done. And yet, in that polling place and in that constituency Duggan had been fifteen years a resident and knew the people. Leach was not a resident and did not know the people except through his greater knowledge as ofganizer for the Liberal party and through the men he had at his beck and call all through the province. Now, Sir, I contend that no small tribute of mitigated praise from the 'West' of Regina with reference to Mr. Leach's making some fair turn in reference to the distribution of seed grain is anything to set against that kind of conduct. It stamps Leach as being of the same pattern as Rudneski. Is that too strong a phrase ? I stand by it. Rudneski did what he did wrongfully, knowing that it was wrong because he was paid for it. Leach did what he did wrongfully knowing that it was unfair and illegal and he did it receiving pay as organizer for that party and receiving the rewards of that party. What is the difference between Rudneski and Leach ? Only this, that Leach had probably a Biblical education and should have and did know better. But Rudneski did not have that advantage. The first part of his name may be an index of the character of his training.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

On the order for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on :

Bill (No 151) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company—Mr. Crawford.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stand.

Mr. LENNOX. I have no objection to the Bill standing but I will not be here on Friday when it may come up.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It can be taken on Monday.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

BELLEVILLE, PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 20) respecting the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company—Mr. Porter.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill is not here; perhaps he wishes to speak on it. I move that progress be reported.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the Occidental Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Ross (Yale-Cariboo).

Bill (No. 137) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr Dyment.

Bill (No. 155) respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the House resumed consideration of the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act and the proposed amendment of Mr. W. J. Roche thereto.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I come now to the remaining and vital proposal in the Bill, namely, the proposal to seize the Brit-

ish Columbia and Manitoba franchises and that of the unorganized territory in Ontario and Quebec, take them from the provincial authorities and jurisdiction, and hand them over to the partisan officers of the Dominion government; for we must take the Bill exactly as it is, and on the face of the Bill that is plainly written. We can also interpret the Bill by the past action of the government, and I propose to cite some instances of the past action of the government under a clause of this kind. What then was the principal proposal of the Bill? That which I have mentioned; but, Mr. Speaker, it was not an open proposal. It was a concealed proposal. It was a part of the Bill which was at first almost if not entirely ignored. When the Minister of Justice introduced his Bill he did not even mention, or if he mentioned it was very slightly indeed, this proposal in the Bill, and a person listening to his exposition of it as he introduced it would be absolutely ignorant that such a drastic and far-reaching and subversive proposal was concealed within the Bill. That was scarcely fair to the country or to the House. The country gets its idea of a Bill from its introduction by the responsible minister, and very many people, whilst they read the introductory remarks, probably form their opinion from these, and either do not have it shaken or do not see subsequent discussions which might shake it. That fact is patent; I do not think it can be denied. It was concealed as well as ignored, for when the second reading came to be moved, the same Minister of Justice devoted the largest part of his time to the grievance which was involved in the overlapping of the polling subdivisions, and it was a very small proportion of his time that he devoted to that portion of the Bill which gives this government through its partisan officers complete control of the lists of two provinces and of the unorganized territory in the two greater eastern provinces. That is patent; that cannot be denied. But the matter began to leak out when the supporters of the government came to discuss the Bill. Then very little was said about the overlapping clauses, but they pegged away at making a foundation if possible, to prove that the lists as they were prepared by the Manitoba authorities were unfair lists, unjust lists, incomplete lists, dead and decayed lists, and that no fair-play could be given to the party at present in power under these lists. And so, as man after man from the west arose, that point came to be prominent, until at last it overshadowed, as it should have overshadowed, every other provision in the Bill, in the estimation and desire of the government which introduced it. To-day, then, we are discussing, and have been for the last week almost entirely that one proposition, that vital proposition. Well, Sir, what is that proposition, as we read it in the Bill? Am I going too far in saying that it proposes to take the Manitoba and British Columbia lists, using them as a basis, whatever that may mean; and it proposes to go on, by its own revising officers and its own government and party machinery, to make a list; and it expressly states that the voters upon these lists, as finally prepared in that way, are the only persons who shall have a vote for Dominion elections in those provinces and territories.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me? There must be some misunderstanding in connection with this thing. As I understand it, the Bill does not disturb in any way the revising barristers in those provinces, and under the provincial lists the revising barristers are county court judges.

Mr. FOSTER. Now if the hon. gentleman will take his seat and exercise his patience, I will deal with that in a little while—two things which it will not be difficult, I am sure, for my hon. friend to do.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am asking for information, that is all.

Mr. FOSTER. I know that my hon. friend wants information, and, more than that, if he only knew it, he needs it. That, then, is borne on the face of the Bill as it appears in section 1. What does that involve? You talk about the old Dominion Franchise Law of 1885; but the lists that were prepared under that law were not rush lists, or emergency lists. They were lists provided for times set in advance, leisurely undertaken, leisurely carried out, not in the heat and turmoil of an election contest. What does this precious Bill propose? It does not propose that the Dominion shall stretch out its greedy hands and seize the franchise of these two great provinces until after the writs are issued. What does this mean? It means that when a writ is issued, within probably twenty-eight days from that time the elections are held. It means that these lists, if they are to be prepared in any way by means of which reasonable revision shall be had, have a very small portion of time in which they can be brought to the point of revision. It means that as they must be printed and in the hands of the returning officers a reasonable time before polling day, the limit of twenty-eight days is considerably shortened. What have you? The writs are issued. Then this government has to communicate with their officers in every Dominion polling division in the unorganized territories of Quebec and Ontario, in Manitoba and in British Columbia. And these are distant places. What kind of communication can you have? Communication à la Mr. Richard Scott, by telegram and telegram only, without instructions of any kind? Is that the kind of communication which is to be had? It

must be, if it is to be an effective, a full and explicit communication. .It takes time to communicate with your man whom you select in each constituency to do the enumerating or the registration. Then the duty is imposed on him, after he gets his instructions, of mastering the instructions and selecting sub-enumerators who are to work with him in that constituency. Is that a light duty? The Minister of Justice said that some of those constituencies were two hundred miles long by one hundred and fifty wide, and he sliced out a large portion of Ontario territory to show how big one of these constituencies in Manitoba was —the constituency of Selkirk. That means that the officer into whose hands you put this business, after he is communicated with, must select proper enumerators for a territory in that case two hundred miles long by one hundred and fifty miles wide. It means that he must make himself acquainted with the places where it is right there should be registration offices opened, and he must complete the whole complex system of getting enumerators through that territory and giving sufficient notice to the men who want to be put on the list. Can you do that in six, seven or ten days? Then you have to post your notices, if you are going to act with any semblance of fairness. You must not start a man off and tell nobody about it. When a Conservative asks where are you sending these men, you must not tell him that you are sending them away north without any definiteness. If you are going to act fairly at all, you are bound to give fair notice to the electorate —to every portion of it. That requires time. Then your enumerators have to fix a reasonable time within which to do the enumeration. Then they have to prepare their lists and send them to Ottawa and have them printed here and then these lists have to be sent back. That is a very large operation. My hon. friend proposes to do it within twenty-eight or twenty-six or twenty-four days. But there is another disadvantage. You are doing all that in the heat of a Dominion election, and you are saddling your candidates as well as your country with a large expense. You are saddling your country with large expense and your candidate with large expense and great exertions. Instead of devoting the twenty-eight days or less to the canvass of his constituency, he has to devote the best of that twenty-eight days to seeing that he is not ousted for want of proper enumeration. Is that fair to the candidate? It is most unfair to him; but it is mighty easy for the government and their officers to intimate to their own friends what is going to be done, as has been done over and over again, and give their own friends the mean, petty, miserable party advantage which such a course of conduct can give. But is it fair to the candidate? What was the great note that my right hon. friend and his colleagues struck in 1895 and from that down to 1898? It was the expense to the country. My right hon. friend was specially strong on that. Why have the country put to such large expense? There are the provincial lists, better than you can get yourselves, they are the common right of the province, and from a constitutional point of view the province should make the lists. There they are ready for you, you do not pay a cent for them, and the country is saved this large amount of money. And the amount of money spent by the Dominion in the preparation of the Dominion lists was paraded before the country as a strong argument against the Franchise Act of 1885. But that is what you have to do in this case. You have to send couriers to run at great expense and with great rapidity over every one of these constitutenciese in these two distant provinces, and the country has to pay the expense. There must be something pretty strong and pretty grave to make you do that. What else are you doing? You are making rush lists in an inopportune time for the people who wish to register. What is the most opportune time for the farmers and others to attend to registration in these western provinces? It is the months of May and June. That is the time when they are least occupied. But when will your elections come on? No one knows. They are apt to come on in October, and in that month it will be impossible to interest the farmers in the work of registration. In that month public interest will not be centred in that duty, and consequently the registration will be in the hands of partisans, and in their hands entirely. By having regular periods for preparing the lists you gain the still greater advantage of making that a settled thing. It gets to be a habit. To-day the greatest difficulty in political life in this country lies in the fact that a large proportion of the best people will not take sufficient interest in politics to have their names put on the lists. Do you remedy this by having rush lists? But your election may come on in January. A fine time you will have running over the constituencies in Manitoba in the month of January—running over a constituency two hundred miles long by one hundred and fifty miles wide and over the mountains of British Columbia in the months of January, February or March. What guarantee is there that your election will not come on in January or March? Under such circumstances a rush list put on in that way would be simply a farce. It will be an invitation to partisan discrimination and be the worst possible thing that could befall the electorate and the public life of this country. My right hon. friend asked is this not to be done in accordance with the law of the province. No, it is not. I say that it is absolutely impossible for it to be done

in accordance with the law of the province. Will my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier deny it? Put your rush list on after the writs issue and show me how it can possibly be done in the unorganized districts of the province of Ontario according to the law of that province? Show me how it can possibly be done according to the laws of Manitoba in Manitoba ; show me how it can possibly be done according to the law of British Columbia in British Columbia.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) allow me a question ? How could we do it in sixteen days, as provided in the order issued in the 'Gazette' in Manitoba at the present time?

Mr. FOSTER. In Manitoba the proclamation is issued on the first of May and the revision is to be completed by the first of July—two months for the operation and in the best season of the year. And the time given for registration under present conditions is ample and the notice that is given for registration is from ten days up to thirty days.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the hon. gentleman will allow me——

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot afford——

Mr. CRAWFORD. The rest of us have to wait for you sometimes.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, very well.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the Beautiful Plains electoral division only sixteen days is allowed from the time the registration begins until the operation is finished.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. And how many days' notice prior to registration? At least ten days.

Mr. FOSTER. How much notice was given in Beautiful Plains?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am speaking of the time allowed in which to do the work.

Mr. FOSTER. How much notice was given. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) may answer——

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have not the 'Gazette' before me.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman does not wish to answer. That is the kind of information my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is going upon—information given by a man, who, when he is asked a direct question, dare not answer it.

Mr. GALLIHER. Can you put on voters during the time of notice that is given ? You cannot.

Mr. FOSTER. You have to register within the sixteen days and then comes the revision and these are two different operations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But the time for registration and revision has been fixed at sixteen days.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose I admit that in the case of Beautiful Plains. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Crawford) be honest—thoroughly honest—and say in how many cases that takes place out of the forty-one divisions ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. In Gladstone, the adjoining constituency, it is seventeen days.

Mr. FOSTER. That is another one; go on. The hon. gentleman does not go on. We have an old saying that one swallow does not make a summer. If you were to take off the statute-book every law that worked a hardship in some special case, how much legislation would you have left? Why, it is simply absurd. The law is not to be condemned unless you can show a general tendency to limit unduly the time allowed.

Now, I come to my next point. And you can illustrate it in the light of the cases where this government has acted under the power given them in the Act of 1898. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) made the statement—made it once, made it twice, made it three times—that for remedying the overlapping of polling divisions in Manitoba there was no provision made in the Election Act. Had he read the Election Act he would have known that sections 24 and 25 give clear direction and absolute power with reference to remedying the overlapping of intersecting polling divisions. And my hon. friends opposite have been acting on that very section of the law in three cases that I will name: in the Brandon by-election of 1901, in the West Algoma and other elections in unorganized territory of 1904, and in the thin red line episode of Manitoba in 1904. Judge what they will do under this clause by what they have done under a clause which gave them even less power than this gives. Take the agent that you selected—I speak of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and the Secretary of State, men still in the cabinet and whose business it will be to carry out the provisions of this Bill—what did they do ? and what did their officer do, to whom three telegrams were sent embodying all the instructions he ever got ? That returning officer, on his oath, declared that he had not paid any attention to the law of Ontario at all. Why ? Because it would have been impossible for him to pay attention to that law and get his work done in the time given him to do it. Does my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) deny that? But take the election of 1901, a by-election in which Hon. Clifford Sifton was a candidate. In that year, let me tell my right hon. friend they had a registration board in the province of Manitoba, and it was a board of judges. Did he follow out the law of Manitoba? Did his Secretary of State and his Minister of Justice follow out the law? They actually passed by the re-

gistration board of Manitoba, a board of judges, and one Alexander Macleod, a partisan of the minister, was appointed sole revising board. And every registration clerk was a partisan of Mr. Sifton, and the whole registration and revision was done in defiance of the law of Manitoba, done by this government and by the various partisans of the minister who was running the election. If they do this under a less full legal authorization, what will they do when they get all they want in the shape of legislation?

Now, take the West Algoma case. An election was called in the unorganized districts. The writ was issued on the 25th of August. On the 27th of August your men had received telegram No. 1 from Hon. Richard W. Scott, Secretary of State, and on that day the enumerators started out to make up nine polls. And on the 2nd of September every one of those polls was made up and the enumerators were back and ready to have their lists printed. Did they follow out the law of Ontario? The law of Ontario was absolutely smashed into atoms by the mere telegram of the secretary of my right hon. friend's government. Does he deny it? Where was the notice that was given? Before the candidate of the Liberal Conservative party knew anything about the electors being registered what was shown him? Five hundred and forty-three names made out, absolutely settled with the exception of revision, shoved under his nose and this enumeration was done in less than six days. Did they tell him that there was going to be a registration at such and such and such a place? They absolutely concealed it, and concealed it from every Liberal-Conservative. The candidate of the government was the man who appointed the enumerators, was the man who appointed the revising judge and was the man who, as clerk of the peace, held the lists and had them in his possession after they were made. Are these fair methods? Is that honourable treatment? Does my right hon. friend wonder that the Liberal-Conservatives in this House, with those two examples before them of the work of my right hon. friend and his ministry, view with suspicion and with dread this legislation? Take the Manitoba case of 1904: The lists were made; they were printed; they were complete; they were sent out to the returning officers, the returning officer under the law was to look after and distribute the voters in the overlapping and intersected polling divisions. What took place, Sir? With every Liberal-Conservative that could possibly be kept in the dark, kept in the dark—for there is Mr. Leach's oath, and Mr. Leach is an eminently respectable and heroic figure, the right hon. gentleman declares it—I believe his oath, and on his oath he declared that he doctored nearly all the polling divisions in the province of Manitoba and that he took mighty good care that the other fellows did not know what was going on. I appeal to any man on that side whether that is playing the game fair? Now, is it? I have every hope that if the hon. member for British Columbia, who is smiling at me, were to get up and in his manly fashion say exactly what he thinks he would say that is not playing the game fairly. My right hon. friend was at a press dinner and by his side was the present Speaker. Mr. Speaker gave us a noble recitation and the refrain of every verse of that recitation was 'Play up, play up and play the game.' I would like to have Mr. Speaker's view, honestly and unreservedly given, as to whether this was playing the game. There was Duggan, your returning officer in Selkirk. Under the law the instruction to Duggan was to see that overlapping voters were properly parcelled out. He was not to see that any other polls were touched. What did Duggan do? He put the list into the hands of Leach, the Liberal organizer, had it doctored by him, got it back when it was ready, and dozens and scores of people had their names erased, yet the Minister of Justice euphonically named that transference of electors. When this was all done, Mr. Duggan took the risk and on his oath, which I believe, he declared he never gave it a glance and that there might have been on it a hundred men or five hundred disfranchised for all he knew. He took the revision made by the organizer of the Liberal party by which Conservatives were left off and disfranchised, and a member sits in this House to-night who would not sit here if it had not been for that. I ask my right hon. friend if that is playing the game fair?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I would like to know how the hon. member can prove anything of that kind. I am the hon. member who is sitting here.

Mr. FOSTER. You are?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, go ahead.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I would like to ask what foundation you have for that statement? Not a tittle.

Mr. FOSTER. The foundation I have—

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I characterize that as a false and misleading statement.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all very well, if my hon. friend will stop bobbing up I will give the foundation.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Give it then

Mr. FOSTER. The foundation I have for the statement I have just made is Duggan's own sworn statement.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Give the quotation from his evidence.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend may deny it till he is black in the face, but it will not

change the record, for there is Duggan's sworn testimony.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. No such evidence is there.

Mr. FOSTER. His evidence has been read in this House by myself and others.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The hon. gentleman ought to be ashamed to make a statement like that in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is not ashamed to quote from the records, the sworn testimony——

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Quote from the records.

Mr. FOSTER. —of even the men appointed by this government to carry out their behests.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Quote from the records or else take it back. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is not entitled to take that back when he makes a statement that is not true.

Mr. FOSTER. Shall I go a little further?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Cannot you explain that first?

Mr. FOSTER. I have explained everything that is necessary.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. You have not.

Mr. FOSTER. And if my hon. friend wants more explanation let him go and look for it in the records.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That from an old parliamentarian——

Mr. FOSTER. That is an answer that is perfectly suited to my hon. friend.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister this afternoon and up to this afternoon was absolutely unaware that Leach and the returning officers in Manitoba had carried on their operations of erasing and transferring from one polling list to another in a large number of the non-overlapping polling divisions in the province of Manitoba, and to-day he denied from his own knowledge, or lack of knowledge, that anything of that kind had been done at all. We go to the word and the testimony and it is plain, as I told him this afternoon, that that was done.

Mr. BURROWS. Is the hon. member aware that in the local election just previous to that, in 17 out of 40 counties, polling subdivisions were subdivided by the provincial authorities with no more shadow of law than there was in this case, just for the convenience of the public?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that that contravenes my statement. These are the three examples that I give of the way the government has acted in cases where they have had this work of revision and registration to do under their own Act. Have we, or have we not, the right to believe that what they have done in the past they will do in the future if they get fuller legislation? The same ministers, the same men, greater power—have we any reason to believe that they wil not exercise it in the same way? The attempt has been made and will be made to put the Liberal-Conservative party in the wrong for opposing this legislation. It is an attempt which will fail because the people are honest and the people are intelligent. Is it the dictum of constitutional or parliamentary government that His Majesty's loyal opposition is bound to let pass in time every measure that the government may propose? It certainly is not. If the House of Commons holds the purse strings and can demand that grievances be remedied before it gives an appropriation we have the same right to consider a piece of ill conceived and tyrannical legislation, when proposed, as being a grievance and refuse supply until that grievance has been removed. There is no difference between the two. They are the exercise of the same generic power. The representatives on this side of the House are the representatives of a great party with a history, a party with a policy, a party with a future. I make there three assertions. We must do what is best for the party and we have sometimes to submit to a great deal of inconvenience and trouble which we would not personally submit to if it were not that the interests of the party and the cause we represent demand that sacrifice at our hands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What about the country?

Mr. FOSTER. The country is served by one party or the other and it is a sample of the fine statesmanlike sense of my hon. friend that he separates one from the other. He can separate his own party interest from the good of the country if he pleases, but the fact is that with party government one party or the other is always in power and always administering theoretically and, generally, in the main, for the good of the country. Now, what happens? The Liberal-Conservative party was thrown out of office in 1896. It gathered itself up and commenced its march again to power. Is there any man in this House who denies that sooner or later the Liberal-Conservative party will get into power? It has a policy, it has a history, it has traditions, it has theories and these theories it proposes to put into practical working. It advertises these to the country, it makes an impression upon the country, it gathers strength and is

gathering strength to-day. It has another duty to perform. It exposes the policy or lack of policy of the party in power. It uncovers their misdeeds, it shows their maladministration, it brings the people face to face with their corrupt acts and in these two ways the party out of power marches gradually up till it becomes the party in power. We have fought an open fight, we have fought a straight fight, we are gaining in the country and we are close upon the time when the country will place the Liberal-Conservative party in power. When we have gained by our work and our policy and when hon. gentlemen opposite have lost by their work and lack of policy and it is coming to be near the deciding time the Liberal-Conservative party refuses to prejudice the future of its party by allowing the government to seize the franchise and by that means to gain a support in the country which it would otherwise not have. That is the purpose of this clause as it has been placed in the Bill and as it has been advocated by hon. gentlemen behind the right hon. first minister. Therefore the country will see, all fair-minded men will see that there come times when the opposition is bound to be true to itself, to its party, to use its utmost endeavour and to make its greatest self-sacrifice in order to prevent an injustice being done. I say that a repetition of the acts perpetrated in 1901, of the West Algoma case and of the Manitoba case of 1904 would be simply the robbery of the Liberal-Conservative party as to its future if it allowed these acts to be again perpetrated or if it gave a chance for the perpetration of them in the broad constituencies of Manitoba and British Columbia. Therefore, we are bound to stand against it and we are bound to stand against that legislation until its provisions are ameliorated. It is our duty and we propose to do it.

The right hon. first minister said that in 1885 they did not stop supplies and use that as a weapon. They could not do it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why ?

Mr. FOSTER. But I know a time when the right hon. gentleman did stop supplies and used it as a weapon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. No ? In 1896 we brought Supply into this House, our period of existence legally terminated at a certain time and I can point to page after page of 'Hansard' of 1896, in the month of April, showing that they absolutely shut down on supplies for the payment of wages due, for the payment of contracts completed, for the payment of services which had been performed and for which the credit of the country had been pledged and for all services in the main which contemplated anything to be carried over during the succeeding year. I, myself, owing to the fact that the elections must be held and that it would be impossible for any government to get back and in harness before the first of July and that consequently the treasury would be absolutely bare, made the proposition that these gentlemen, who were then in opposition, grant two months' Supply in order that the country's interests might be conserved whichever party came into power and in order that the necessity for recourse to illegal and wrong methods by the issue of Governor General's warrants for unforeseen expenditures should not exist. I met with the absolute refusal of the right hon. gentleman. I met the same refusal of Sir Richard Cartwright and I heard man after man on this side of the House simply get up and say : This item shall not pass ; drop it—and it was dropped. Never used Supply as a weapon ? That was the one burnished weapon in the first session of 1896. It is fair to use it sometimes and there are periods when it is absolutely necessary to use it.

Now the right hon. gentleman made some statement in reference to this particular clause but I cannot understand what he meant. It was very hurriedly done as he himself will acknowledge. I have therefore treated the clause exactly as it stands here and as the Minister of Justice pleaded for it in the House. I would suppose that the Minister of Justice has the mind of the Prime Minister when he introduces and pleads for a Bill in this House. I have treated it as every member on that side of the House has argued and pleaded for it. I should imagine they did not commit themselves until they knew the mind of the government. I have argued it upon the language as it is in the Bill and on the arguments which have been presented by the other side of the House in favour of it, and I leave it at that.

I now come to another phase of the question. There has been something said with reference to the inconsistency of parties and as to the principles upon which each party worked for or against the Franchise Bill of 1898. These principles have not been fairly represented by the Minister of Justice and perhaps they were not quite fairly represented by the Prime Minister. It is true, as he says, that you cannot take any one sentence out of a speech on a subject and define from it absolutely the views of the speaker. That is often the case ; but sometimes it is not. But in view of the discussions upon the Franchise Act from 1885 to 1898, I venture to say that the Prime Minister had his opinions pretty well in hand in 1898 when he crystallized them time after time into expressed language. Am I not right in saying that my right hon. friend, in the position which he took from 1885 to 1898 and in the legislation which he introduced in 1898. based himself absolutely on

two things: Provincial franchise and provincial lists. The very resolution the right hon. gentleman read to-day coupled the two, and in that resolution he tied himself to not only provincial franchise but provincial lists. Read his arguments in 1885 and in 1898, and over and over again he repeated that notwithstanding there may be grievances, notwithstanding there may be inequalities, notwithstanding there may be things that militate against us in the Dominion, yet taking it all in all his basic principle was the provincial franchise and the provincial lists as they are made by the provincial authorities. Does my right hon. friend object to that version of his views? I shall read some citations from his speeches on that point, not because they have not been read before, but because they are mightily pertinent to the very thing we are discussing at this moment. In 1898 my right hon. friend had a Bill introduced by Mr. Fitzpatrick, and Mr. Fitzpatrick stated the object of the Bill to be :

> The object of this Bill is to repeal the existing franchise and to substitute therefor the laws of the different provinces as to the qualification of voters, polling divisions and preparation of the lists.

That is the legal interpretation of the Bill given by the hon. gentleman who introduced it and who was fully able to state its meaning. There is no talk there about municipal systems, or municipal officers preparing the lists at the start. Now, every province had a different system at that time as it has now, but no matter about that, as Mr. Fitzpatrick said, the object of the Bill is to adopt the different provincial qualifications the provincial polling divisions and the provincial preparation of the lists. Sir Wilfrid Laurier put himself largely upon 'Hansard.' Sir John Thompson had introduced a franchise Act and Sir Wilfrid Laurier criticised it and said in 1898 :

> The blemish in the Act introduced by Sir John Thompson, and it is to me an absolute and irredeemable blemish, was, that while he adopted the provincial franchise, yet he retained the revising officer and the preparation of the list by the revising officer. I say this is the blemish of the Act. The wording of Sir John Thompson's Act was that the Governor in Council may from time to time appoint a proper officer to be called a revising officer, and so far as that is concerned that was a blemish.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier goes on to say :

> It was far more logical according to our view, having adopted the principle of provincial franchise, to also accept the voters' list so prepared under the authority of the provincial legislature. On this side of the House we have an absolute hostility to the revising officer and the lists prepared by the revising officer.

That is sufficiently plain. He goes on :

> I propose that we shall revert to that system. If we apply the principle of the provincial franchise why should we not take at the same time the means and methods by which the principle is applied.

Again he said :

> If hon. gentlemen opposite have a better way, let them offer it. But as between the Dominion and the provincial franchise as between a Dominion list and provincial lists there can be no hesitation because we have had for 19 years the provincial lists and the provincial franchise.

That is clear, is it not. Again he said:

> Local legislatures are likely to represent the people of the province.

That is exactly my argument this afternoon :

> They are elected to represent the same people we represent here and no other people. It is supposed, and it is not a very violent supposition to make, that they will exercise that power to the best interests of their constituents according to their judgment and light. It is supposed they will adopt the best franchise to suit the province.

And having done that the right hon. gentleman says that he adopts the provincial franchise. Again he said :

> It is possible that the control of the several provinces may pass into the hands of the Conservative party. Still, on a question of this kind, I am quite disposed, for my part, to accept the franchise prepared by the legislature, whether Liberal or Conservative. Would it not be far better as a matter simply of good government if the elections for this House should be conducted on the local lists and that the members of this parliament and the members of the legislature should represent the same body of people and should be elected by the same electors?

There cannot be anything more definite than that, but he goes further and he says:

> There can be no difference of opinion, at all events from this point, that even if we had the power to pass such an amendment, its adoption would create great confusion. You would have a set of lists prepared for the local elections and by this amendment you would introduce federal legislation to take effect at the same time which would take the lists away from the local jurisdiction and bring them under federal jurisdiction as to the method of their preparation.

That is as explicit as it is possible to make English words. The Nova Scotia and New Brunswick situation was brought up. My right hon. friend was ready for it then:

> I have no doubt that if the people of Nova Scotia find the present system not satisfactory, the system which has given satisfaction hitherto, if they thought that the sheriff being appointed by the executive authority did not give them the same security as in former times, when the sheriffs were appointed by the judicial authority, they will undoubtedly in the exercise of their rights as citizens of

a free province introduce legislation in amendment to that legislation. But it may be said that their efforts would be unavailing, because the party suffering would not control the legislature. That may be so at the present time. But when any grievance exists in any legislature governed under British institutions, the minority is never slow to avail itself of any opportunity to offer amendments to remove it, although the minority may be sure that its efforts may not succeed, but be rejected. A minority will never fail to bring grievances to the attention of a legislature though they are satisfied their efforts will be frustrated, because the minority will do so simply for the purpose of affecting public opinion and affecting it in its own direction. I am forced, therefore, to the conclusion that as no efforts have been made either in the legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in the direction indicated by my hon. friend, the law has been found satisfactory to the people of these provinces.

Let me apply the same reasoning and say I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that as no efforts have been made in the legislature of Manitoba or of British Columbia in the direction indicated by my right hon. friend, the law has been found satisfactory in the province of British Columbia and in the province of Manitoba. Will my right hon. friend take his own reasoning? It is absolute; it is conclusive. But he went still further through his Minister of Justice. What happened to that legislation? The Senate put on an amendment—but my hon. friend did not accept the amendment, and it was moved to be disagreed to, for the following reasons :

Because the amendments made by the hon. the Senate to the Bill excepting from its operation the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and providing for a special revision of the voters' list in those provinces for elections to this House, is inconsistent with and subversive of the general principle of this Bill.

I think I can leave the position of my right hon. friend and the two parties with this single remark. You say Liberal-Conservatives are inconsistent because they stand for a Dominion franchise and a Dominion list throughout the whole Dominion, when you propose to single out two special provinces, in which you have lost the majority you had, and apply to them the principle which you thundered and volleyed against from 1885 to 1898. I make this proposition to my right hon. friend : Let him bring in a Bill to establish a Dominion franchise, with lists made up by this government, and the boundaries of the constituencies marked out by this government, and put the whole thing into the hands of non-partisan and judicial authority, and you will find the party on this side at your back in support of it. But we are not chargeable with inconsistency when we stand for a uniform Dominion registration and voters' lists; we are not inconsistent when we oppose an effort to seize the thing that they hated in the general with reference to two provinces where they propose to get a party advantage by so doing. That is the position with reference to the two parties.

Now, I come to the last part of the subject that I propose to deal with to-night. My right hon. friend says that a position has arisen in Manitoba which imperatively demands interference. That is in justification of the position which he says he took, and incidentally he did, that something might happen at some time in some province which would make it necessary for the Dominion to assert its rights. No one denies that something might happen. And so he says: That condition has now arisen and I am not inconsistent when I come to this parliament and propose a remedy. It all depends on the basis of your demand, the reality of the grievance. I will take my right hon. friend's own definition—a condition has arisen in Manitoba which imperatively demands Dominion interference. He goes on to explain two elements. One is the overlapping of constituencies. We admitted that from the first; we admit it still ; it was a grave difficulty. The lawless and partisan manner in which it was attempted in 1904 to do the business was absolutely unauthorized by law and absolutely unauthorized by the fair rules of the game. But it was a difficulty which demanded the fullest and best legislation, and we hit upon the expedient, upon which both sides are agreed, and the overlapping difficulty therefore drops out of sight in this discussion. What is the other? The other is the vital point of the lists. The grievance was the overlapping, but in bringing about the remedy for that, the bright thought instilled itself into the mind of the Minister of Justice, and found its expression in section 1 of that Bill, that they would go a step further and actually seize the lists. They broke it to us gently and to the country gently. It was as though the Minister of Justice should go to a servant of his and say : 'Bob, I am going to give you a different kind of a hat ; it will be a good hat, and it will keep off the sun and the rain. I am going to change your style of coat, but I will give you a good, serviceable coat. The cut of your pants is a little out of date; I am going to give you new pants, and they will be good pants. The shoes you are now wearing are obsolete; I am going to give you a brand new pair of a new style.' And Bob says : 'I have no particular objection to that; I like my old clothes. but if you give me nice new clothes of an approved pattern I do not know that I can raise any objection.' A day or two after that the Minister of Justice comes along and says : 'Bob, there is just one little thing that I omitted ; I told you what I was going to do, but I

forgot to tell you that I am also going to hang you and I have got the timber all ready for the gallows on which you are to be suspended.' So the Minister of Justice comes down to this House and says: We are going to give you new styles, new patterns, new clothes, and they will be good ones. He says nothing else when he introduces his Bill, but by and by he comes down and acknowledges that what he is really going to do is to hang the party, and that he is getting the timber ready to make the gallows.

Now, I take my right hon. friend's definition of what should constitute a crisis. I took down his own words: 'If fraud is committed or if hostile legislation is passed by the provincial legislatures, we must act; we would be recreant to our duty if we did not.' I propose to argue that out with my hon. friend. In the first place, if fraud is committed, against whom is it committed? Against the party in the province or against the party in the Dominion? Under the arrangement of the voters' list, as it is in Manitoba, it is impossible to commit a fraud against the one without committing it against the other. Well, is it possible that fraud has been committed against the Liberals of Manitoba and that up to this date, though that fraud has been going on for years, not one of their leaders or representatives has raised a voice against it in the provincial legislature? So that I think my right hon. friend has to prove something more than a fraud against the provincial electorate. He has to prove outside of that, he has to prove fraud against the Dominion electorate. That would be fraud against this House, which this House would have a perfect right to remedy. That would be hostile legislation which we would have a perfect right to resent. Well, I propose to look at this legislation and ascertain whether Manitoba, from the time the Conservatives came into power in 1899, has been guilty of putting legislation on the statute-book hostile to the party which supports my right hon. friend. And to do that well, you must contrast it with the legislation which Mr. Greenway had before Mr. Hugh John Macdonald came into power. You must trace the course of legislation. Now what was Mr. Greenway's franchise and list preparation? In his time and under his regime, they were Liberal partisans who were the registration clerks and not officers of municipalities. Does my right hon. friend agree with that? In Mr. Greenway's time the legislation on the statute-book provided that the revising barristers should be partisans and not judges, and they all were partisans, chiefly lawyers, mostly sent out from the city of Winnipeg. Am I right in that or not? Under Mr. Greenway, the registration clerks actually prepared the lists. That is they had wider powers by far than the registration clerks have under the present legislation. Is that denied? And after they had done their work, it went for revision to a partisan appointee of the Greenway government and not to a judge.

Mr. BURROWS. The difference between the registration clerk then and now is this. Under the Roblin Act, the registration clerk to-day takes the names of the applicants and writes them in the register. Unless there is an application to strike the names off, they remain there, and the judge has nothing to do with it. They are registered as voters once the clerk writes them on.

Mr. BERGERON. How was it before?

Mr. BURROWS. Just the same, only he put them on the list and the list was published and advertised a month so that any one could apply to have the name struck off. But now the lists are not published at all, and no one ever sees the names from the time of revision.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not correct.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has tried to enlighten the House and instead has led us into an absolute fog of untruth. What he says is not correct.

Mr. BURROWS. In what way? It is absolutely correct.

Mr. FOSTER. I am coming to that. Mr. Greenway's legislation, which I have described, was acted on in the elections of 1892, 1896 and 1899. Then Mr. Hugh John Macdonald came into power, and he immediately made a change in the registration and the list preparation law. Was that change hostile to the Liberal party? What was it? It put the lists absolutely into the hands of a registration board from beginning to end. The registration board consisted of the judges of Manitoba and appointed its own revising officers and registration clerks as well. I ask my right hon. friend if that is correct or not? Comparing that With Mr. Greenway's law, was it hostile legislation?

Mr. BURROWS. That portion of the Act is repealed.

Mr. FOSTER. Let my hon. friend not be in such a hurry. I know that he was born in a hurry, and since these timber limits and timber leases are concerned, he is not disposed to wait. He will get all he wants if he is just patient as I go through with this question. What I ask now is was there any indication of hostile legislation in that of Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, passed in 1899 or 1900, comparing it with the legislation which Mr. Greenway had in force in that province before? You have an absolutely unpartisan board. You have your board of judges appointing your registration clerks. You have your board of judges appointing also the revising barristers. It appointed nineteen Conservatives and sixteen Liberals, and the other five constituencies went to the judges themselves. They themselves

were the revising barristers. Could anything be more unpartisan or fairer than that board and that registration? Under such a board, the lists were absolutely made anew. No man got on the list under that board unless he came up and made his application anew. Am I not right in that? Consequently, on that revision, done in that unpartisan manner, you had an absolutely new and an absolutely clean list, so far as you can ensure it, by a non-partisan board of judges acting on their own responsibility throughout.

Mr. BURROWS. That law has been dead four years.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes. That is not an answer to my question. Does that, I ask, show hostile legislation as compared with the previous legislation?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. How long did it last?

Mr. FOSTER. There is another impatient man. There is a class that is always impatient. A strong man waits and bides his time and takes what the gods give him and when they give it to him. Why cannot my hon. friend wait? Now changes were made in that legislation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. One thing, however, was not changed. Under the succeeding legislation, under to-day's legislation, the judges are the revising board and they revise the lists themselves or the revising barristers that they themselves appoint. Is that true or is it not?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I would correct my hon. friend to this extent, that in practice, the last two years, the judges do not appoint any revising barristers. They do all the work themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. That is still better. I have waited for an answer and have got no denial. Changes were made in that legislation, but one thing remains to this day and that is that the revising board is made up of judges and that the judges do the whole of the revising, either by themselves or by the revising barristers they appoint, and for the last two years they have done the whole business absolutely themselves. Is that hostile legislation? Will my right hon. friend rise in his place and say that frauds under such revising and such a board of revisers were practised on the voters in Manitoba? He dare not do it; that would be to impugn the judges of his own appointment, the judges of the land. But there may be disabilities, there may be cases of hardship. Some men may not get on the list, some men may not get before the revising barrister—all this may be true. It is true in Ontario or any other province; it is true wherever you have an election law. There must be due diligence on the part of the elector, or he will be left off. But, says the Prime Minister, the men at Lac du Bonnet did not get in, and the revising officer, going there under the circumstances, put himself out of court. But was there any disability that prevented the electors of Lac du Bonnet from coming to that registration's clerks office in proper time and putting in their applications? If they did not exercise due diligence, that is their fault. The only possible grievance can be that the local government does not provide a sufficient number of registration booths to properly and reasonably provide for the necessities of the counties. One gentleman declares that a man has had to walk a hundred miles to get his name before the registration clerk. Are you going to condemn the law because that happens? In a county of great distances and small population, one, or two, or three, or a dozen, may be at some extreme point of the constituency, and it may be impossible to have a registration booth for them. But is that to govern the whole matter? Because an isolated case of this kind happens are you going to declare that fraud is committed and that there is hostile legislation? Let us come to the present legislation as it stands, what is it? There is a registrar for each polling subdivision or nearly so. The registration is not by registration districts to-day in Manitoba, but by polling divisions, and from six to twenty registration booths are open in every local constituency. And it is said, on fair authority I think, that the present distribution and number of registration polling booths are sufficient for the wants of these constituencies. But, even so, it may happen that some men may have to travel very many miles in order to get their names on the register. Is it hostile legislation that you have to register when you have a registrar for each polling subdivision, or nearly so, and that you have from six to twenty polling booths in each local division and that you have that distribution in every part of the province? You may say that, in some cases, it is inadequate. But that is not evidence of hostility or fraud. Now, the registration clerks are local men. Is my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in favour of that principle? Does he not think it better that local men should be the registration clerks than that strangers should hold those positions? We may have a difference of opinion on that point, but there is no hostility or fraud involved in a condition of that kind. These registration clerks sit for the time named in the proclamation. These times are sufficient in the main, and every one of these registration clerks is bound by the law under penalty to extend the time of the sitting provided there are applicants in the place to have their name put upon the registration list. Now, is that an evidence of hostility? The duties of these registration clerks are not judicial in any sense, they

are absolutely and simply clerical duties. The clerk must receive every application which comes. The applicant comes and answers the interrogatories, signs a paper and swears to it before the clerk, and the clerk has to receive it and enter it ; he has no power to reject it. If a man be absent through illness or necessary cause, a friend may make application for him, and the application must be received by the registration clerk. Is that not a fair provision ? The applicant has to swear before the clerk himself to these full interrogatories. Moreover, both political parties are represented at that booth. Each party has its representative there. The candidates past and prospective are allowed, and twelve other people, the limitation, I suppose, being designed to keep these booths from being overcrowded. But all this means that the proceedings are as open as the day—all are conducted in the open light and before witnesses for both parties. Nothing could be fairer. The applications must be received. And the hours of sittings for this registration are from nine to ten a.m. and from one to six. In cities they open at eight o'clock for the labouring men and if at the end of the hours there be persons ready to make their applications, the registration clerk has to take their declarations. The lists are all posted up on the outside of the registration booth by the clerk. They are sent to the clerk of the executive, and from there they go to the revising barrister. There are heavy penalties upon the registration clerks for any non-performance or mal-performance of their duties. Could you have a fairer, more open, more reasonable method of carrying on the registration in order to get these people's names into the hands of the revising judges? I ask the right hon. Prime Minister if this is sufficient for a crisis. I ask him if he can say that this is hostile legislation so that we are called upon to act and that we should be recreant to our duty if we did not deal with the situation?

But my right hon. friend says, if fraud is committed. If fraud is committed against whom ? If fraud is committed intentionally as it must be, where is the right hon. gentleman's basis for an attack upon the system, for the imperatively demanded action of this House ? I assume because fraud is committed in the province of Manitoba. Is there any evidence of it? Is there sufficient evidence of it, is it general or is there now and then a single case ? If the fraud is committed it is committed on your provincial voter. Your provincial voter is within walking distance of Winnipeg, in Winnipeg the legislature sits and his representatives are there. Can we believe that if fraud is committed in Manitoba to any extent at all upon the provincial Liberal voters, his grievance has not yet been aired and that he has not made it known throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba and in the political and legislative home of that province ? I think that is conclusive ; it is conclusive in the reasoning of my right hon. friend as applied to 1898. Down in Nova Scotia the sheriff revises the list and I have heard reputable people say that appeals have been refused by the sheriff in Nova Scotia. I have heard and read allegations that hundreds have been refused revision by the sheriff and have consequently been deprived of their votes. Let the right hon. gentleman use his argument of the natural right there. It is a natural right that a man should have his ballot. It has been denied to him in Nova Scotia. Then this government has a right to interfere and see that the legislation in Nova Scotia is changed. Does my right hon. friend propose to do that ? Some one has told me that for every case of lack of proper action on the part of the revising authority that you can bring in Manitoba he can bring ten to meet it in Nova Scotia and reputable men make statements of that kind. Does my right hon. friend think that is sufficient ground for interference and seizing the franchise ? Why not advance the argument of natural right there ? My right hon. friend knows that we are governed by laws which in the main work out justly but under which injustice and wrong, as far as natural right is concerned, may happen to many individuals in the commonwealth under the action of those laws.

We now come to the question of revision. Does my right hon. friend find that fraud is committed in the revision ? The revision is by the judges. The last two years judges and judges alone have done it. Judges are dispensers of justice, and a man when he goes upon the bench and is engaged in looking after the interests of justice and of the people forgets, I think in ninty-nine cases out of one hundred, all partisanship and is animated by the desire to do right. Show me an instance where a charge has been brought of breach of faith or fraud committed by one of the revising judges in Manitoba. If fraud is necessary as a foundation for such action bring the evidence of it, bring the proof of it. Where is the evidence ? Where is the proof ? In the press of Manitoba, in the legislature of Manitoba, in the action of the Liberal party in Manitoba ? Not a reasonable basis . It is here, by indiscriminate statement in a way, but where is the evidence of fraud ? My right hon. friend has absolutely no answer. All appeals are disposed of. My right hon. friend hangs his case upon one single occurrence that is possible, namely, that the judge may be revising, the hour may be up and he has no right to extend the hour That is the only point on which my right hon. friend can hang his case with reference to the judges. Will he cite an instance where that has been done ? He brought forward one instance that has been ex-

plained but will he consider it fair to condemn the whole system, root out the whole legislation, replace it by something new, because in an individual instance an injustice has been committed, and committed unwittingly because no judge would commit it of malice aforethought. But, Sir, we contend that the judges as the revising board have the absolute authority to extend the time and they can do it under their powers. It is a fair contention and we ask for the proof that these judges have abused their authority as revising officers and have committed fraud upon electors.

I have made my plea with reference to Manitoba ; let me say a word with reference to British Columbia. We have heard very little from British Columbia. So little has been said about it that I imagine my hon. friends opposite have no case from British Columbia. The Minister of Justice said there was little grievance from British Columbia. The member who spoke yesterday from British Columbia (Mr. D. Ross) said they had a way of playing fair there, that they were not dishonest and that as a rule every one thought the game was played fairly and honestly. He told how the lists were made and surely there is publicity enough. Your registrar, who is generally a mining recorder, receives the applications. Every application must be by swearing to and signing of a blank form. The revisions are made twice a year which surely is often enough and two months are given between the time for the applications to come in and the revision. The revisions are made, in the first instance, by the registrars. A notice containing every name has to be posted on the outside of the registrar's office, on the court house, published in the 'Gazette' and in three conspicuous places in the electoral division, so that people may know when the revision goes on and then, after the revision takes place, there is an appeal to the county court judge and from the county court judge there is an appeal to the Supreme Court bench. Surely as a general scheme of registration and revision that is an open, honourable, reasonable scheme. But my hon. friend says the people take no interest in the registration. That is more the fault of the people surely than the fault of the system which is provided for registration.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I did not say that the people take no interest.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will read the speech he will see that he conveyed the impression—he conveyed it to me at least—that the people took little interest in the registration. However, if he says he did not, it is a matter which does not amount to much.

What are the circumstances of fraud or hostile legislation in the province of British Columbia which make it necessary for this House to take over the franchise of British Columbia and Manitoba in regard to voters for the Dominion elections ? In what have they become recreant to their duty ? Fraud ? Where is the evidence of it ? Hostile legislation as to the lists ? Where is the evidence of hostile legislation ? Where is the necessity of the action founded upon fraud and upon hostile legislation in the provincial legislature ? Can it be pointed out now in the province of British Columbia ? Not so much as it can be even in the province of Manitoba ; absolutely free from either of these so far as we have any evidence presented. And yet I doubt not that that there are many cases in that province of men not having a vote. They wake up on election day to find that they are not on the list. It happens everywhere. To-day, in the city of Toronto, there are 45,000 names of male adults that are not upon the regular lists and the process of registration is now under way which will end in as many of these as wish, if they have the qualification, being placed upon the voters' list.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Within what time ?

Mr. FOSTER. Commencing, I think, next Monday and going on until the Saturday following with two days intermission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Five days?

Mr. FOSTER. Four days. The booths are not scattered everywhere, but they are fairly numerous, there are notices given in the newspapers and otherwise and the two parties are actively, I suppose, at work trying to get the voters registered. But the work of the municipal officers with reference to these people does not amount to anything. That vast number of people in the city of Toronto are to-day looking to the manhood registration, as it is called, in order that they may get upon the list and be able to vote. In every city in Ontario of over 9,000 people there will be an opportunity to register under these conditions during the next two weeks.

Mr. LENNOX. Four days are given.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, four days are given and there is a chance for an appeal to the court of revision. I have made these remarks directly to the subject in hand and the consequences may be a little more momentous and more important than the right hon. First Minister thinks of attempting to seize in this way the franchise for Dominion purposes and for the partisans of the government in two provinces and make an invidious distinction which the history and the work of these two provinces in the matter of the preparation of their lists give no warrant for at all. If I lived in Manitoba and were singled out for this invidious action on no better basis than that which has been given, I would feel like fighting against that invidious distinction I would

feel like fighting for fair treatment, for being placed on the same basis as my brother from Nova Scotia and my brother from Prince Edward Island and my brother from Ontario. Why should you single out these two young provinces for this invidious legislation? It is demeaning, it is humiliating, it is insulting and I tell the right hon. First Minister, for he may not know it, that he has raised up a storm against himself and his party in these two provinces that it will take many many years to allay, and I mistake the temper of the people of these provinces if they do not make their dissatisfaction known when the proper time comes.

Mr. T. A. BURROWS (Dauphin). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the very able speech delivered by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). But I was not able to find out from him whether he was in favour of accepting the very fair offer made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or whether he was going to vote against his suggestion. He went on to discuss the Bill which is before the House, paying no attention whatever to the explanation made by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) in his speech, and, in so far as I could make out, he paid no attention whatever to the suggestion which my right hon. friend made this afternoon to the effect that if the opposition felt there was any intention on the part of the government to have a partisan voters' list in the province of Manitoba they were prepared to suggest that the whole matter be placed in the hands of the judges so as to prevent one side or the other from getting any particular advantage. To this suggestion I do not see how anybody could object.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the government do the same for the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. BURROWS. I am not speaking for the province of Nova Scotia. I come from the west.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But I am speaking about it.

Mr. BURROWS. My hon. friend ought to know more about Nova Scotia than I do.

Mr. TALBOT. I thought the hon. gentleman had forgotten about it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know something about it.

Mr. BURROWS. The Bill now before the House provides in its first clause for two things so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned, viz.: A complete and full revision of the Manitoba provincial lists and their proper application to Dominion constituencies, thus removing the difficulties the returning officers had to meet in 1904, when it was necessary for them to use the thin red line in readjusting polls where local constituencies overlapped Dominion constituency boundaries.

The opposition say we are singling out Manitoba for special treatment and treating that province differently from the others in regard to the voters' lists and that our action in this regard is exceptional and indefensible.

The explanation and justification are found in the character of the lists themselves. The Ontario lists are compiled by municipal councils and are, in point of fact, complete and impartial, while the Manitoba lists are incomplete, defective and partisan. The law governing the compiling of lists in Ontario is permanent, stable and well understood, while the Manitoba election law, which formerly placed in the judges' hands the power to make and revise voters' lists, was repealed in 1904, and full power was placed in the hands of the executive to appoint partisan registration clerks and control the date, time and place of making and revising the lists. It therefore can be called partisan. For instance, in 1903, when the law was administered by the judges, 430 registration clerks sat for six days each taking applications, or an average of eleven registration booths, held for six days each in every local constituency to put names on the list, while in 1905, under government direction, there was only one place in each local county allowed where a registration clerk sat for only one day to take applications, followed by a one day revision in each county.

There was only one registration clerk appointed for each constituency; that is, 40 registration clerks for the whole province of Manitoba, and they sat on one day in each constituency, or 40 days in 1905 to take the applications for the whole province of Manitoba as against 2,000 in 1903. The hon. member for Marquette stated that the chief aim of the Bill was to place the preparation of the lists in the hands of partisans. In justice to the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) I would call attention to the remarks he made at page 8102 of 'Hansard' where the Minister of Justice said in introducing the Bill that he did not intend to place the making of these lists in the hands of partisans.

We have lists that ought to be submitted to the work of a revising officer, a county judge or a barrister according to the Manitoba system, with time given him within which he can effectively do that work of revision, within which he can effectively purge the lists of dead men and of absentees.

Again the Minister of Justice said:

We prefer to adhere to the provincial lists, and accordingly, in the Bill I am submitting, the lists as established in the provinces, shall be taken in the preparation of the lists for

Dominion purposes, and to them shall be added the names of any persons qualified to vote which are not on them and from them shall be struck the names of all those who are not qualified. The lists so prepared, subject to the revision of a county court judge, shall be allotted and distributed to the polling divisions, to be used in the Dominion elections. That is in brief the outline of this clause.

It will be seen that the Minister of Justice was careful to point out that the government intended to adopt the laws of Manitoba with regard to the making of the lists and that the lists were going to be revised by the county judge. I have noticed that all through the debate, hon. gentlemen opposite referred to clause 1 of the Bill as being designed to take the power of making the list out of the hands of the judges and to place it in the hands of partisans. That is an unfair presentation of the case, because we know that the Minister of Justice provided that exactly the same machinery that is adopted by the province of Manitoba will be adopted by the Dominion government in making the lists.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman point to the clause of the Bill which provides for that.

Mr. BURROWS. Clause 1 which says :

In the preparation of such lists the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and manner of revising and bringing into force the provincial voters' lists in the like cases shall as far as possible be observed and followed and no person whose name is not included in the voters' lists so prepared and revised shall be entitled to vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly ; 'as far as possible.'

Mr. BURROWS. The Minister of Justice stated in his speech explicitly what line would be followed in that regard and nobody could arrive at any other conclusion from the remarks of the hon. minister, but that he intended to follow absolutely—not as far as possible, but absolutely the law as it was in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. May be my hon. friend will explain to the House how it is possible in the time intervening between the issue of the writ and the polling, to carry out absolutely, as he says, the Manitoba law.

Mr. BURROWS. That might be answered by my stating that at present in Manitoba they do not take any more time to make their lists than the time which would ensue between the issuing of the writ and the election. However, so far as that is concerned, I would say that the time given is pretty short in some parts of Canada and I have no doubt that when this Bill is considered in committee that point will be gone into and that the government will meet any suggestion which will result in giving us a working basis which will be satisfactory to both sides.

Mr. FOSTER. All we can do is to take the Bill as we have it before us.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That would not satisfy you.

Mr. BURROWS. If it is clearly shown that the time given in the court of revision is too short I have no doubt that a remedy will be provided in the Bill. I know cases in Manitoba where the two opposing candidates agreed among themselves that in order not to subject their friends to the trouble and inconvenience of coming to court they would go to the revising officer and put in a certain number of names on each side. They did go to the revising officer but of course he expressed his regret that he could not agree to any such proposition. However, that goes to show that in a country of such distances it is necessary to resort to some means to get voters on the lists because of the great inconvenience that may be caused by those wishing to register travelling very many miles to the registration booth. Another great objection we have to the Manitoba law is the fact that it is unstable and unreliable. Its administration is erratic, unreliable, and defective. There has been no permanency and the conditions regarding the preparation of the lists have been changed from year to year to suit the whim of the Manitoba government. In 1905 there were seven Dominion election protests pending and the preparation of the lists that year was a farce. They only had one day in each county on which they received applications and only one day in each county when the court of revision sat. and if any of those gentlemen whose elections were protested had had to run a by-election the election would have taken place on these very imperfect lists. I have a clipping here from a prominent western newspaper which gives a brief sketch of the working out of the Manitoba election law. It says :

In 1905 there was only one registration clerk for each constituency, and the registration lasted for only one day at one place. In Mountain constituency an elector, not on the list, had to journey to Baldur to protect his franchise. In the city of Winnipeg, with thousands to register, there were only three booths open for the one day only.

In 1906, with an election pending, there was a registration clerk for each polling division; but the booths were kept open, not for six days, but for two only.

In Winnipeg, in February, 1907, when there was a special registration, prior to the elections, the booths were open for three days only.

In 1907 the government reverted to the device of the perambulating registration clerk, one for each constituency, who stopped here and there for an hour or so.

It will therefore be seen that there is nothing stable in the manner of making up the lists in the province of Manitoba. Some years you may have a good revision and some years a very imperfect revision. As

a matter of fact since the present law has come into operation there has only been two years in which sufficient time was given for registration and revision and these were the years 1903 and 1906, immediately preceding a local election, when the local government found it necessary to make pretty good lists for themselves. But at any time between these local elections the revising of the lists is merely a matter of form. The Manitoba government held no annual revisions until the year 1904, when they decided to revise the lists annually in order that they might be able to control the preparation of the lists on which Dominion elections would be held, and that action on the part of the Manitoba government was a piece of political sharp practice. They do not require to incur the expense of revising the lists annually for provincial purposes, but they deemed it necessary to do so in order that they might have these lists used in Manitoba elections. In Manitoba the revision and preparation of the lists is not in the hands of judges as has been represented by our hon. friends opposite, for the government has power to decide from time to time what kind of a revision they will have and whether it will be a complete revision or a partial revision. I submit that the policy of placing in the hands of five men who form the executive of any provincial government the absolute power of saying from time to time what kind of voters' lists we are going to have for the election of members to this House of Commons is a policy which this Parliament should not submit to. But yet, if we retain the lists as they are in Manitoba that is just the policy we would be following. The hon. leader of the opposition and other gentlemen opposite have challenged us to show where any person was left off the list of electors by any official of the Manitoba government, or where any complaints had been made against the lists that had been prepared. My hon. friend from Selkirk gave last night a good many instances of this kind, but I might refer in addition to the incident at Balsam Bay where 28 voters applied to the registration clerk to put their names on the list, but they could not get the registration clerk to receive their applications and they were disfranchised. The registration clerk, in making the return, wrote to his friend, who was the candidate for the constituency, and said: 'Nobody had applied but a few Grits, and you bet I did not put them on.' There was a case where some electors were disfranchised. In the city of Winnipeg a large number of electors could not get on the list in 1904, in West Winnipeg, in North Winnipeg and in South Winnipeg, there were about a hundred who could not get on the list. Some 28 were in the registration booth at the time it was closed. I have here an affidavit, made by George John Lovell of the city of Winnipeg, which reads as follows:

Dominion of Canada—Province of Manitoba.

In the matter of the preparation and revision of voters' list for Winnipeg Centre, prior to the last provincial election in 1903.

I, George John Lovell, of the city of Winnipeg, province of Manitoba, agent, do solemnly declare:

1. That I was organizer for the Liberal party for Winnipeg Centre prior to and during the compilation and revision of the list for Winnipeg Centre in May and June, 1903, and as such took great interest in and closely followed all matters pertaining to the said compilation and revision.

2. That at several of the registration booths, owing to the large number of persons registering, several persons qualified to register as electors were unable to apply for registration during the week set apart for registration (viz.: May 25 to 30 inclusive) although several of the aforesaid persons presented themselves on various occasions at the registration booths for the purpose of so registering.

3. That in particular at the booth in registration division No. 6 in the neighbourhood of 100 persons were unable to apply to be registered as voters during the said week on account of the large number of persons in the booth waiting to apply at the time when the said 100 persons severally appeared.

4. That I was present at the court of revision for Winnipeg Centre held on the 15th day of June, 1903, and at some time during the day over 160 persons favourable to the Liberal party and fully qualified to be registered as voters in the electoral division of Winnipeg Centre appeared in the court of revision to be registered as voters but on account of the dilatory manner in which the court of revision was conducted by the revising officer, and on account of the unnecessary delay caused by the counsel appearing for the Conservative party, and permitted by the revising officer, only some 45, or at the most, 50 of the aforesaid 160 were registered when the court of revision was closed at 5 p.m.

5. That at the hour of 5 o'clock the revising officer closed the court of revision notwithstanding the fact that there were over 30 persons then present in the court room for the purpose of applying to be registered, 23 names of whom are as follows:

I will not read the names, as it would take too much time.

6. That, in accordance with what was apparently a well-prepared scheme on behalf of the Conservative party, over 87 appeals were made against voters of which not more than 20 at the very outside could be sustained, such being entered for the sole purpose of taking up the time of the court of revision so that Liberal electors appearing at the court of revision for the purpose of being registered would not have an opportunity to register. My reason for believing that this was premeditated is the fact that a large majority of the parties appealed against were old and well-known residents of the city of

Winnipeg, well known to be Liberals and fully qualified to register to whom there could be no possible exception taken.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

GEORGE JOHN LOVELL.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the date of that ?

Mr. BURROWS. June 16, 1903.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Who was the revising barrister ?

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Barnett.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Who appointed him ?

Mr. BURROWS. He was appointed by the registration board.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. By the judges ?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, by the judges.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. member would not say that such a thing could occur again., since the Act has been amended.

Mr. BURROWS. I think the same could occur again.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Oh, no ; the hours for registration have been increased.

Mr. BURROWS. The great fault we have to find with this election law is that there is not enough time given to register and not enough time for the court of revision. I read that declaration for the purpose of showing that in the city of Winnipeg, right in the shadow of the parliament buildings, with the knowledge of the government, people tried for a whole week to get on the list, and hundreds were turned away. At that time there was a good deal of agitation on this question, and Mr. Lovell, acting on behalf of some electors, applied to the court for a mandamus to compel the revising officer to receive the applications of those present when the court closed. The revising officer agreed to appear, and the case was set down for the following day. The case was tried. Able counsel appeared on both sides. Mr. John S. Ewart appeared for the appellant, and Mr. Andrews, I think, for the revising officer. The judge decided that the revising officer had power to take the names of those who were in the booth at the time. In the meantime, however, the revising officer played a trick, by which he returned his papers to the registration board, and as he was not an officer any longer, the judge could not issue the mandamus, and for that reason it was not issued. There is a case in point where a large number of electors in the city of Winnipeg were deprived of their franchise because of the very short time given for revision. That is the greatest complaint we have against this Franchise Act.

I might cite another case, because it seems to me that every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who speaks on this subject tries to create the impression that we have no grievance or cause for complaint. We have no great complaint to makes so far as the Election Act is concerned. There are many people who believe that the principle that a man should have to apply personally for registration is a good one. I do not believe it myself, because it I think entails too great a hardship on many electors. But I am not discussing the question whether it is wise to have a personal registration or not. What I am trying to show is that the administration of the Act does not give satisfaction to the people of the west, but that the way in which the Act is carried out is entirely unsatisfactory. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) during the delivery of his speech, was very brave. He made this statement :

> I was surprised on a recent visit to my province to find no Liberals justifying the Bill, while every Conservative condemns it. The fair-minded Liberals will not stand for it.

Then, on page 8288 of 'Hansard' he said :

> I am afraid the Prime Minister is not being well informed by his supporters in this matter. Let him apply to the Hon. Chas. Mickle, leader of the opposition in the local House, who is on record as having stated that our present lists in Manitoba are the cleanest we ever had in the province.

I want to say that Mr. Mickle never made any such statement. I happened to have the honour of a seat in the Manitoba legislature at the time this Act was passed, and what Mr. Mickle said was this, that he had no objection to the principle of the Act so far as it worked out in his constituency. I wired Mr. Mickle on the evening that my hon. friend made that statement, and I got this reply from him :

> Birtle, Manitoba, May 8, 1908.
>
> T. A. Burrows, M.P., Ottawa.
>
> In 1904, when not leader of opposition, referring to 1903 election, stated preparation of list cumbersome, expensive and needlessly inconvenient, but result so far as I could judge from my own constituency was a good and complete list owing to being first election under new Act, close attention paid to preparation changes in Act since have produced objectionable features.
>
> C. J. MICKLE.

At the same time he telegraphed to another hon. member of this House the following :

> The Act better in 1903. New amendments have largely destroyed best features. Grievous complaints of unfair administration by government in many parts.

That is the latest expression of Mr. Mickle's opinion on that question. I have in my hand a clipping which shows what Mr. Mickle said in the House when that Bill was introduced. I think my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Jackson) read it last night. I do not intend to read it all again. It was in the main a criticism of the amendment to the Act of the year 1904. He said that the government were going back on their principles altogether in amending the Act. They had first appointed a registration board. By the amendment of 1904 they went back on that altogether, and took into their own hands the power to appoint registration clerks, to which he objected. The only thing he said with regard to that Act of 1903 is quoted here, and it is from this my hon. friend took his inspirations :

Another advantage claimed for the present Act of 1903 was that the making of the lists was taken out of the hands of partisan officials and put into the hands of judges. This provision also was wiped out by the proposed legislation. It was reasonable and fairly satisfactory in practice under the present Act——

That is the Act of 1903.

But now it was done away with. Hence forth the registration clerks are to be appointed by the government. True, there was still a board of registration but it was not for the receiving of names but for the appointment of revising officers. If the principle adopted under the present Act had the merits claimed, what reason was there for the changes now sought to be introduced?

You will see that at the very time when the government of Manitoba introduced the amendments which now form the Election Act of Manitoba, Mr. Mickle, as leader of the opposition in that province, objected and pointed out that they had gone back on the principles of the Act of 1903 and had taken the power to appoint partisan registration clerks.

Another case which has been cited before, a very glaring case,—a case which shows we had grievances under this Act—was the deliberate disfranchisement of thirty-eight electors at Lac du Bonnet. In this case the revising officer, Mr. Heap, in order to enable the people who were living at Lac du Bonnet to be placed on the list, and at the request of representatives from that district, adjourned his court and agreed to go to the lake and take the applications of the residents there. The train goes to Lac du Bonnet once a week, remains about two hours and returns. The clerk sent word that he would be there on a certain train, the residents met him, and he took all their applications. They were bona fide electors. Nobody raised the claim that they were not entitled to vote. But as soon as the government found out that he had adjourned his court, they notified him that his action was illegal ; and notwithstanding the fact that the registration board certified to the list, when the election took place the sheets containing these names were torn off and these men were disfranchised.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), at the beginning of his address, launched out in very vigorous terms against my hon. friend the member for Winnipeg (Mr Bole) as did other hon. gentlemen on that side, particularly the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche). Apparently, my hon. friend from Winnipeg displeased these gentlemen by reading in this House certain affidavits which went to prove that certain fraudulent transactions had taken place in Winnipeg, whereby 492 names of men who were not entitled to vote were put on the voters' list. Well, since that time other affidavits have been obtained in Winnipeg, and I propose to read an affidavit which appeared in the 'Free Press,' the original of which can be got if necessary :

To wit: I, John Hyzy, of 627 Lorette avenue, in the city of Winnipeg, do solemnly declare I am at the present time vice-president of the Polish Conservative Club. I have seen in the 'Free Press' of this morning certain affidavits from Theodore Rudneski and others as to the way in which naturalization papers were made out just previous to the last election, in March, 1907. I have also seen in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of this evening affidavits denying such charges, and, with a full knowledge of the facts and the seriousness of such charges, I do say and solemnly declare:

1. During the month of February, 1907, I went to the headquarters of the Conservative Club, in the Maw block, and met Mr. Rudneski and Mr. Sablewski, and asked them about the naturalization papers for Mr. Desput and Mr. Jaworski and others, and they told me that they were not ready, but Rudneski said it was easy to make them out.

2. Mr. Rudneski then sat down and filled in one of the papers and several others afterwards. I had to spell the name of Desput for him. He then went into an inner room on the right hand side of the large room where I was. I followed him to the door of the inner room, but he told me not to come in. There were other persons there whom I did not know.

3. I saw him go to the table, then the door was closed. He came out a few minutes later with the papers. Before he took them in I noticed they had no stamp on them, but I could not say whether the signature of the clerk of the court was on them or not. When he came back and gave me the papers they had the stamp or seal of the court on them down in the left hand corner.

4. He gave me the papers, I think only two at that time, and I took them away, but I was suspicious that they were not genuine, and so I took them to my former employer and asked him to look at them and see if they were all right. He looked at the stamp and the signature and said he thought they were. I afterwards gave them to the men for whom they were intended, but not before I had

shown them to other persons, all of whom seemed to think they were genuine.

5. I am quite positive that the court seal was not on the blank papers before Mr. Rudneski filled them in and carried them into the inner room, but it was on the papers when he returned, and I could not understand how the seal could be there, and this was why I showed them to certain people before I gave them to the men.

6. I had a conversation about the matter with a friend this morning, and was afterwards asked to see a 'Free Press' reporter and repeat what I had said to my friend. I was then asked if I was willing to make this statements and to swear to it, and I consented to do so, as I know the facts to be true and as I have stated.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Sgd.) JOHN HYZY.

Solemnly declared before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 7th day of May, A.D. 1908.

(Sgd.) J. B. HUGG,
A Commissioner in B. R.

Mr. STAPLES. Who secured that affidavit ?

Mr. BURROWS. I could not tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. STAPLES. Was it the provincial Liberal organizer, Mr. Walton ?

Mr. BURROWS. I could not tell. I did not get it from Mr. Walton.

Mr. STAPLES. Can you give us information as to how much that affidavit cost ?

Mr. BURROWS. How much did Rogers pay for the cheque ? With regard to that cheque I might say that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) tried to create a false impression. I have a facsimile of it which shows that it was given for eight days work and for securing certain affidavits.

Mr. STAPLES. I have in my desk the original cheque and it does not state any such thing. It states that it was given for eight affidavits. I can show it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BURROWS. You can see the facsimile in the Winnipeg 'Telegram.'

Mr. STAPLES. There is nothing like the original documents.

Mr. PATERSON. If it has not been cashed.

Mr. STAPLES. No, it has not, but it is marked and can be cashed at any time.

Mr. BURROWS. I might also point out, speaking of irregularities, a case that occurred in the election of Morris where the result was changed by the fact that three men were allowed to be put on the list illegally. I am not here to say whether these men were entitled to vote, but the same consideration should be given to one side as to the other. If the registration clerk is going to receive applications in an illegal manner from the government side, he should if he wants to be fair, receive them from the other side. I mention this case to point out that, in the administration of this Act, a good many irregularities have occurred, and it is to these irregularities that we object. I may add a word in explanation of what my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) said the other night The case was this : A certain gentleman wrote a private letter to the registration clerk asking that three names be placed on the list. The registration clerk put these names on the list, as there was no application in the legal form justified by the Act. No application was made to strike the names off the list, and according to the Manitoba Election Act the judge has no power to strike off a name unless the parties have been notified to appear. When the revision was held, the gentleman acting for the Liberal party asked to see the interrogatories and found that there were no interrogatories, but that the cases were irregular. He pointed this out to the judge, but the judge said that although the names were on irregularly he would not strike them off because proper notice had not been given to the parties. As a result these three names were left on the list, though they should not have been there. This is a case with which I am quite familar. Probably, I should not have mentioned it, had not the hon. member for Marquette mentioned it. In that election, the attorney general was elected by two votes, and these three men improperly put on the list were supposed to be the means of electing him. There was a recount resulting in a tie and the attorney general was declared elected by the casting vote of the returning officer. Another case may be cited which Mr. J. A. Campbell, the local member representing the county of Dauphin, brought it up in the legislature. He was accused of making a charge against the judge who was the revising officer. He said he made no charge. He made a motion for a return of the papers in the case, but the government refused the motion and it was voted down. The government said they had not the original papers and would not bring them down. The motion was voted down on a straight party vote of 18 to 12.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The hon. member for North Toronto said there was no discussion in the local house.

Mr. BURROWS. The discussion lasted for two days. I know every one of the men whose names were put on. Mr. Campbell appealed against them. I know that they were not entitled to vote. There is no doubt that there was some jugglery practised in connection with these names.

Another complaint and one very common-

ly made by the people of the west who are trying to look after the voters' lists, is that there is great difficulty in securing electoral lists. I, myself, through a gentleman in Winnipeg, tried to secure voters' lists for my own division, and a letter received the other day said that they could not get the lists of 1906. Therefore, as far as I am concerned, I am not able to get the lists to give my co-workers so that we may be prepared to apply to the court of revision. In North Winnipeg during 1905, there were great complaints. I desire to read an extract from the 'Voice,' a paper published by a gentleman who used to be a member of this House and published in the interests of organized labour. It gives an account of the meeting of the Trade and Labour Council :

When the president announced 'good and welfare' a number of delegates proceeded to indignantly tell how they had been handled in their attempt to get into the registration offices during the day and evening for the purpose of having their names put on the voters' list. One delegate who had changed his residence from North to Centre Winnipeg wished to register for the latter constituency in the Market square. He had found the premises besieged outside and inside by a sweltering crowd. Exit was made through the windows. He had made two attempts but had failed to meet the clerks. Other applicants gave a stronger description of the uproar at the North Winnipeg office. Here the police had been called to clear the place. Scores of applicants had gone away in disgust. Of those at the council meeting, five told of their lack of success to get registered, and there was not a man in the room who got on the list at this year's court.

The resolution printed on this page was passed unanimously. Several were for some action to be taken to enforce the demand and proposed a public demonstration to wait on the government.

The resolution which the Trades and Labour Council passed unanimously and which the 'Voice' printed in large type on its front page, was as follows :

Whereas the facilities for registration of voters have proved altogether inadequate for the purpose, therefore be it resolved:

That this Trades Council demand of the government that registration be re-opened and kept open for at least five days.

Needless to say, the Roblin government did not reopen the registration proceedings.

I have here a copy of another affidavit with regard to the country districts which I desire to read to the House :

Dominion of Canada—Province of Manitoba.

In the matter of the registration of voters in the Emerson electoral division, registration district 8, held May 25-30, inclusive, 1903, to wit:

I, George Walton, of the city of Winnipeg, province of Manitoba, agent, do solemnly declare that:

1. I was present at No. 8 registration booth for the provincial electoral division of Emerson on Monday morning, May 25, 1903, and each subsequent day on which the booth was open.

2. That the registration clerk who opened the booth on Monday morning was Thomas Battan, of Stuartburn.

3. That during the forenoon of the first day of registration, five applications for registration had been accepted by the registration clerk, four of whom were Galicians who answered the interrogatories satisfactorily and took the reading test in the English language to the satisfaction of the registration clerk.

4. On account of the time occupied by the registration clerk in completing the interrogatories of applicants, it was suggested that the registration clerk should defer entering the names in the register until the noon hour. This was agreed to by myself as representing the Liberal interests at said registration booth. Mr. Battan admitted his incompetency to fill the important position of registration clerk, which he said had been pressed upon him by the Hon. D. H. McFadden.

5. That after the booth was closed for the noon hour, Monday, Mr. Battan, the registration clerk, stated in the presence of myself and others, that when asked by the Hon. D. H. McFadden to take the position, he had been deceived, that he never had any experience in such work, and being a poor penman he did not feel competent to do justice to the important position; that he had been told by the Hon. D. H. McFadden that there would probably not be more than 60 or 70 English speaking electors to be registered, and that, as no Galicians were entitled to be registered, he could easily handle the number applying for registration within the six days. That it was only on this assurance that he accepted the position, and that he said (addressing myself) you have succeeded in getting four Galicians on during the forenoon, and that there were a large number outside waiting to be registered, he decided not to open this booth again.

And at this juncture myself and others urged Mr. Battan to keep the booth open until a successor could be appointed, offering to send a messenger to Emerson to tender Mr. Battan's resignation through Mr. McFadden to the board of registration, and further offering to ask the Galicians to go home and not return until Wednesday by which time Mr. Battan's successor could be installed. That Mr. Battan would not consent to this arrangement, but announced the registration booth closed for good, never to be opened again so far as he was concerned. That at this time, at least 125 Galicians were present waiting an opportunity to register, many having travelled on foot from 10 to 20 miles.

6. That the registration booth was not again opened until nearly 4 o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday the 27th (no notice having been given as to the time it would be re-opened) when Mr. John McColl, of Emerson, a pronounced Conservative partisan, appeared at the booth to continue the work of registration.

7. That I was present at the re-opening of the registration booth, and upon examination of the register, discovered that the names of the four Galicians who applied for registra-

tion Monday had not been entered upon the register, as promised by Mr. Battan, the then registration clerk. That upon this discovery I applied to Mr. McColl (Mr. Battan being present) to have the names entered on the register, and that he refused to enter such. I also requested Mr. Battan to make the entry and he refused to do so saying the books were out of his hands.

8. That notwithstanding the registration booth had been closed for more than two days the registration clerk closed the same at 10 o'clock Saturday evening, the 30th, refusing to extend the time for registration as provided by the Election Act for cases of interruption.

9. That only a few of the 125 Galicians present when the booth closed on Monday returned again to register, not having received notice that the booth would be re-opened.

10. That a number drove from 20 to 30 miles to the court of revision held at Emerson, successfully took the reading test before the revising officer and were put on the list by him.

11. That in my opinion from 50 to 100 more Galicians were eligible and would have been registered had the registration booth not been closed.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

Declared before me at the of in the province of Manitoba, this day of , in the year of our Lord, 190 .

Mr. STAPLES. What is the date of the affidavit ?

Mr. BURROWS. Registration was held on May 25, 1903.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE Would the hon. gentleman tell us who appointed the registration clerks at that time ?

Mr. BURROWS. I do not know, but I think Hon. D. H. McFadden.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It was the judges

Mr. BURROWS. But I can tell my hon. friend something which he knows but would rather I did not tell the House, that these Galicians were favourable to the Liberal candidate and if they had got a chance to have their names on the list the Hon. Dr. McFadden would have been defeated. He was defeated at the next general election by virtue of the fact that these people got the franchise and he is out of politics to-day.

Mr. W. J ROCHE. At that time the first law was in operation, the law which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were lauding, under which the judges had the appointment of registration clerks.

Mr. BURROWS. That only adds strength to the argument we urged for if at the time when there were six days to register the electors could not get on the lists, what is to happen when there is only one day in which to register as at present ?

Mr. BURROWS.

I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of June 2, 1905, referring to the registration in Winnipeg. It reads :

So dense was the rush before the constables arrived that to depart by the door was impossible. Dozens left by jumping from the window to the ground at the rear, a drop of about seven feet. At a quarter to ten, men still kept arriving, and when the doors were shut at ten o'clock only about a dozen remained to complete their papers, out of the hundreds who had besieged the court during the evening. . .

The registration at St. Boniface was light, but in the evening there was quite a rush, and from fifty to seventy-five persons were shut out, according to estimate.

I have here an extract from the Winnipeg 'Free Press' of June 7, 1905, referring to the distances that people had to go to get on the list. It is as follows :

The 'Free Press' has already printed the facts as to the constituency of Emerson, but the case will well bear recapitulation. The voters at Sprague, Vassar and other points at the east of the riding must take train to Winnipeg, travel thence to Emerson in order to register, since owing to the great swamp completely crossing the constituency, and which nothing without wings can cross, it is impossible to go direct to the point of registration. The voter from the eastern end of Emerson must travel 160 miles by rail, spend $7 in railway fare, besides his hotel and meal expenses in Winnipeg en route, and take three days of his time in order to secure a right to vote.

It goes on :

In the constituencies around Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba, the distances that must be travelled in order to register are enormous. Parts of Gimli are 210 miles from the registration booth. Parts of Kildonan and St. Andrews are 260. Some voters in Swan river, must go 145 miles to the place of registration. Some voters in Gladstone are 110 miles from the only place where they can procure the right to vote. It must be borne in mind, too, that great as these distances are they are really multiplied by the fact that there are no swift means of communication and in some cases no roads. In Swan river some voters must drive to Lake Manitoba, sail across it, and then drive 30 or 40 miles to the point of registration. In Kildonan, Gimli and Gladstone it will mean a voyage of 200 miles up and down the lake and more than a week of time, to say nothing of the expense, if the elector desires to preserve his right to the franchise.

I shall also read an extract from the 'Free Press' referring to the registration at North Winnipeg. It says :

The scenes enacted at the North Winnipeg booth were disgraceful. There was only one door by which to enter and leave the building, which was little bigger than a box. Up the steps leading thereto, swarmed a pushing crowd of would-be voters, at times more than a hundred in number. It was impossible for a voter who had registered to get

out, so that some of them respectable citizens, men of advanced years, were pulled out by the collar over the heads of the crowd. Doors were burst and windows broken, shirts, coats and collars were torn in the attempt to secure entrance or exit. More than 80 qualified voters were left unregistered when Clerk McCutcheon refused to register further.

The hon. member for North Toronto this evening advanced a very ingenious and very able argument to try to point out the enormity of the Act of the Liberal party in 1904 in dividing up certain polling divisions throughout the province of Manitoba. My hon. friends on the other side of the House apparently did not inform the hon. gentleman that at the previous provincial election in 1903, on the same lists, in the same country and under the administration of the Conservative government who brought this election law into force, they found it necessary for the convenience of the electors to subdivide their polls. There was no power on the statute-book to enable a returning officer to do so, but yet they did subdivide their polls. I am making no charge against them for doing so, because they did so, in so far as I am aware, in the public interest. They stated that they did it for the convenience of the public. I will read the names of some of the counties: Arthur, Avondale, Emerson, Gladstone, Kildonan, Killarney, Lansdowne, Manitou, Morden, Rockwood, St. Boniface, Springfield and Virden. There are thirteen counties here and there are four others. There were twelve polls in Lansdowne and the returning officer divided them into twenty-two, and of course he had to use the thin red line to carve up the voters' lists to suit. In Emerson there were nine polls and he made thirteen, and in Gladstone there were fifteen and they made twenty. I have here a copy of the evidence which was taken in the case of the King vs. Duggan in which Mr. Harvey, the Conservative returning officer in the electoral district of Springfield, gave evidence. He was asked why he made eleven polling divisions when there were only nine provided by law. He gave the answer which has been given here before. He stated that he had done so in order to make it more convenient for the public. I will read a short extract from his evidence:

Mr. HOWELL. I want to see this, because, although it may seem startling, I have seen several proclamations that were changed after they were signed by the returning officer, and I am anxious to know if this is one.

Continuing, the witness described the territorial division of Springfield into the 9 registration districts in which there were 11 polling divisions.

His Lordship observed that the polling divisions should have corresponded with the registration districts and the witness had thus made 11 polls, where, according to the law, there should have been only 9.

Mr. AIKINS——

Acting for the Attorney General and a prominent Conservative.

—admitted that that was so, and said that it was necessary to lay all the facts connected with the matter before the court.

The witness, however, did not appear to be wholly responsible for the violation of the law, handing in a printed notice, signed by the Provincial Secretary, D. H. McFadden, naming the 11 polling places, the extra 2 being made by the subdivision of 2 registration districts.

I am mentioning this not to find any fault. I have no knowledge of the facts, but I believe that in making the eleven polls they did so in the interest of the electors to make it easy for them to vote. But they had to change the list. They only had nine lists and they had to take these lists, carve them up, use the thin red line, or the thick black line, to scratch out the names of voters. If that was a proper procedure and in the public interest in 1903 on the same voters' lists and in the same constituencies why should the Attorney General of Manitoba take action against returning officers who happened to be working for the Dominion government in the election which was conducted on the same lists and in the same country within a year? At the October, 1905, assizes an indictment was preferred to the grand jury charging the returning officer for Macdonald with having struck off 46 names from polling division No. 5 of the local constituency of Mountain. This particular polling subdivision is divided between the three Dominion constituencies—Macdonald, Lisgar and Souris. What the returning officer did was to strike out from the Macdonald list the names of the electors who lived in Souris and Lisgar. Not one of these 46 electors were disfranchised. Had their names not been struck out from the Macdonald list they would have had a vote in each constituency contrary to law.

In regard to the subdivision of the polls, polling subdivision No. 10 of the constituency of Emerson comprises no less than 12 townships, that is, 24 miles long by 18 miles wide, or 432 square miles. For the purposes of the elections to the local legislature there was only one poll and that poll was at the extreme west corner, which made it very inconvenient for the electors to vote. In that polling division there was a large Liberal majority and the Liberals were mostly situated in the eastern end of the division remote from where the poll was placed. When the elections took place for the Dominion House the returning officer divided that poll into two and the result was that there was a majority of 105 for the Liberal candidate. I have no doubt that some of the people resented the idea of being sent so far off and on this account voted against the Conservative party. Contrast this with poll No. 11, Emerson, comprising a single township, with an electoral

population of 59. Yet it got a poll. It should also be contrasted with No. 8, Emerson, one township with only 40 names, these two latter gave large Conservative majorities. If the provincial polling division had been followed in the Dominion elections of 1904 the people of Lac du Bonnet, in Selkirk county, would have been obliged to go to Cromwell to vote. This would have involved a railway journey from Lac du Bonnet to Molson and another railway journey to Beausejour and a drive from Beausejour to Cromwell, in all a drive of 40 miles. It is very difficult, in fact, impossible, for the electors to go from one place to the other as there is only one train a week. If the train happened to go on election day it would be all right, but trains do not as a rule run on election day any more than on any other day if it does not suit their convenience. The Dominion returning officer put a poll at Cromwell and another at Lac du Bonnet and they had to divide the list to agree with the polls. That was one of the cases in which action was taken against the returning officer for using the thin red line as stated by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, in contradistinction to the statement made by the hon. member for Marquette, that the people of the west are in favour of the legislation which is now before the House. I think the suggestion made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will not bring this legislation into disfavour. Anybody who is fair-minded will realize if you are going to have registration and if you want non-partisan registration you can put the whole machinery in connection with the making of the lists in the hands of the county court judges the same as was done in 1903. My hon. friend from Marquette said that when he made a trip home during Easter holidays he did not find anybody who was in favour of this Bill. If he had looked at the Winnipeg 'Telegram' a short time ago he would have seen an article which was probably an inspiration to most of the gentlemen whom he saw. On April 19, 1908, Mr. W. H. Hastings, the organizer of the Conservative party, wrote a circular letter to the Conservative papers in Manitoba and the Northwest. I think it would do no harm for me to read this letter to the House.

Mr. STAPLES. It has been read before.

Mr. BURROWS. It will do no harm to read it again. Mr. Hastings is the organizer of the Conservative party and he is the gentleman who has been furnishing the campaign thunder for most of the people who are on that side of politics. This is his letter:

My Dear Sir,—You will notice the controversy between the 'Free Press' and the 'Telegram' in reference to the proposed amendment to the Dominion Election Act as provided by the Aylesworth Bill now before the Dominion parliament, has grown to be one of considerable interest.

So far as the Aylesworth Bill is concerned, I may state to you in confidence that the real fight on this Bill has not yet begun, but it will start when this Bill comes before the House for its second reading, and the opposition will keep the House in session until the snow flies next winter before they will allow it to pass in its present shape.

If the Aylesworth Bill, as it now stands, should become law, it means that the Liberals will have it in their power to make up voters' lists for Dominion elections along the same lines and following the same tactics as were adopted and used by the officials when voters' lists were made up during the time the Greenway government was in power in this province and exercising their ingenuity along that line. With the voters' list made up after the writs of the election have been issued (as provided by the Bill), it would be absolutely impossible for the Conservatives to conduct an aggressive campaign and at the same time endeavour to check the crooked work that would be at the same time perpetrated upon the people by the officials in the way of making the lists up, or in other words, it would simply mean that we might just as well concede the whole of this province to the Liberal party, and waste neither time, energy, or money, in the way of putting up a good legitimate fight.

Our party at Ottawa thoroughly understands this and will make the fight accordingly, but they need to be backed up by the public sentiment of Manitoba, and I therefore write you, upon behalf of the party, asking you, as a favour to the party, to devote as much space in the columns of your paper as you possibly can in showing up the iniquity of this proposed legislation, and in doing so you will not only confer a favour upon the party, but you will be doing a great act in the way of preserving the civil rights and liberties of the independent electors of this province.

I would be much pleased if you would send me marked copies of your issue which contains any reference to this matter, and I will be pleased to have the same reproduced in the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' and all Conservative newspapers in the east.

I feel that it is unnecessary for me to say anything further upon the subject as you understand as well as I the great importance that surrounds the question of the passing or rejection of the Aylesworth Bill.

Kindly drop me a line and let me know if you will be able to comply with the request of the party in this regard.

Yours, very truly,

W. H. HASTINGS.

I wonder if Mr. Hastings will write another letter now and state that the government advocates the lists being made by the judges, surely if he were fair he should change his mind in that regard. I may say that I noticed the week after this letter was written there appeared in the 'Telegram' a whole lot of articles headed 'Western

Press comments on the Aylesworth Amendment,' but the 'Free Press' made so much criticism of these comments that the people got on to the combination that produced it, and the 'Telegram' ceased publishing these comments. This was manufactured indignation, manufactured under the guidance of the Conservative party organizer in Manitoba.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is Hastings ?

Mr. BURROWS. I think he is a provincial government employee so far as I understand.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. gentleman say Mr. Hastings is a government employee and paid a salary ?

Mr. BURROWS. I do not know his salary.

Mr. STAPLES. You do not know anything about it ; play the game fair.

Mr. BURROWS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up the time of the House citing quotations from the press, and I would not have done so were it not for the fact that we have been challenged from time to time to show reason why we object to the present legislation in Manitoba. It has been said by our friends opposite that there was no agitation in the west for an amendment of the law, and in consequence of that allegation I found it necessary to cite the public comment on the question. I think it is very important that this Bill should pass. It is a fair Bill, it is a Bill that nobody can take any exception to and I believe that our friends opposite when they come to reflect will decide that they will support the measure along the lines suggested by the right hon. the Prime Minister

On motion of Mr. Staples the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 13, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 164) for the relief of Edith May Gilmore.—Mr. J. D. Reid.

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a question. I notice in the press this morning a statement that the volunteers of Canada are not to take part in the tercentenary celebration in Quebec next July. I would ask if this is true ; and, if the volunteers are not to take part in the tercentenary, I desire to ask why this decision has been reached after their interest has been aroused in the matter, and, in many cases, they have gone to a great deal of trouble in preparing ? Is it owing to the inability of the department to transport them, or what is the cause ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry that I cannot give my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) the information he asks for. This is purely a departmental matter, and I shall have to inquire concerning it of my colleague the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden).

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to lay on the table certain plans relating to the Georgian Bay Ship Canal as follows :—

Plate 4—Map of river, mile 0 to 33.
Plate 5—Map of river, mile 33 to 66.
Plate 25—Daily discharge of the Ottawa river at Besserer's grove for 1846, 1876, 1881, 1887, 1890, 1904, 1905 and 1906.
Plate 26—Daily discharge of the Ottawa river at head of Montreal island, Besserer's grove, Gower point and Deux Rivières.
Plate 28—Daily discharge of Amable du Fond river and daily fluctuation of reserve lakes, summit supply.
Plate 29—Curves relating to summit water supply investigation.
Plate 36—Diagrams showing movements of boats through the Poe lock and approaches, St. Mary's Falls canal.

I trust, very soon, to have the remainder of these plans and the final report of the survey.

QUESTIONS.

WATER-POWER PRIVILEGES IN ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What sales or leases of water-power privileges have been made by the Department of the Interior in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan since 1900?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. February 15, 1905.—Baumbach and Meler were granted 17·69 second feet from Ross creek on the northwest ¼ of 24—10—3—4 to operate a mill at Irvine, Sask.

July 3, 1905.—Blindman River Electric Power Company were authorized to divert 250 second feet of Blindman river near its confluence with the Red Deer river, for power purposes.

November 8, 1907.—Blindman River Electric Power Company were authorized to raise the level of Gull lake 18 inches for storage purposes in connection with the power plant at the confluence of the Blindman and Red Deer rivers.

June 19, 1907.—Mich. Sostrop was authorized to use enough water from the Medicine river to operate a mill upon section 31—40—3—5.

July 20, 1900.—The Canadian Milling Company were granted 20 second feet from the St. Mary river on northeast ¼ of 14—3—25—4 for the operation of a mill.

April 23, 1908.—Mr. O. T. Johannson was authorized to use the waters of Fallen Timber creek for power purposes on the southwest ¾ of section 3—32—5—west of 5th meridian.

SNAGS IN RIVER ST. JOHN—PAYMENT OF MR. THOMAS LAFFERTY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Has one Thomas Lafferty, of Kings county, New Brunswick, received payment for services performed for the government in connection with the work of removing snags from the River St. John during last year?
2. If so, what is the amount received and the rate of pay per day?
3. Who is the owner of the tug boat which was employed in the work?
4. Was the said boat hired by the day? If so, what was the rate of pay, and how many days employed?
5. If the work was done by the day, why was it not put up to tender?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works)) :

1. Yes, as labourer.
2. (a) $14 ; (b) $1.75 per day.
3. George R. Vincent.
4. (a) Yes ; (b) 78 days at $15 per day.
5. It was thought that the work would be more satisfactorily performed by day's labour.

CANSO COLD STORAGE PLANT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What is the total cost of construction of the cold storage plant at Canso?
2. What has been paid as subsidy or otherwise by the government on account of this plant?
3. What remains yet to be paid under the existing contract?
4. What has been the total cost to the government of carrying on the Scotch curing experiments for herring each year since its inception?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. $67,828.
2. One-half the cost of construction of plant up to maximum payment of $30,000.

Bonus 1905.. .. ..$1,031.23
" 1906.. .. .. 1,959.34
" 1907.. .. .. 682.11

3. Nothing.
4. 1904-5 (including purchase drifter).. .. ..$26,891.04
1905-6.. .. .. 15,446.60
1906-7.. .. .. 10,831.60
1907-8.. .. .. 10,628.17

MR. J. E. CLOUTIER.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Between the 1st of May, 1906, and the 31st of March, 1907, what amounts were paid by the Department of Public Works each month to J. E. Cloutier, of the town of Chicoutimi, or elsewhere, in the county of Chicoutimi?
2. What amounts have been paid each month since April 1, 1907, to date to the same party?
3. What was the nature of the services for which these payments were made?
4. Where are they set forth in the Auditor General's Report for 1905-6 and 1906-7?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $240, including one month which accrued previous to 1st May, 1906, but paid in this term.
2. $20 for each month up to 30th April, 1908.
3. Rent of office for resident engineer at Chicoutimi.
4. Auditor General's Report, 1905-6, page V—216.. ..$ 60 00
Auditor General's Report, 1906-7, page V—165.. .. 180 00
Not yet reported.. .. .. .. 260 00
$500 00

SAGUENAY DREDGING—PURCHASE OF COAL.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. What quantity of coal was purchased last season for the use of the Public Works Department in connection with the Saguenay dredging?
2. From whom was this coal purchased, and at what price?
3. Where was delivery of this coal made?
4. If at Quebec, what did it cost to bring the coal to Chicoutimi?
5. Were any offers received to supply steam coal delivered at Chicoutimi on wharf or barge? If so, what was the price quoted?
6. What was the net cost of the coal actually purchased, including price at Quebec and haulage from Quebec to Chicoutimi?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. 1,700 tons.
2. (a) Canadian Import Company of Quebec ; (b) $4.50 per ton.
3. Delivery was made from time to time at Quebec when needed.
4. Coal was towed by government tug and barges at an estimated cost of about 50 cents per ton.

5. Yes, $4.85 per ton, but, in addition to this, it would, if this offer had been accepted, have been necessary to add cost of providing storage facilities at Chicoutimi. Further the coal offered was not of the quality required.

6. About $5.

SAGUENAY DREDGING—TUG 'STORM KING.'

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. Is the tug 'Storm King' in the employ of the Public Works Department in connection with the Saguenay dredging?

2. If so, what services were rendered by the said tug during the season 1907?

3. Is a memorandum of the earnings of the said tug required and furnished to the department?

4. What were the total earnings for the season of 1906-7, and what was the nature of the services for which charges were made?

5. Does the said tug at times tow coal from Quebec to the Saguenay? If so, what charge per ton is made for such tug service?

6. What amount was credited to the said tug for towing coal last season?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.

2. Was employed entirely under the supervision of resident engineer at Chicoutimi doing government work.

3. Resident engineer is required to furnish returns.

4, 5 and 6. From General Construction Company, $120 for services, towing one of the companys' vessels from 2nd to 4th October, 1907.

Tug frequently tows departmental coal from Quebec, tows dredges when necessary and is used on works of inspection or survey.

ONE CENT DROP LETTER.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked :

Has an estimate been made of the amount that the postal revenue will be lessened by the proposal to give a one cent rate to drop letters in cities? If so, how much?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The department does not anticipate that the postal revenue will be lessened by the change proposed, but has on the contrary reason to believe that the new arrangement will result in increased postal revenue.

HOMESTEADING SECTION 18.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. In respect to the northwest quarter of section 18, township 53, range 4, west of the 5th meridian, by whom and at what time was it homesteaded?

2. What extensions have been allowed in regard to the performances of homestead duties, and for what reasons?

3. What other applications have been made for this homestead?

4. Does the party in whose names the homestead now stands reside on the property? If not, where has he resided within the past three years?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The following entries were granted for this land : E. A. Bellamy, 2nd June, 1905, cancelled on the 12th of February, 1907 ; Thomas H. Mason, 9th of March, 1907, cancelled on the 2nd of May, 1907 ; Daniel Brox, 8th of May, 1907.

2. On the 23rd of May, 1906, cancellation proceedings against the entry of E. A. Bellamy were held over until the 1st of July, 1906, as the homestead inspector reported improvements recently made, and the homesteader stated that he was earning money to go into residence.

On the 25th of March, 1908, cancellation proceedings against the entry of D. Brox were held over until the 15th of April, 1908, for the reason that the homesteader claimed that the residence condition only remained unfulfilled, and that he wanted time to make arrangements for his office.

3. The head office file shows the following applications for this land : 17th of January, 1907, Thomas H. Mason. 27th of January, 1908, William Craig. 1st of February, 1908, Joseph Burns.

4. The present homesteader, D. Brox, does not reside on the land. He is postmaster at Spruce Grove, where he has apparently lived for the past seven years.

WHARF AT GRAND RIVER.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Were tenders received for the building of a wharf on the south side of Grand river? If so, what are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender ?

2. What amount of money has been expended on said wharf up to May, 1908?

3. At whose recommendation was said work undertaken?

4. Were any petitions received asking for the wharf to be built at this point? If so, how many names are on the petition?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. (a) Yes, at McPherson's Cove. (b) For construction of wharf, Thomas Campbell, $8,999 ; for extension, F. S. Macdonald, $4,289 ; W. W. Jenkins, $4,440 ; J. F. Morrison, $4,484 ; M. McDonald and J. L. McPherson, $4,923 ; W. L. Poole and G. A. Thompson, $5,497 ; Thomas Campbell, $5,990 ; D. W. B. Reid and Lewis Archibald, $6,440.

2. $10,996.56.

3. At the request of Mr. J. J. Hughes, M.P., a report as to the necessity for this accommodation was secured from the resident engineer.

4. There are no petitions on file in the department.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Was a petition asking for the extension of the Prince Edward Island railway to Dundas and Avondale received by the government in 1906? If so, what action does the government intend taking in this matter?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The department has no record of any petition being received asking for an extension of the Prince Edward Island Railway, to Dundas and Avondale.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Why was the steamship service between Bridgetown, Annandale, Georgetown and Souris, Prince Edward Island, and Pictou and Sidney, Nova Scotia, discontinued?
2. Is it the intention of the government to re-establish this service? If not, why not?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The department has no record in recent years of a service touching at all the points mentioned. There is a service at present from Pictou touching at Georgetown and Souris ; there is another service from Pictou touching at Murray Harbour, Georgetown and Montague; there is another service from Sydney touching at Souris en route to Montreal.

SECTION 32.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Has the report ordered in reference to the northeast section 32, township 36, range 16, west of the 2nd meridian, yet been made and received? If so, when will such report be laid on the table of the House?

Hon FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The report referred to, which is dated March 23, 1908, was received, and laid on the table of the House on the 21st of April, 1908, as supplementary to return No. 98 (Department of the Interior).

LIGHTKEEPER AT GANANOQUE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Who has charge of the lights and buoys immediately east and west of Gananoque in the St. Lawrence river, including Burnt island and Fiddler's Elbow?
2. When was he appointed and what salary does he receive?
3. Where does he reside at present, in Canada or the United States?
4. Has he attended to the work himself or does he farm it out to others?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Mrs. Manly Cross, widow of the late keeper.
2. Appointed by order in council 2nd of January, 1908, at $550 per annum.
3. The lightkeeper's post office address is Gananoque, Ontario.
4. Mrs. Cross reported on 22nd of January, 1908, that her son will do the work.

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). A short time ago I asked a question of the government with reference to the militia going to the tercentenary celebration at Quebec this summer, and I notice a statement in the papers to-day that they are not going. I desire to ask the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) what are the facts. If they are not going, why are they not going? Is it due to the inability of the department to handle the troops, or what is the cause of their not going ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). It is not correct to say that the troops are not going to the tercentenary. It is a fact, however, that the annual camps of instruction will be held as usual throughout the Dominion this year, instead of being held at one common point at or near the city of Quebec, as was proposed. The annual drill of the city regiments will also take place as usual this year. The reason of the change in the programme, which programme I announced briefly to the House three or four weeks ago, is chiefly due to the difficulty of transportation. It will be understood, I am sure, that one of the principal things had in mind in connection with this tercentenary celebration is to bring together the largest number possible of people to Quebec to witness the ceremonies. Some time ago the chairman of the commission called my attention to the fact that the transportation lines, the railways and steamboats, must be left free as far as possible to bring the people to Quebec and take them home again, and he thought it proper to ask the Militia Department to agree not to move any troops on a certain number of days before the celebration began and a certain number of days afterwards. It will be readily understood that such an arrangement would hamper the railway transportation lines very much. An earnest effort was made to see whether the difficulty could be overcome, but it was found it could only be partially overcome. It was therefore thought better that the camps should be held at the usual places of holding camps. As to the statement that has been made that the headquarters of the militia were unable to cope with the mobilization of 25,000 or 30,000 troops at a central point like Quebec, the story is absolutely without foundation, and is entirely absurd. The Militia Department is quite able to mobilize 40,000 troops at a

central point like Quebec, within a few days, if not within a few hours, if the necessity arose. But at a time when tens and hundreds of thousands of people from all over the northern part of this continent will be looking towards Quebec, and have got to be taken there over the railways and steamboat lines, every one will agree that a serious problem is presented ; and owing to the fact that the companies cannot give the necessary accommodation such as we think the militia should have, this part of the programme has been given up. As to what will be done to bring troops to Quebec to take part in the celebration, I am not prepared at this moment to make any announcement. But the Militia Department will be prepared to co-operate with the commission in every way in its power.

Mr. FOSTER. That is finally final, is it?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. TALBOT. Might I be permitted to ask the Minister of Militia if it is the intention of the department to allow the rural corps to go into camp as usual ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, I intended to say that.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the government respecting the opportunities which Mr. Justice Cassels will have to pursue the inquiry that he commenced a short time ago ; having regard to the fact that he considers his judicial duties to be his first concern—and I quite approve of his attitude in that respect—having regard also to the near approach of the summer vacation, when is it expected that the inquiry can be resumed for any considerable period, and what opportunity will there be between the present date and the first day of January next for proceeding with the inquiry in an effective way ? The government should also take into consideration, in replying to the question, the fact that Mr. Justice Cassels has already announced, as I understand, that the investigation will be protracted because he proposes to go into the question somewhat exhaustively. I would like to know what the idea of the government is as to when the investigation will be effectively proceeded with and completed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not give any information at this moment to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden). Probably the department will have to communicate with counsel and with Mr. Justice Cassels himself as to what his intention is in this respect. My hon. friend says that he wants to know what opportunity there will be to resume the inquiry between this and the first of January. I would have hoped that the inquiry would have been completed long before the first of January.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thoroughly agree with that, but I understood from some quoted statement of Mr. Justice Cassels in the public press, that there was a considerable amount of work of a judicial character awaiting his attention to which he would properly give precedence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will have the matter looked into.

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have heard it remarked that the city corps are to be allowed their annual drill as usual in the fall and spring of the year and are to be paid therefor and that if permitted they are willing to go to Quebec provided their transport and allowances are made good. If that is true what is to be done with the rural corps? Are the rural corps not to be permitted to go to Quebec and, if any of the rural corps decide to take advantage of the same proposition, will they also have their transport and allowance given to them?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Nothing has been settled, but it is a fact that the city regiments, or some of them, or their commanding officers for them, have offered to give the time to go to Quebec, that is six days, or whatever it may be, and also do their full annual training as usual. That is twelve days. That is to say, assuming that it would take six days of their time to go to Quebec, they are willing to give eighteen days drill for twelve days pay. But nothing has been settled in regard to this matter.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I presume the same privilege will be extended to the rural corps?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have not extended it to any one yet.

INSURANCE BILL.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he has come to any conclusion in reference to the early introduction of the Insurance Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes ; 'Introduction' is hardly the word that my hon. friend wishes to use because the Bill is before the Committee on Banking and Commerce. We are considering and preparing some amendments which we will be able to offer to the committee. It is our full intention to press the measure before the Banking and Commerce Committee at an early day.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Aylesworth for the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act and the proposed amendment of Mr. W. J. Roche thereto.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker. when the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) rose in this House yesterday to make his speech upon this particular piece of legislation, known as Bill (No. 115), but better known as the Aylesworth Bill, I was in hopes that he would have had the courage of his convictions and that he would state to this House and the country that he was prepared to withdraw the contentious part of the Bill and allow the business of the House to go on. The right hon. gentleman spoke at some length. I listened to each sentence of his speech but he was prepared to withdraw not even one contentious word, not even one contentious clause of this Bill. I listened to him expecting him to refer to clause No. 1 which deals with the province of Manitoba, the unorganized districts of Ontario and Quebec and the province of British Columbia, but not one word did he utter as regards withdrawing this particular clause. I listened that I might hear him say that he was prepared to withdraw clause No. 17 which refers to the secret ballot, but he failed to mention clause No. 17. Now, Sir, the right hon. gentleman thought he had scored heavily upon the opposition when he said: I am prepared to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Marquette, and when he said that he was prepared, in so far as overlapping portions of the various constituencies in Manitoba were concerned, to refer the question to the judges of the province. I say that the right hon. gentleman did not concede anything there. He gave us nothing but what we enjoy at the present time in the province of Manitoba, fixed by law and on the statute-books of that province. Therefore, the right hon. gentleman has not conceded anything. He has not been so fair as he would try to lead hon. members of this House and the people of this country to believe and I cannot understand for a moment how it has gone broadcast throughout our country in the press that the right hon. gentleman has conceded all the wishes of Manitoba. He has not conceded a single thing. Why, I ask, why has the right hon. gentleman singled out the little province of Manitoba? Why is he so anxious to get a slap at the province of Manitoba? Why is he so anxious to insult the intelligence of the people of Manitoba? The right hon. gentleman has refused to allow the province of Manitoba one stick of timber, one acre of land, one ounce of mineral, one fish that floats in the waters of that province and now he comes forward and puts his grasping hands upon the franchise of the people and tries to take it from them. I say that we will not tolerate that for one moment. Where did the right hon. gentleman get his information? By whom has he been prompted? He has been prompted by the Liberal contingent from the province of Manitoba led by the ex-premier of that province. He consults them. He accepts everything they say, and there is not one word of truth in their statements. I am surprised that the right hon. gentleman should not have listened to the arguments that have been made on this side of the House, arguments which are backed up by facts and backed up by law; but he accepts the statements, and they are only statements, of hon. gentlemen in the Liberal contingent from the province of Manitoba.

Now, Sir, I intend, for a few moments to refer to these hon. gentlemen. I shall endeavour to take up their arguments one by one. I do not for a moment say I am going to attempt to answer them because they have been answered. They were answered in nearly every case before they were made and it is only a waste of time to undertake to answer these hon. gentlemen. But, first, I shall refer to the hon. gentleman who spoke in this House last night. I refer to the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows). Who is this member for Dauphin ? He is a gentleman who sits over there and he has a monopoly of the timber of the western country. He sits in his seat, not by the will of the people, but through the manipulation of his brother-in-law, the ex-Minister of the Interior, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) who has, by his ingenuity, succeeded in setting back his election and allowing that hon. member for Dauphin to take his seat by acclamation.

Now, Sir, I say to the hon. gentleman : come out, fight fair, come out from behind the large spruce trees, come out I say and let the people of this country tell you whether you shall represent them any longer in this House. And if the hon. member does come out in the open I will venture to say he will not come back to this House if he has to fight as others have to fight in the coming election. The hon. gentleman was very careful to read from his Bible, the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' and that was about the whole of his speech ; that was all he had to say. He was very careful to read affidavits one after another and they were affidavits which did not do any credit to the hon. gentleman or his party behind him. Amongst others he read a letter which was written by Mr. Hastings, of Manitoba, and that letter is a fair letter, it is a loyal letter, it is a patriotic letter. But, the outside leader of the Liberal party in the province of Manitoba, Mr. Brown, wrote a letter which he had inserted in the different papers throughout the province and when I

read that letter I want to ask the members of this House if those who voted for Mr. Brown in the last provincial election did their duty when they voted for any such man. He was writing with regard to the flag policy of Premier Roblin and he wrote this letter to the newspapers of Manitoba :

In regard to the flag can you not get interviews with school trustees in your district as to what they think of the teachers being compelled to hoist the flag and take it down with the thermometer at 25 and 40 below?

Is there anything patriotic or loyal about that? Then he wrote to the newspaper editors :

Comment yourself editorially on the subject and if you do you can send a special marked copy to the 'Free Press' at once so that we may copy your views.

Now in connection with this I will take the liberty to recite two or three verses which were written by a late member of the press gallery—methinks I see him here to-day—and there is nothing I can say to you that will represent the feeling and sentiment of the people of Manitoba better than the verses I am going to recite. That gentleman wrote the following beautiful words:

Give me the Grand Old Union Jack
Baptized in blood and tears;
The flag that o'er a nation free
Has waved a thousand years.
More modern flags; with stars and bars
As beautiful may be;
But the flag that's waved a thousand years
Is good enough for me.

Now, these are the words I want specially to commend to the Prime Minister.

Then may it wave o'er land and sea
Through time's eternal space;
Equality and liberty
There find abiding place.

That verse represents the sentiment of the people of Manitoba : Equality and liberty. That is all we ask, that is what we are fighting for, that is what we expect to get. But I have a doubt as to whether we shall be able to get it from the right hon. gentleman when we take into consideration his past record and dealings with the province of Manitoba. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the day is not far distant, the day will soon come, it will come at the next elections when the people have a chance to express their wishes at the polls and they will make the Prime Minister of Canada dance. He will dance as he never danced before, and the people of the country will waltz him from that side of the House and put him in the opposition benches where he always belonged. So much for the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows).

Mr. BENNETT. Take another one of them.

Mr. STAPLES. The next hon. gentleman I wish to call your attention to is the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway). He sat for twelve long years as Prime Minister of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is he to-day ?

Mr. STAPLES. I do not know just where he is to-day. A few days ago the hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) made a speech in this House and he made sweeping statements like all the rest of his speeches. He defied any one to take the lists of the province of Manitoba and compile a federal list out of them. Well, it is the simplest thing in the world to do that. The only trouble that arose was about the overlapping of the voters in the polling subdivisions and all that is necessary to do is to leave the assignment of the voters in their proper divisions to the judges of the land. Yesterday the Prime Minister told us he was willing to do that and we thank him heartily for it, and I say that any man who makes the bold statement that it is impossible to compile the federal lists from the provincial lists is stating what is not true. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) went on to say that the addresses of the different voters in Manitoba are not given on the lists. I am prepared to admit that originally when the lists were compiled by that judicial board which hon. gentlemen opposite think was so perfectly fair and just, in a great many cases the post office address was left out, but the section, township and range were given in almost every case and it was therefore quite easy to find the voters. The hon. member (Mr. Greenway) also said that qualified electors had to go hundreds of miles to get on the list and he said the member for Selkirk would endorse that statement. Well, my colleagues and myself have gone over the constituency of Selkirk and we have taken the last census map of the province of Manitoba, and we have taken every polling subdivision in that constituency where a registration clerk is required by law to sit in the near future, and we have failed to find where a man would have to go fifty miles, much less one hundred miles to get on the list. Therefore I say that the member for Lisgar was wide of the mark when he said voters would have to go one hundred miles to get on the list. There is not a word of truth in it. He also found fault with the shortness of the time that elapses between the conclusion of the registration sitting and the court of revision ; but the province of Manitoba is at the present time having new proclamations issued to extend the time so as to suit the fancy and meet the whims of hon. gentlemen opposite.

The hon. gentleman also said that the government of Manitoba had deliberately torn from the list of voters certain names. It has been said before, and I repeat it, that there was never such a thing done that was contrary to law. He also made the state-

ment that the Tories of Manitoba had undertaken to make some voters. Well, Sir, I want to say again that there is not a word of truth in that statement. The names that were put on the list were put on at the request of the Liberals of that particular polling subdivision. Now, who is this member for Lisgar? Is he the man?—yes, he is the man that went up and down this country for twelve years shouting: 'Hands off the province of Manitoba; equal justice to all, special privileges to none.' These were his war cries. Where is he to-day? He is the man who said to the government of the day: 'Give us our swamp lands, give us our school lands, give us our national schools.' I wonder where he is on that question to-day. He is the man who in those days stumped not only the province of Manitoba, but also the province of Ontario, trying to raise religious prejudices? Yes, he is the man; but where did we find him when the autonomy legislation was on? I watched him in his seat the only time he was in the House while that debate was going on, and I rather pitied him; he twirled his thumbs, stroked his whiskers, dusted his coat, and looked very uncomfortable, because his conscience was pricking him. On another occasion he made some remarks with regard to some provincial matter, and what did we find? When the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) was replying to him, and making things very hot for him, we found the hon. gentleman stealing back to one seat after another until he got close to the back door, and there he tumbled out, notwithstanding the euphonious strains of the hon. member for Simcoe singing, 'Tommy, dear Tommy, don't go.' He is the man who in those days said: 'Give us the provincial lists for federal purposes.' Where is he to-day? Is he shouting, 'give us provincial lists for federal purposes?' No; he wants to insult the people of the province of Manitoba. And now, Sir, I appeal to the ex-Prime Minister of Manitoba, I appeal to the hon. members of this House, to give us the assistance we are deserving of at this present time. All we ask for the province of Manitoba is equal rights, equal justice. No special privileges are we asking. I say, as the hon. gentleman said on that occasion, hands off the province of Manitoba.

The next man I come to of this Liberal contingent from the province of Manitoba is the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford). It seems to be the delight of that hon. gentleman to question the veracity of the Hon. Robert Rogers and the veracity of the hon. the Prime Minister of Manitoba. It is his whole delight to get up in this House and talk of the maladministration of the government of Manitoba. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman; he is the last man who should rise in this House and question the veracity and the honesty of the Prime Minister of the province of Manitoba. It is nothing more than cowardice on his part.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is an unparliamentary expression, and should be withdrawn.

Mr. STAPLES. Well, I will say unfair, Mr. Speaker—lack of courage. I was saying that he is the last man who should reflect on the veracity or the honesty of the Prime Minister of Manitoba. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that if it were not for the mercy, the great grace, of the Prime Minister of the province of Manitoba, the hon. gentleman would by no means be sitting where he is to-day.

The next man I come to is the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Jackson), and I purpose passing him over with very brief mention. I must say that he is not in quite the same category as the other hon. gentlemen that I have mentioned or the ones I purpose to refer to. But, Sir, even this gentleman has a record. He was speaker of the local legislature. He filled that position very gracefully, with great ability and with great credit to himself; but he has another record. He is the man who, when the Autonomy Bills were before this House, gathered up his little bag and struck out for the province of Manitoba, and went to the constituency of Mountain, hung his map on the wall, and extended the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. Quite a man after all; a little in advance of even the Prime Minister of this country. We have not yet got our boundaries extended.

The next hon. gentleman I come to is the member for the city of Winnipeg, the man who has the great honour of representing that great western city, the metropolis of the west, the Chicago of Canada. I would naturally expect, Mr. Speaker, a man who holds that honourable position to be a big man, a broad man, a fair man, a man who would not stoop as he stooped to reading the affidavits which he read in this House. But, Sir, he read some of them only; he did not read them all. I want the hon. gentleman now to read the rest of them. He read only four. He read the affidavits of Rudneski, Szymanski and Cichoski; but, Sir, he neglected to read those of Gdoski, Dumenski or Mosquito—we will leave it there. He failed to tell the whole story on that occasion. He did not tell us that the affidavits which he held in his hand cost the Liberal organizer of the province of Manitoba $25—$25 for four? No, $25 for eight; and there, Mr. Speaker, is the original cheque. There is the original document.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. STAPLES. I want, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to read this cheque. It reads thus:

Winnipeg, Man., March 30, 1907.

The Merchants' Bank of Canada, pay Theo. Rudneski, or order, the sum of twenty-five dollars. Eight men's time, affidavits.

(Sgd.) GEORGE WALTON.

Who is Geo. Walton? He is the Liberal organizer of the province of Manitoba. He holds a seat in the local legislature of that province. The cheque is marked, but has not been paid. It is charged up to the debit of Geo. Walton, Liberal organizer of the province of Manitoba. Here is the original document— something that proves the case. It is all in the same handwriting, and I challenge the right hon. the First Minister or even the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) to repudiate it.

The next man I come to is the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), the ex-Minister of the Interior—a very interesting man. He will be still more interesting within the next few moments—the father of the legislation we have now before us; the man responsible for this proposed legislation; the man who in 1903 tried to foist upon the people of Manitoba similar legislation; the man who drafted a similar Bill in 1903. The right hon. gentleman has denied that there was such a Bill drafted. I ask him now if there was not a Bill of that kind drafted in 1903. He denied it yesterday and the day previous. I ask him now whether there was not such a Bill drafted and printed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is entitled to an answer from me. If such a Bill was drafted, it never was to my knowledge.

Mr. STAPLES. I accept the right hon. gentleman's denial, as it is my duty to do, but now it becomes my painful duty to show the right hon. gentleman that there was such a Bill printed and that it was printed down here in the Printing Bureau of this government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the right hon. gentleman deny that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot deny or affirm it. I say that if anything of the kind was done, it was not to my knowledge.

An hon. MEMBER. You were not intended to know.

Mr. STAPLES. We have had some hard fights in this House to obtain possession of original documents. We have had to debate for hours and days and weeks to try and get into the different departments of the government and get hold of original documents. But I did not have such a fight in order to get this, and I have it. Had it been in one of the departments, I venture to say I would not have it, because the first man who would throw himself against the door, backed by a subservient majority in his refusal to let us see the original documents, would be the Prime Minister. Not so in this case. We have the document here. There it is, conceived in iniquity, born in sin and submitted, I am told, to the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of Justice of that day, killed by that Minister of Justice, buried by him, the Hon. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, now Chief Justice of Canada. But resurrected, Sir, by a minister of injustice, incorporated in the Bill we have now before us, designed for the same purpose—the purpose of gagging the will of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I rise to a point of order. Seeing that the hon. gentleman has produced an original document, a certain cheque, I ask that it be laid on the table of the House.

Mr. STAPLES. I shall deal with that later. I do not know that I shall either lay the Bill on the table or yet the cheque, but the right hon. gentleman told us yesterday that his memory was quite as good, quite as bright as ever. I am glad to know it. If that is the case, as I read this document, surely he will remember some of the words or the construction of some of the clauses or perhaps the entire Bill.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. Has that document not to be laid on the table?

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule as to the production of documents is limited to the case of a minister quoting from or referring to a public document and does not apply in this case.

Mr. STAPLES. Now, Sir, as I read, I have no doubt the right hon. gentleman will remember some of the language.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In my turn, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman says no doubt I will remember. I state that to my knowledge this document never was presented to me.

Mr. STAPLES. I am trying to refresh the memory of the right hon. gentleman. If after I have read the document he says he does not remember it, there will not be the least doubt in my mind that it was not presented to him, and I shall certainly accept his word. This is the Bill—Blank number, with 1903 at the top, and it reads thus:

An Act further to amend the Franchise Act, 1898, and the Dominion Election Act, 1900, as respects the province of Manitoba.

His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as the Manitoba Supplementary Voters' Lists Act, 1903.

2. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—

(a) The expressions 'Dominion election,' 'election' and 'provincial election,' respectively, have the same meanings as they have in the Franchise Act, 1898;

(b) The expression 'province' and its derivatives respectively mean and refer to the province of Manitoba;

(c) The expression 'electoral district' means any place or territorial area in the province which is entitled to return a member to the House of Commons;

(d) The expression 'registration district' means a registration district constituted under the laws of the province for the purposes of the provincial registration upon which were based the voters' lists designated by the Franchise Act, 1898, and amendments thereto, for use at the election about to be held.

3. Section 13 of chapter 16 of the statutes of 1901 is repealed, and it is hereby enacted that section 9 of the Franchise Act, 1898, as amended, shall not apply to the province of Manitoba, and that as regards the said province the provisions of this Act shall be taken to be substituted therefor.

4. For the purposes of any Dominion election about to be held in the province, voters' lists shall be prepared and revised, in manner hereinafter provided supplementary to those so designated as aforesaid for use at such election.

5. The provisions of paragraph (e) of section 19 of chapter 52 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1902, and any provisions of the provincial law directly or indirectly imposing an educational qualification for registration as an elector, shall not apply to or be regarded in the preparation of such supplementary lists, nor shall any provision of the provincial law requiring an applicant for registration who claims to be a British subject by naturalization to produce his certificate of naturalization.

6. Every person who possesses the qualifications prescribed by the law of the province for registration as an elector, as the same are modified by the provisions of the next preceding section, and by the provisions of the Franchise Act, 1898, and amendments thereto, and whose name is not on the voters' lists designated as aforesaid for use at the election about to be held, shall be entitled to be registered as an elector for the purposes of such supplementary lists, whether or not such person possessed the said qualifications at the time when the said voters' lists were made or revised, and whether or not he then applied for registration.

7. Whenever it becomes necessary under this Act to prepare and revise supplementary voters' lists in one or more electoral districts, the Governor in Council may by proclamation appoint for each of such electoral districts a fit and proper person, who shall be a judge of a county court, or a barrister of not less than three years' standing, to be the revising officer for such electoral district, and he shall, by such proclamation, fix the date for the closing by the revising officer in each electoral district of the registration for such supplementary lists.

8. Immediately after receiving official notice of his appointment, the revising officer shall take an oath of office before a judge of the Court of King's Bench, or of a county court, or before a justice of the peace, in form A in the schedule to this Act, which oath he shall forthwith thereafter cause to be filed with the clerk of the Crown in chancery.

9. The revising officer shall thereupon open an office at some convenient place in the electoral district for which he is appointed, and shall, until the closing of the registration for such supplementary lists, keep such office open every day, Sundays excepted, between the hours of nine and twelve o'clock in the forenoon, and one and four o'clock in the afternoon, and shall during those hours by himself or a substitute be present at such office to receive applications for such registration and to transact other business pertaining to his office as revising officer.

10. The revising officer shall, immediately after taking the said oath, insert in a newspaper published in the city of Winnipeg, and also in one or more newspapers published in the electoral district, or if there is no newspaper published in the district then in some newspaper which circulates therein, a notice in form B in the schedule to this Act, and he shall continue the publication of such notice in every issue of each of such newspapers up to and including the day fixed for the closing of registration.

11. The revising officer shall at the same time send to every postmaster in the electoral district, by mail, registered, a similar notice, to be posted up for the information of the public.

12. The revising officer shall receive applications in form C or form D in the schedule to this Act, or to the like effect, up to midnight of the day fixed for closing the registration for such supplementary lists.

13. Each application shall contain the name of only one person applying, or on whose behalf application is made, to be placed on such lists.

14. Such applications shall be sworn to or affirmed either by the person for whom registration is sought, or by some other person on his behalf, such other person being an elector of the electoral district, before a mayor, reeve, justice of the peace, commissioner for taking affidavits, county court clerk, registrar or notary public, or before the revising officer.

15. The revising officer shall enter the name, residence, post office address, and occupation or profession of each person by or on behalf of whom an application conforming to the provisions of the three next preceding sections has been received by him, and whose name does not appear in the list so designated as aforesaid, on a preliminary list for the proper registration district according to the alleged qualifications of such person, the names being entered in alphabetical order.

16. Where part only of a registration district lies within the electoral district, a separate preliminary list shall be prepared for such part.

17. Every person before whom it is provided that an oath or affirmation under this Act

may be taken, shall, upon request, administer such oath or affirmation gratuitously.

18. Any person who has attained the full age of twenty-one years and is a British subject by birth or naturalization on or before the day on which the preliminary lists are finally revised, shall be entitled to be registered as an elector, if otherwise qualified.

Revision of lists.

19. Forthwith after the closing of registration the revising officer shall fix a day and hour, and a place within the electoral district, for the revision of the preliminary lists, such day being not less than two weeks after such closing, and he shall give public notice of the time and place so fixed in the manner prescribed by sections 10 and 11 of this Act with respect to the notice therein mentioned.

20. Such notice may be in form E, in the schedule to this Act, and shall state that the preliminary lists may be inspected during office hours at the office of the revising officer.

21. The revising officer may if deemed advisable on account of distance or otherwise, fix separate times and places for different portions of the electoral district for the revision of the preliminary lists, in which case the notices published by him shall specify the registration districts and parts thereof, the lists for which shall be revised at such times and places respectively.

22. At the time and place specified in the notice the revising officer shall hold a court for the revision of the said preliminary lists, and for the purposes of such revision he shall have all the powers which were vested in the judge or other person presiding at a court for the revision of lists of electors under the Act, chapter 49 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1891, and the amendments thereto hereinafter mentioned.

23. It shall not be necessary to notify the revising officer that it is intended to apply to have names struck off the list, but it shall be sufficient if it be proved in court to the satisfaction of the revising officer that a summons or order in form F in the schedule to this Act has been served upon any person whose name is objected to, at least forty-eight hours before the time fixed for holding the court, and upon such proof the revising officer shall proceed to hear and dispose of the application whether or not the person whose name is objected to is present.

(2) Such summons or order may be served either personally or by leaving a copy thereof with some grown person at the residence as shown upon the preliminary list of the person objected to.

Division of registration districts.

24. The revising officer may divide any registration district which is found upon the completion of the supplementary list thereof to contain more than three hundred electors, or any registration district where, in his opinion, on account of sparseness of settlement or for any other reason, the convenience of the electors requires it, into two or more polling divisions, and in every such case he shall prepare a separate list for each of such polling divisions, dividing the list designated as aforesaid for use at the election about to be held, as well as the supplementary list for the registration district, according to the residences of the electors whose names appear thereon, as such residences are stated in such lists respectively, and shall certify the lists so prepared by him as correct and as having been prepared by him pursuant to this section; and for the purposes of the election about to be held, such polling divisions shall be regarded as duly constituted and the list so prepared and certified shall be regarded as duly prepared and in force.

25. The revising officer shall forthwith notify the returning officer of any action taken by him under the next preceding section, and the returning officer shall thereupon fix a polling station in and for each of the polling divisions constituted thereunder, and shall cause a public notice to be posted up in at least two of the most conspicuous places in each of such polling divisions setting forth the polling stations so fixed and the territorial limits to which they respectively apply.

Printing of lists.

26. If in his opinion there is not sufficient time to have the supplementary lists or any of them, or any lists prepared by him under section 28 of this Act, printed in the manner provided by the Franchise Act, 1898, the revising officer shall procure such lists to be printed in the province and shall supply the returning officer with as many printed copies thereof as are required for the purposes of the election about to be held.

General provisions.

27. Where they are not inconsistent with this Act, the provisions contained in sections 21 to 66, both inclusive, of the said Act, chapter 49 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1891, as the same were amended by chapter 12 of the Manitoba statutes of 1892, and chapter 9 of Manitoba statutes of 1894, together with the forms therein referred to shall, mutatis mutandis and so far as the same are capable of application, apply to the preparation, revision and bringing into force of the said supplementary lists, there being substituted in such provisions inter alia for the Lieutenant Governor in Council the Governor in Council, for the registration clerk, the revising officer, and for the clerk of the executive council of the province the clerk of the Crown in chancery.

28. The Governor in Council may make such other provisions not inconsistent with this Act as he deems necessary to the full and effectual carrying out of the intention and object thereof.

29. The Governor in Council may fix the times to be allowed for any proceeding under this Act and, if he thinks proper, may shorten the delays prescribed by the said chapter 49 and amendments thereto with respect to any such proceeding.

30. The Governor in Council may fix the fees and allowances to be paid to officers and persons engaged in carrying out the provisions of this Act, which fees and allowances may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Right to vote to persons on supplementary lists.

31. Every person whose name appears as an elector on any such preliminary voters' list as finally revised shall be entitled to vote at the election for the purposes of which the same was prepared in the same manner as if

his name appeared upon the voters' lists designated by the Franchise Act, 1898, and amendments thereto, for use at said election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all the affidavits and forms of declaration in connection with this Bill, are here. There are a great many of them, but I do not think it is necessary for me to read them, as I am taking up more time of the House than I really should. But I want to say in conclusion, that we have reason to thank Heaven that when this Bill was drafted there was in this government a Minister of Justice who would not allow such an iniquitous, such a nefarious, cruel, fraudulent act to be placed upon the statute-book of Canada. And to-day, I am sorry to say, we have a minister of injustice, as I claim he has been properly termed——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I think the hon. member will see that it is hardly proper to apply such a term to a member of the House.

Mr. STAPLES. The reason I use it is that it has been used before.

Mr. SPEAKER. It should not have been used before, and if I had noticed it at the time I should have insisted on its withdrawal. I think the hon. member should not repeat the term and should withdraw it now.

Mr. STAPLES. Certainly, I withdraw it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Since the hon. gentleman has refreshed my memory, let me say this to him. He is aware that all Bills which are introduced by the government are first brought before council and discussed. Some are approved and some are not approved. When they are not approved, they are not brought down ; if they are approved, they are brought down. I have this to say to my hon. friend, that I have no recollection that this Bill was submitted to council, or to myself. I will inquire from my colleagues. If it was brought before council, it was not adopted. But so far as I remember it never was brought before council, and I do not think it was submitted to myself, either.

Mr. STAPLES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the explanation of the right hon. gentleman. But I may supplement my remarks in regard to the preparation of that Bill by saying that Liberal lawyers in the city of Winnipeg, according to my information, assisted the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) to prepare the draft of that Bill. My information is that it was submitted to the Minister of Justice of that day, and he refused to accept it, he refused to single out the province of Manitoba and make special legislation concerning it. Now the right hon. gentleman has denied it, and I accept his denial that he never saw that Bill and that to his knowledge it was never printed. But neither the chief justice of Canada the hon. member for Brandon, I think, will say that a Bill such as I have read, printed on the same paper, printed with the same type, has come from the Printing Bureau down here. Therefore I say that the Bill was designedly drawn up by the ex-Minister of the Interior, or those who assisted him, for the purpose of gagging the people of Manitoba, or in other words, trying to steal, if I may use the expression, the seats of the province of Manitoba.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to see the Bill ?

Mr. STAPLES. Yes, but I want you to return it to me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Most certainly.

Mr. STAPLES. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more material that I might use. During the debate a few nights ago I interjected a remark across the floor of the House that I could give the names, and could prove that some 20 or 30 men actually——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The House is witness that I return the Bill to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. STAPLES. I thought the right hon. gentleman was going to say that he recognized the Bill when he got it in his hands. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I have further material, and that I am prepared to prove the statements I made regarding the thin red line, that fraud was committed by Mr. Leach, the late organizer for the province of Manitoba. But as I will have an opportunity of speaking on an amendment to this Bill which will undoubtedly come up, I will reserve those remarks and speak on the amendment. But in conclusion I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that we, the citizens of the province of Manitoba, cannot understand how it is that the right hon. gentleman is so anxious to get a slap at that little province. Why, Sir, it seems to be his delight to refuse the province of Manitoba a foot of its land, a stick of its timber, and as I said before, a fish that floats in the waters of that province. Why he refuses to extend the boundaries of Manitoba we cannot understand. Therefore, I appeal to the right hon. gentleman. I appeal especially to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), the ex-Premier of Manitoba, and the contingent of Liberal members from that province which he leads in this House, to take the stand he took in by gone days and to say, hands off the province of Manitoba, equal rights, equal justice to all. I say that is what the citizens of Manitoba expect from the hon. member for Lisgar, that is what the province of Manitoba expects from every other member who sits on the government side of the House. True, numerically, on this side of the House the members from the province of Manitoba are

weak, but physically they are strong and, for my part, I purpose to stay here and fight this Bill so long as I have an opportunity before I allow the right hon. gentleman to foist upon the people of the province of Manitoba any such iniquitous provisions as are laid down in certain clauses of Bill No. 115. We, on this side of the House, fall behind our leader in the remarks which he has uttered, we are prepared to stand by him, and, I know he is prepared to stand by us, therefore, all I ask for the little province of Manitoba is that she shall have justice, British fair play, that she shall not be discriminated against, that she shall be placed upon the same plane as her sister provinces, that she shall be given the same status in confederation as all the other provinces in this Dominion and if these things are granted we will be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we have all enjoyed the very amusing speech made by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) this afternoon, but I do not believe it is worth taking up very much of the time of the House to follow him in any detail. He has travelled from confederation down to the present time and has tried to present the real or imaginary wrongs which he thinks Manitoba has suffered at the hands, not of this government, but at the hands of his own party. When he talks about lands, when he talks about mines, when he talks about the area and boundaries of the province of Manitoba and when he talks about the fish that float in the waters this government had nothing to do with these things, but the things of which he complains were done when his own friends were in power. But there is one thing which the hon. gentleman has referred to which, in my mind, is very pertinent. He spent nearly half of his time, in fact, I think more than half, in trying to prove to this House and the country that an attempt was made by the government in 1903 to correct the wrongs, at least the alleged wrongs, which existed in the province of Manitoba at that time and which certain members on this side of the House contend exist at the present time. He has delved into the archives of some of the public departments at Ottawa and has produced an original document which he has placed upon the pages of 'Hansard' and which he says is a Bill which was prepared for the purpose of providing for a special revision of the voters' lists in Manitoba in 1903. He tried to fasten this upon the knowledge of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has denied that he knows anything about it, and I do not think that there is any hon. member of this House, or any person in Canada, no matter what his politics may be, but who will agree that the Prime Minister is telling the truth when he says that he has no recollection of it. The important question is not whether the right hon. Prime Minister knew about this Bill, but the important fact is that in 1903 a condition of affairs existed that justified some person in attempting to pass legislation which would remedy that condition of affairs. To my mind that was the important question in 1903, and it is the important question in 1908. There has certainly been an agitation going on in the province of Manitoba for the last six years. That agitation has culminated in the introduction of the Bill which we are now discussing, and for a short time I wish to discuss the Bill as I view it, giving, to some extent, the reasons why I think it is necessary to introduce this Bill and the reasons why this Bill should become law. The arguments which have been addressed to this House by hon. members from the province of Manitoba, and I think nearly every hon. member from that province has taken part in this discussion, seem to show that there is existing to-day a state of affairs in regard to the voters' lists which does not exist in any other province in Canada, and which, if it did exist in the eastern portion of Canada, would lead almost to a riot. Imagine for a moment a man in the province of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Ontario being compelled to travel 60 miles to have his name put on the voters' list. Some hon. gentlemen from the province of Manitoba have stated that men are compelled to travel 100 miles to get their names on the voters' list. What would be said in the eastern provinces if people were subjected to an indignity and an inconvenience of that kind ? As was stated by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) last evening, one of the great difficulties which people who take any interest in the preparation of the voters' lists have to contend with is the apathy of a great many voters in looking after the revision of the list and seeing that their names are placed upon it. If people in eastern Canada had to travel five miles to get their names put on the voters' list, in a good many cases there would be lots of names lacking from these lists. They would not go at all, as an hon. member says. But that is a matter that I will discuss a little later on. Before the present government came into power in the province of Manitoba there was an election law which our friends, then in opposition, now in control of the government, claimed to be unfair. I am not going to argue whether that law was fair or not. I am only mentioning it to show that there has been difficulty in the province of Manitoba for many years over the franchise. The cardinal features of that law, however, were that the government appointed registration clerks and that these registration clerks sat continuously at certain places in the province, or their offices were open continuously for four

weeks. During that time they would receive applications to add to or strike names from the lists. Then an interval of six weeks must elapse between that and the revision courts, and during that time these preliminary lists were posted in public places in the constituency, in the post office, in the court house and in other public offices. Municipal officers, members of parliament and defeated candidates, both federal and provincial, received a copy of these lists and they had six weeks within which to file their protests and to have the lists cleaned up by revision. Our friends, then in opposition in the province of Manitoba, stated that when they came into power they would change that law and would pass a law which would work out more to the advantage of the people and which would be an improvement upon the law existing at that time. They came into power, I think, in 1899, and in the year 1902 they passed a franchise law which has been admitted by members on this side of the House to be fair, and which I must say appears to be fair. I am not going to give all the particulars of it, but the underlying principle of the law of 1902 was that a registration board, I think it was called, consisting of the county court judges, appointed the registration clerks and then they also assigned to themselves certain districts in which they sat as revising officers. But, Sir, here is where we commence to see the fine hand of the politician in Manitoba, because, while the board had the right to appoint the registration clerks, the government, by order in council, took upon themselves the right to say when, where, for how long and under what conditions these registration clerks should sit. I am bound to say that in the year 1903 there seemed to be a goodly number of places at which people could apply to have their names added to the list. I am not going to weary the House by reading extracts. I have a list prepared by my hon. friend the member for Dauphin which gives the number of days, the number of places and the registration clerks in each constituency in Manitoba from the year 1903 to 1908. Just here I want to point out a few inconsistencies and a few of the reasons why my hon. friends claim that the law was unfair. In the constituency of Arthur there were in 1903 nine places at which people could register their names before the clerks and in 1905 that number was reduced to one, and the registration clerk sat only on one day. The trouble, as I understand it, is not in the law of 1902, but in the administration of the law, and I think I might go as far as to say that there is not very much fault with the law of 1904. The fault is with the administration. Under the Manitoba franchise law of 1902, which is said to be fair, and which would look to me to be fair from reading it, acts were done and things happened which would not be tolerated for a moment in eastern Canada. Even under that Act of 1902, which appears to be fair, things happened and conditions existed in 1903 in Manitoba, by the manipulation of the politicians there, which made that election one of the most unfair that has ever taken place in the political history of Canada. Proof after proof has been given by hon. members on this side of the House that hundreds of people applied at these registration booths and were unable to get access when the supposed legal hour for closing expired and were deprived of their franchise. Again, by the Act of 1902 all foreigners who had not been in the country for seven years and who could not read the Manitoba Act in one of a number of languages were disfranchised, with the result that many Galicians were not put on the voters' list.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If the hon. gentleman means what he says: that unless a man could talk in one language he was disfranchised, that is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. gentleman will listen to what I say he will not need to interrupt me. I did not say they had to speak in one language. I said a number of languages. I think it was five.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Then you are all the more wrong.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman knows I am not wrong for he knows that by the legislation of 1902 unless a foreigner could speak in one of four or five languages he could not exercise the franchise.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You are getting right now, but that is not what you said first.

Mr. CARVELL. I wish only to state the facts. I will give a few more instances of how this beautiful law worked out in 1903 and I am basing my statements on evidence that has been furnished by members of this House, and if only one-half of that evidence is right it affords the best justification in this world for this parliament interfering. At Balsam Lake on the eastern shores of Lake Winnipeg in the county of Selkirk one of these registration clerks held his court—he was one of those supposedly fair registration clerks appointed by the county court judges—and he wrote back to his friends that nobody applied but some Grits, and you bet I did'nt put their names on the list. It is stated that twenty-eight men were refused registration in this way at Balsam Lake, and it is admitted by gentlemen opposite that seven who were qualified voters were refused admission to the voters' lists, and such was the scandal that at the next session of the legislature the Conservative government passed an Act to specially enfranchise these seven men. Think of the like of that happening in

eastern Canada. Again, at a place called Lac du Bonnet, which was a small district some thirty or forty miles from the registration place, the people could not leave their homes to come to the court, and the revising officer stated that if these people could not come to him he would be fair and go to them, and he went to them but he arrived on a date after the date fixed in the proclamation. He accepted the application of these men and placed thirty-eight of them on the list, and no one denies that every man of them was entitled to be a duly qualified elector under the law of Manitoba. But when the election came in 1903 these thirty-eight men were denied the franchise simply because the revising officer had tried to carry out what ought to be the spirit of the law. There has been an attempt made by gentlemen opposite to show that the county court judge gave a different certificate for this registration from that which he gave in other cases, but that only shows the iniquity of the law which would prevent these men going on the list simply because the judge happened to make a different kind of certificate from the usual certificate. The fault is in the law; it is in the people who are adminstering the law in Manitoba, and the whole process by which names are kept off the list or put on the list in that province is in need of being remedied. It is such things as that we complain about, and that is the reason why this legislation is introduced. Another instance, right in the city of Winnipeg a revising officer named Bonner closed his court while hundreds of people were waiting to be registered, and so great was the outcry raised by the Liberals and by the press and by fair-minded men generally, that the matter was taken to the courts on a writ of mandamus to compel this officer to open his court and give the people a chance to register, and in the Supreme Court of Manitoba in Regina verses Bonner (Volume 14, page 467) it was held unanimously by that court that the revising officer should have continued his court open and that he had the same right as a county court judge had to adjourn the sitting from day to day until the sitting was finished. On that branch of the case the court of appeal held that this man was wrong.

Mr. LENNOX. And the law right.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, and I will say just now that because the law was right, at the next session of the Manitoba legislature the government took precious good pains to fix the law so that it would not be right again. Such was the agitation in Manitoba about this affair that this Bonner even applied for an order of contempt of court in regard to what the newspapers were saying about him and the judges rightly held he was not entitled to any such protection. The case was dismissed without costs. In all these matters, while the court had to held that Bonner was wrong, they gave no costs to anybody. But the contemptible part of it, one of the things that makes it necessary for this parliament to intervene, was the fact that this man was allowed, with the connivance of the authorities of the government of Manitoba, between the time the application was made for the mandamus and the time fixed for the hearing, to return his papers, and thus give up all power to hold any revision; and consequently there was nothing to be gained by the court ordering the mandamus to issue. That is only a sample of the way the Conservative party manipulated things in Manitoba.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Will the hon. gentleman kindly say to the House who appointed Mr. Bonner revising officer?

Mr. CARVELL. As I understand, by the law of 1902 it was the county court judges. I am admitting that that law appears on its face to be fair; but by the orders in council which the Manitoba government passed, when it came to be worked out, it was most unfair. These are a few of the things that happened in 1903. The agitation in the province became so great that the legislature at the next session had to try to pass legislation to meet some of these cases. I am going to show what they did. They practically repealed the law providing for the registration of voters. All the sections, I think, from 22 to 99 were repealed, and new sections enacted in lieu thereof; and while I am not going to say that this is absolutely a new law, I am going to say that it is new in principle. Very many new principles were introduced into the Act which made it even worse than it was before. The cardinal change was in regard to the appointment of registration clerks. Prior to this amendment the registration clerks were appointed by the county court judges; but by the legislation of 1904 that power was taken away from the county court judges and was placed in the hands of the Governor in Council, so that the registration clerks in Manitoba to-day are the appointees, the loyal supporters, in many cases the active workers, of the Manitoba government. The government also took to themselves the right to say when and where registration clerks were to sit, how many there should be in a constituency, how long they should sit and the dates and times they should sit. And remember, these registration clerks were not in the position of county court judges, and therefore, when the government prescribed that they should sit at certain places till five o'clock, when five o'clock came their jurisdiction was gone. I want to be fair to the hon. member for Marquette, who first brought up this matter. When he was delivering his speech, and I must say that it was an able speech from his standpoint, he pointed with a good

deal of pride to the fact that by a certain section of this law the registration clerks could sit after the clock struck the hour in certain cases; and I submit that the hon. gentleman tried to leave the impression on the House that notwithstanding that the time had been fixed by the order in council for the closing of the registration office, yet the registration clerk had the right to go on and finish up the business. If that was the intention of the hon. gentleman it was most unfair. That was the impression made on my mind, and I am satisfied that it was the impression made on the mind of the Prime Minister, because immediately afterwards he referred to it; but when you come to analyze the clause of the Act with regard to that, you find that it was only the persons present at the time the clock struck the hour for closing the registration office who had a right to have their grievances heard. The section with regard to that is section 26, subsection a, which I will read, so that there may be no misunderstanding about it:

The registration clerk shall receive all applications of electors for registration, the striking off names of electors from the list, and for the correction of names on the list, who are present for that purpose at the time fixed for the conclusion of the registration sittings, notwithstanding that such applications are, in point of fact, received by the registration clerk after the hour of closing the registration sittings aforesaid.

My hon. friend said: here is the evidence that no man is going to be shut out from having his name put on the list. But my hon. friend took good care, when quoting the law of the province of Manitoba, not to quote section 48, subsection d, and I am going to read it for the benefit of my hon. friend. It says:

The following persons shall be entitled to be present at sittings of the registration clerks for the purposes of this Act:,

(d) Any person desirous of being present as a spectator; provided that no more than twelve persons, other than the persons before mentioned and officers in attendance, shall be entitled to be present at the same time.

When the legislature of Manitoba found that injustice had been done and that public sentiment had been created to such an extent that they had to do something to amend this law, pretending to be fair they provided that the registration clerk should have jurisdiction to go on and take the applications of all present at the time of the closing of the court, but they put in that rider that there could be only twelve persons in the room at that time. I ask hon. gentlemen again, if they call this British fair play.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They need not necessarily stop at five o'clock. Twelve could go on after five o'clock.

Mr. CARVELL. Twelve could go on, but suppose there were one hundred?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That has not occurred.

Mr. CARVELL. It occurred in Winnipeg, and it occurred all over the country. I will come down to 1905 and show what occurred. I am going to refer to the press reports that appeared in Manitoba at the time these things happened, and I presume that there must have been foundation for these reports or they would not have been published. Here is the heading of a Winnipeg paper, I presume the 'Free Press,' of June 2, 1905:

Hundreds of electors deprived of their votes. The one-day, one-place registration worked out as expected—citizens had to stand in line for hours to register. In South Winnipeg the law was ignored in interests of fair play. Hundreds unable to get access to booths—lively scenes—indignation at St. Boniface—registration elsewhere.

Then it goes on to give other particulars under these headlines. It was estimated that hundreds of people were prevented having their names put on the lists simply because the time limit fixed by that government was not sufficient for the work to be done. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite try to make the country believe that no one was deprived of the right of having his name registered on the list. A resolution was read here the other day, which I need not read again, from the labour council, in which the labour council claimed that hundreds of people were unfairly dealt with and were prevented having their names put on the list, and that council asked in strong terms for an amendment to the law. That was in 1905, and it shows how unjustly this law has worked out by order in council. In 1903-1904 there was a fairly good chance to put names on the lists, but in 1905 there was only one registration place in every county in Manitoba. Think of it—and that for only one day or a portion of one day.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does the hon. gentleman say that there should have been just as many days for registration in 1905 as there was in 1903?

Mr. CARVELL. Most certainly. The very iniquity of the law is now being voiced by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not suppose I am allowed to explain why there should not be, but I ask the question whether there was the same need for as many days of registration in 1905 as there was in 1903. Everybody knows there was not.

Mr. CARVELL. I am surprised that my hon. friend has the nerve to ask that question. What is the difference between an election list in 1903 and one in 1904 or 1905? Does my hon. friend not know that there is liable to be a by-election any day, that a man is liable to die and the consti-

tuency he represents liable to become vacant? That interruption only shows the perverted minds of the Tories of Manitoba. I want to tell my hon. friend how we do these things in the east. We have there a revision every year—an honest, full and complete revision. I would like my hon. friend to come down there and say to the municipal authorities in any district: Oh, there is not going to be an election this year, and therefore there is no reason to revise the lists.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is not my reason at all.

Mr. CARVELL. That is the only inference any reasonable man can draw from my hon. friend's utterance. Because there was not an election in 1905, he says there was no necessity for a complete revision.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is not my reason. Give me one minute only and I will explain.

Mr. CARVELL. You may ask any question you have a mind to.

An hon. MEMBER. Never mind him.

Mr. CARVELL. It only shows what a perverted idea the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has regarding the preparation of the voters' lists. His idea is that the voters' lists exist by and for the Tory party only, and should be prepared only when the Tory party wants to use them, and the ordinary elector or the ordinary man who happens to be a candidate has no right whatever. And it is because of this perverted idea that this parliament is asked to interfere and remedy this condition and so arrange that every man will have a fair show to be put on the lists. There is another reason which I may give and which my hon. friend need not accept, but it is the reason why this unfair advantage was taken, why there was only a chance given on one day at one place in a whole county for the putting on or striking names off the lists. And that reason was that the election of every Liberal except one was protested, and if those election trials went on, in all probability they would be settled in 1905, and by-elections would have to be held, and the Tory party did not want any chance given to have names put on the voters' list.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Were not also the elections of six Conservative members protested, and how therefore could there be any discrimination?

Mr. CARVELL. The whole object of the Manitoba Act was discrimination. Its whole object was to give the Conservatives an unfair advantage over the Liberals. This seems to be what my hon. friends opposite have at heart.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You have not been posted right.

Mr. CARVELL. I will take the responsibility of whatever I say, and you need not blame it on my friends in Manitoba.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. They had to stuff the lists if they wanted to keep in office.

Mr. CARVELL. There is another thing which my hon. friend from Souris dilated on yesterday, and he thought he had found a panacea which could be applied to any disease in the electoral body of Manitoba. When the right hon. the First Minister was speaking, my hon. friend could not contain himself and he asked the right hon. gentleman to read section 61. My right hon. friend did read section 61, and it would have been well for the hon. member for Souris if he had taken some advice from his legal friends before making that request. He had in his mind that this section 61 gives the county court judges power to enlarge the time in which to do any act regarding the preparation of the lists or the carrying on of elections in Manitoba. That evidently was his idea because that is the substance of what he said. Well, sections 22 to 51 inclusive deal with the registration clerks alone. Then from section 51 down to section 70, they deal with the revising officers, and let me point out that the revising officers are not necessarily county court judges. By a proclamation issued every year in the month of May, the government of Manitoba creates the county court judges a court of revision, but this court of revision has the power to appoint barristers of not less than three years standing to act in the place of the judges and carry on the business of registration, and they are called registration officers, and while they are sitting as such, they have the same powers as county court judges. But my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) will not claim that a man sitting as a revising officer is a member of the board of registration. I do not think the hon. member for Souris will claim that a revising barrister is a member of the board of registration, and it is only the board of registration which has the power to extend the time. Let us get down to a concrete example. The revising officer is holding his court, and according to the order in council that court ceases to exist at six o'clock. When six o'clock comes, has he the power, under section 61, to extend the time? Not by any means. Has he the power to extend anything? No. Let me tell you what section 61 means. It means that after the Governor in Council have provided that a court will sit, say in Souris, for one day, from one to six in the afternoon, if the Board of Revisers think that time is not sufficient, they will have, before the revision takes place, the right to ex-

tend the time. If they think that sufficient time is not given between the close of the registration clerks' court and its opening, then they have the right to extend the time for their sittings. And I assert again that they have no power whatever over the registration clerks, they have no power whatever sitting as independent judges or revising officers to extend the time.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I never said they had.

Mr. CARVELL. But my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner) implied that. He read this——

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I said the revising officers.

Mr. CARVELL. I wish my hon. friend would possess his soul in patience until I am through, and then he will have his opportunity——

Mr. PUGSLEY. He admits that you are right.

Mr. CARVELL. Of course, he admits that I am right. And he knows that the only logical effect of his arguments and his quotations was that something else——

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I rise to a point of order. I never admitted that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) was right, and I never said that this applied to the registration clerks.

Mr. CARVELL. The point is not well taken, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentleman admits that this is the only logical conclusion of what he did say.

Now, I think I have pretty well exploded the hon. gentleman's theory concerning section 61. Let us see now some further effects of this law of 1904. When the hon. member for Marquette was speaking, to show that there was no injustice in this case, that the law had been devised to meet every emergncy and——

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) would allow me, before he leaves the point with which he was dealing, I would like to refer him to the speech of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on this point wherein he speaks of section 42. First the right hon. gentleman quoted the section as follows:

In case, by reason of interruptions or other emergency a sitting of the registration clerk is not commenced on the proper day, or is interrupted after being commenced and before the closing thereof, the registration clerk shall resume the registration on the following day and so on from day to day within the hours hereinbefore limited, until the registration sittings have been opened and kept open without interruption, and with free access to persons desiring to be registered, for the full number of days provided in the proclamation to be issued under the provisions of this Act. The times limited for the registration of electors shall be directory only, and any mistake or miscarriage in respect thereto shall not invalidate the list of electors of any electoral division.

After quoting this. the right hon. gentleman proceeded :

This seems to be perfectly fair, I have nothing to say against it. On the contrary I would altogether commend it. It provides that if the registration clerk, within the time allotted to him by the proclamation of the lieutenant governor, has not sufficient time to hear all the applications or to erase names or to do all the work he is commanded to do, he can extend the time.

Mr. CARVELL. The quotation of my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) only shows the danger of laymen undertaking to interpret law. My hon. friend knows the English language well enough to know that that only provides that, in case something has happened by which the five hours, or whatever it may be, allotted by the Governor in Council has been interrupted, and the clerk has not been able to sit, he may sit the next day for the number of hours provided. The Prime Minister admitted that that was fair, and it is fair, as far as it goes. But my hon. friend knows—or, if he does not know, let him ask his leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) or any of the legal gentlemen on that side of the House—that I am right in my construction of the section and that it only means that if an interruption happens it is not to prevent the people having the five or six—or sometimes only two—hours granted by the munificence of this order in council, and that they may not be cheated of any portion of it. That is all it means. But the registration clerk cannot and will not extend the hour, and the hon. gentleman cannot find the section in the Manitoba law which says that the clerk can extend the time, or which allows him to do anything after the clock strikes except to take the applications of the twelve men who may be present at the booth to add their names to the list.

Now, I was going on, when my hon. friend from Marquette interrupted me, to refer to another provision which he referred to with great pride. He could not find the citation at first, though he said he knew that the provision was in the law; but his friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) looked it up and handed it to him. He quoted it in order to show the fairness of the law with regard to revising courts. The provision referred to will be found in section 65. subsection 11, and my hon. friend from Marquette read it with a great deal of pride and thought it settled the whole question. I think I can show him it does not settle as much as he thinks it does. It says :

The revising officer shall also receive and deal with the applications of all persons to be registered as electors who shall be present at

the time fixed for the closing of the court of revision, notwithstanding that the hour so fixed shall have elapsed.

Now, Sir, that provision gives the revising officer the right to hear the applications of men who are present at the time the clock strikes. What for? To have their names added to the list, but not to strike names from the list. And, as if this were not explicit enough, in the same section, by subsection 9, this government of Manitoba has provided that :

No complaints or appeals shall be heard by a revising officer to strike names off the list of electors, unless applications therefor have been filed with the registration clerk as hereinbefore by this Act provided.

I stated a little while ago to an hon. gentleman on this side that I would show that the legislature of Manitoba, by their Act of 1904, not only did not extend the privileges granted under the previous law, but actually curtailed them, that if it corrected vices which existed in 1903, it actually made it harder for people to get a fair revision than it had been before. Now, the compaint from Manitoba members on this side of the House, as I understand it, is not so much of the impossibility of having names added to the list as of the impossibility of cleaning up the list; and my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner), I think, gave the best illustration that has been given in this House of the unfairness of this feature of the law. I have not the citation here. but I can come within a hundred of his figures, and that is near enough when you talk of taking names off the list by the thousand. The hon. gentleman, in attempting to show the unfairness of the Greenway law, said that in the revision early in 1889 or 1900, if I remember well, something like 2,500 names were struck off the list in the city of Winnipeg alone.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I rise to a question of privilege. The time to which I referred was before this government came into power at all.

Mr. CARVELL. I will take the hon. gentleman's word for that. But he said that they had succeeded in striking off 2,500 names, and this he cited as evidence of the injustice of the Greenway Act. Then came a remarkable admission. He went on to say that, in 1903, there were ten or fifteen names struck off; the next year ten or fifteen names struck off. And for this whole time up to the present he was only able to show that less than a hundred had been taken off the list. What greater condemnation do you want of this law and the manner of its administration than this statement of the hon. member for Souris? The whole burden of the cry of the representatives of Manitoba is that they cannot get names struck off the list. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) stated that in his division the only way they could get the list cleaned up was by agreement between the parties. So, let us see where we stand: You have a registration clerk, sitting we will say in the centre of a constituency which may be forty miles square—as distances run out there I think they would easily be as large as that. I am asking my hon. friends from the east to consider that situation of affairs. You have a man sitting there, we will say, in the centre of a district forty miles square. He says, I will sit here for two, or three, or four or five hours, if you will; come now with your applications. Consider that under those circumstances the whole county is being compelled to come to that one point. He says: Come on now with your applications to have the names struck off the list. You have a list of 400 or 500 names who do not belong there, and you have possibly two hours, in any case not more than five hours, to do all this work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would it take more than five minutes at the most to file the applications.

Mr. CARVELL. But you have to take evidence, you have to see that these people have the right to come there. You have to take evidence in order to get the names on the list.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. I understand his complaint to be that you could not get the names off. Why, it would not take more than a minute or two to file a hundred applications.

Mr. CARVELL. It is not the question of time, it is the fact that a man has to travel 30 or 40 miles in order to get there.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is there no party organization by which anybody on behalf of the party can put in a hundred names all at once ?

Mr. CARVELL. No, the merits of the case have got to be tried. I am speaking of adding on names, and every man going there himself, unless he is sick.

Mr. LANCASTER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I thought he was speaking of the trouble of striking off names.

Mr. CARVELL. I am speaking of both. I am showing the unfairness of asking people to go 30 or 40 miles to get their names on, and I am also showing that unless they do go there and are present during those two hours, and unless they happen to be one of the 12 lucky men who are inside the registration booth at the time the clock strikes the hour, then they have no chance to file an application to remove names from the list. And if they do not get the chance, then I say that under this beautiful law which the hon. gentleman wants to perpetuate, the revising officer has no jurisdiction

to receive applications afterwards in his court to strike a name off the list in Manitoba to-day, so I am informed. It has been stated here by hon. members, and is not denied by the opposition, that there are thousands of names on the lists which have no right to be there.

Now I will not dwell any longer upon this specific instance of unfairness in the law, excepting to show what has taken place at the revision which is going on at the present time. Now there was an investigation before a committee of this House, I think in 1906, where evidence was given by both parties as to the condition of affairs in Manitoba at that time. It was known by the Conservative party in Manitoba two months ago that this Bill was going to be introduced and brought up for discussion. Now they are wily politicians, and the moment they found that their acts were going to be brought under the limelight and criticised by the people of Canada, the moment they found that remedial legislation was going to be enacted, then they become virtuous, and then hon. gentlemen opposite from that province stand up and say, see how virtuous we are to-day, look what we are doing to-day, why, we are giving you 6, 10, 12, 14 registration districts in each constituency, we are giving you two days in most cases for revision courts when you had only one before; we are giving you everything you ought to have, and everything that a reasonable man could ask. Also their leading Tory paper comes out with a challenge that they will give $25 to any man who fails to get his name on the list and complies with all the provisions of the Manitoba law. Well, why did they not make that challenge five years ago? The trouble was that the poor fellow could get no chance to comply with provisions of the law.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We have made the challenge retroactive.

Mr. CARVELL. Well, I have not seen that part of the challenge, I have seen the challenge which says they will give $25 to any man who fails in this revision to get his name on the list. Now I want to show what they have done in the division represented by my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford), in their management or mismanagement of this application. We find that it is an impossibility to appeal against names added or proposed to be struck off, in at least I think two districts in his constituency. We have shown that by the law there must be at least five days elapse between the close of the registration court and the opening of the revision court. I think there must be one or two days for handing in the lists to the revising officer, and the revising officer must give at least three days notice to a person against whose name there is an appeal. Their orders in council show that there are only three days between the last day for the sitting of the registration court and the revision court. Now I ask how is it possible to appeal against a name added, or to appeal against striking a name off the list, under those circumstances. Oh, they say, that is a mistake, and that is the reason why this law should be erased from the statute-book. Well, Sir, I say that if you have a law in Manitoba by which it is possible for a mistake like that to be made then you have abundant evidence that it is right and just for this parliament to intervene in order to cure the evil, so far as we are concerned, and to provide a law that will be fair, just and equitable to all parties concerned.

Now I want to discuss the thin red line matter, because if I do not they will say that we are afraid of that. There has been a good deal of discussion in the province of Manitoba and in the newspaper press of Canada over this thin red line. I think probably outside of Manitoba there has been more discussion over the red line than there has been over the unfairness and iniquity of the law itself. We find that when the returning officers received the lists in 1904 for the Dominion elections, in a number of cases there was an overlapping of constituencies, that is to say, a portion of a local constituency would be included in a federal constituency. In the constituency of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie, we are told there are parts of seven local constituencies included, and there is not any entire local constituency included in the federal constituency. That is true to some extent in all the constituencies in Manitoba. My hon. friends opposite now do not deny the right of the returning officer to arrange these lists so that the proper persons may vote in their proper places. They admit that now, because they are compelled to admit it. The other evening the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that in the prosecutions which followed the elections of 1904, there was no fraud, and no protest against fraud. You will find his remarks on page 8585 of 'Hansard,' but I will not trouble the House with reading them. He stated that there were no informations against returning officers for correcting overlapping lists, but for internal redistribution, I think I am giving the substance of his statement.

Now, Sir, I am sorry that neither my hon. friend from North Toronto nor any other member of this House has placed upon 'Hansard' the exact informations which were laid against these people. I admit that we people who are not on the ground are all discussing this question somewhat in the dark as far as that question is concerned, but I simply want to ask this question and I shall be glad if some hon. gentleman will answer it: If the informations were laid solely on account of fraud in redistributing internal constituencies why were these informations dropped? If these

returning officers committed a fraud upon the public I do not think there is enough magnanimity and brotherly love in the Conservative party in Manitoba to drop such a beautiful chance of wreaking vengeance upon their opponents. If there was anything in these charges, if the thing was not a farce, why did they not go on with the prosecutions ? They have the sheriffs in their control, they have the juries in their control, they have all the machinery of the province of Manitoba, why did they not go on with the informations ? The only reason that has been given so far is that which has been given by the hon. member for Marquette who says : Oh, well, politics will creep in and you cannot get convictions. Of all the flimsy excuses I ever heard for dropping charges as iniquitous as this and charges involving such serious consequences this is certainly the flimsiest. I never heard such a flimsy excuse in my life put forward by a great political party to explain the action that it took upon that occasion. Any man from the east is forced to the conclusion that it was done for political effect. He is forced to the conclusion that these officers were arrested on election day in order to influence the election on that particular occasion and that when these arrests did not influence the election and did not defeat the Liberal candidates, the object for which they were brought about was gone. No offence against the law had been committed and all these gentlemen could do was to drag the cases on for two years from court to court until finally they were brought up against a stone wall and when Mr. Leach demanded that there should be a prosecution the atorney general of the province of Manitoba took the only course open to him, went to court and publicly entered a nolle prosequi in all cases.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. And then they distributed a few thousand dollars among their legal friends in Winnipeg.

Mr. CARVELL. That was only an incident.

Mr. HENDERSON. That was all right, was it not ?

Mr. CARVELL. They have a right to do that and if ever hon. gentlemen opposite are in power they will distribute a few thousand dollars among their legal friends as well. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was eloquent last night over the omissions from this iniquitous Act. He said that it was an outrage upon the rights of the people to allow constituencies to remain vacant beyond a reasonable time after the vacancies occurred. I know that because they did wrong it is no justification for doing wrong now, and I do not think that there has been wrong done, but I simply want to point to the inconsistency of this hon. gentleman. If there is an hon. gentleman in this House who is capable of being absolutely inconsistent it is the hon. member for North Toronto and the more inconsistent he is the more I admire the nerve of that hon. gentleman. That hon. gentleman can stand up and put forth a proposition which would cause any other man to be laughed down, but because of his record of inconsistency and because we know what he will do, he is allowed to go on and make these statements without protest. Did he, when he was a member of the Conservative government, ever protest against allowing a constituency to remain vacant for more than a fortnight ?

An hon. MEMBER. Answer that.

Mr. CARVELL. Did he ever allow a government official to go around the country for the benefit of the Conservative party and take part in elections ? Does he remember that when he was running an election in the province of New Brunswick in 1896 that they would send for another thousand shingles, shingles meaning passes on the Intercolonial Railway, in order to bring Tory votes to the polls ? Does he remember that ?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman has a most convenient memory. I do admire his nerve every time he speaks. The first time I heard the hon. gentleman speak was when I was not more than ten years of age. I heard him addressing a temperance meeting and I thought it was the most magnificent speech that had ever been delivered up to that time.

Mr. FOSTER. Did it have any effect on you ?

Mr. CARVELL. It made me believe at that time there was only one great man in the world and that was George E. Foster. But I have been completely undeceived on many occasions since then. I have been deceived by this hon. gentleman's inconsistencies and when I hear this hon. gentleman standing up and finding fault with the Liberal party because they have allowed constituencies to remain open six months, when I hear him condemning them for allowing their officials to take part in elections and when I hear him charging this government with trying to bribe the constituencies with public works I am forced to exclaim : O, consistency, thou art a jewel. If you take the record of the hon. gentleman and the party which he practically leads and consider what they did for the eighteen years during which they were in power no man can do anything but admire the hon. gentleman when he can stand up and berate this government because they have not provided for certain things in this Bill. The hon. gentleman also waxed eloquent over the abolition of the secrecy of the bal-

lot. There is no man in this House who will stand for the secrecy of the ballot more than I will and, in so far as the province which I represent and with which the hon. member for North Toronto is well acquainted is concerned, there has never been a protest from either Liberal or Conservative against the secrecy of the ballot. I think we can at least claim that in that respect matters have been straight and square on both sides. I would be the last person to vote for any measure that would in any way interfere with the secrecy of the ballot. But, the hon. gentleman knows, I have no doubt, that the object of this legislation is not to do what he says it will do. He knows that in the last general election in Wentworth the deputy returning officer at one of the polling subdivisions placed the numbers on the ballot instead of his initials, he knows that the result was to disfranchise the electors in that polling subdivision and he knows that the final result was that the election was voided and that a new election had to take place. He knows that there are irregularities in a great many constituencies throughout the Dominion of Canada. He knows that in one of the constituencies in the province of Ontario some years ago a returning officer placed certain marks on the ballots and the ballots were refused. He knows these things have happened in the past, he knows they are liable to happen again and he knows that the sole object of this clause is to provide that in cases of that kind, in the absence of fraud, the men who have gone to the polls shall not be disfranchised and the party for whom the votes are cast shall not be penalized unless there has been some fraud in the matter. My hon. friend must know that.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I know that. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) out of courtesy, allow me to say one word ? I am just revising my speech and in the colloquoy which took place last night I had the wrong constituency in my mind. I was referring to Provencher in reference to the member who was sitting here and who, I said would not sit here except through the action of Mr. Leach and the returning officer. Not being thoroughly acquainted personally with the topography of the country I was misled in that way. I do not mean to say and I did not mean to say last night that the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Jackson) sat here for that reason. It was the member for Provencher to whom I referred. What I should have said, to be perfectly correct, is that the hon. member for Selkirk sat here with a greater majority than he otherwise would have had had it not been for Duggan's action.

Mr. PATERSON. Is there anything else you want to correct ?

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. FOSTER. When I come to it I will correct it.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I do not think there is anything on the record or in Duggan's evidence which will justify the statement the hon. member has made, that I am sitting here with a larger majority than I otherwise would have. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that although the fourteen names were left off the list they voted and their ballots were put in an envelope, and the voters did not lose their vote. I acknowledge that they were left off for some reason or other which we have not been able to find out, but they voted and my majority was not any larger through any action of Mr. Duggan.

Mr. CARVELL. On two occasions in his speech last night the hon. member (Mr. Foster) chastised members on this side of the House because they had not made their complaints about the unfairness of the management of this election law, before the legislature of Manitoba. I am not familiar with all that has taken place in the legislature of Manitoba but statements have been made here pro and con as to what was said by Mr. Mickle when the Bill was introduced in the legislature and with that I will not deal now. I want to refer to one matter which was laid before the legislature of Manitoba within the last two months and I will show the kind of satisfaction that any Liberal member gets in that legislature when he tries to complain against the electoral law. At a revision held some time in 1906 or 1907, at a place called Macinac. application was made for the removal of six names from the list, and three were Liberals and there were Conservatives. Two Liberals had removed out of the country for a number of years and two Conservatives left the country after they did. Then there were two other men, McLaren and Thibeau who had been station agents in that locality and McLaren had left three years before the revision and was succeeded by Thibeau who left the country about three months prior to the holding of the court. McLaren was a Conservative and Thibeau was a Liberal. Under the law of Manitoba all six of these men should have had their names removed from the lists, and it was understood by Mr. Campbell a member of the legislature who was present that the names were to be removed. But when the list was sent to Winnipeg and issued from the office of the King's Printer we found that the three Liberals were removed from the list and the three Conservatives allowed to remain on. During the last session of the local legislature Mr. Campbell from his place in the House referred to the matter and the attorney general and the Prime Minister of Manitoba became very indignant and Mr. Campbell was asked to with-

draw his statement. He stated that if the papers were brought down and if it was found that Judge Ryan had not removed these names from the list and that Judge Ryan had done what the printed lists showed, then he would withdraw his statement. The discussion was published in the Winnipeg papers the next day and on the second day after, Mr. Campbell rose in his place on a question of privilege to discuss what the newspapers had said about his withdrawing his statement. But the moment he rose the premier raised a point of order on the ground that he was referring to a previous debate. The Speaker of course ruled with the premier and the attorney general and Mr. Campbell was refused permission to speak on the question of privilege. He then moved the adjournment of the House and at the same time he moved that all original applications to add to and strike from the lists be brought down, and he said : If you will bring down these papers I will show you whether the statement made by me was correct or not. And, Sir, can you believe that the Conservative majority in the legislature absolutely refused to bring down the papers although under the Act they were legally, or ought to be legally within the custody and control of the deputy provincial secretary. They did not deny and they could not deny that the papers were there, but by brute force they refused to bring the papers down and give Mr. Campbell a chance to justify his statement. They took the flimsy excuse that Mr. Campbell's action amounted to a charge against Judge Ryan. It is wonderful what those gentlemen will do when they want to protect themselves over the heads of others. They were very anxious to protect the judicial reputation of Judge Ryan, but they were a great deal more anxious to protect the unlawful acts of their own officials in leaving the Conservatives on the list and taking off the Liberals Had it not been for that the Manitoba government would be only too glad to bring down the original papers and transfer the charges from themselves to Judge Ryan.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Does the hon. gentleman make that charge ?

Mr. CARVELL. I state the facts as I have them here and I say these are the facts.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). You do not state all the facts

Mr. CARVELL. I say it is another evidence of the impossibility of the Liberals in the Manitoba legislature getting justice from the Conservative majority. I say it is another evidence of the necessity of this legislation, and it is another evidence that in one hundred and one ways the will of the people of Manitoba is burked by the resort to every conceivable trick known to the trade. It shows the futility of the Liberals going to the legislature of Manitoba to have any grievance redressed.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman is ignorant of the fact that the attorney general produced the original list that was revised by Judge Ryan which showed that Mr. Campbell was entirely wrong and Mr. Campbell apologized.

Mr. CARVELL. I will not apologize. I will state that two nights before, the attorney general brought down a detached sheet and handed it round among the members but he did not produce the original document except that one sheet which he passed round among his friends, and my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) knows it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong in saying that the Attorney General did not pass around the correct document and that I know it. I say quite the contrary, that I know that the Attorney General produced the original voters' list signed by Judge Ryan.

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. gentleman is right, why do they not bring down the original, and let the Liberals see it. I notice that when I get on to some thing pretty vicious, my hon. friend always gets on his feet. Now, I have only this further to say, that I have no hesitation in voting for this Bill as it stands, though it does not go as far as I would like to see it go. I would like to see the principle of personal application entirely eliminated from every election law in the Dominion of Canada, except perhaps in cities and towns. I want to ask my hon. friends from the east what they would think of asking that a farmer's son who has just come of age should be compelled to travel even five miles to a registration court to get his name put on the list ? He would not do it. Compare this cumbersome system which the Conservative government of Manitoba have worked off on that province, with the simple system that prevails in any of the provinces of eastern Canada. For instance, in the province of New Brunswick, the two county councillors for a parish, which means the same thing as a township in other provinces, and one member appointed by the government meet on or before the 10th of September, and they take any means of information they have—the voters' list of the year before, the oath of any one who comes before them, or their own knowledge—and they make up a preliminary voters' list, and post that for something like six weeks in three of the most conspicuous places in the locality. Then they give notice that between the 20th and the 25th of October they will meet at a certain place to complete the list. They meet, and if anyone wants to have a name struck off or put on, he gives notice to that effect. But this is never done ; I do not believe there have

been ten notices of this kind in ten years. They or other persons probably know every man in the parish, and if there is a name that should be on the list, they put it on, and if any man has moved away, they remove his name. Compare this simple, honest, inexpensive system with the system which the people of Manitoba are compelled to live under. I say again that I would like to see a commission of judges appointed to revise this list and eradicate from it as far as possible the principle of personal application. Surely in the rural portions of Manitoba the people themselves must know who are entitled to go on the list without compelling every labouring man or farmer's son to travel ten or fifteen or twenty miles to get his name put on the list. However, I am only offering this as a suggestion, and I hope the government will take it into consideration.

On the general principle of the Bill, the instances of unfairness which I have given are enough to convince me at least, they have convinced the government, and I believe they have convinced the opposition, of the necessity of a fair revision and some change in the present law. When the great Conservative party, which the hon. member for North Toronto told us last night was a party with a history, and that is true, and a party with a policy, and a party with a future, stand up in this House and say that by physical force they will stop the Supplies unless the government withdraw a Bill which is so fair that they offer to leave it to the county court judges to work it out, then I think this great party are carrying out their task with a vengeance. When they come to think the matter over, surely they do not want to be placed on record as refusing the fair and honourable offer made by the permier yesterday afternoon. If they take the responsibility of holding up Supplies and bringing upon this country all the consequences that that course will entail, that is for them to decide; but if they take that course, I do not think the Liberals of the Dominion of Canada will have very much cause to complain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to follow the hon. gentleman into the many details which have occupied his attention while he has been endeavouring this afternoon to instruct the people of Manitoba as to the proper way in which to prepare their voters' lists. It is apparent that the hon. gentleman has come to the conclusion, very much to his own satisfaction at least, that the people of that province and their representatives in the legislature are not capable of framing laws under which the voters' lists shall be prepared for the provincial elections. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that under the policy deliberately adopted in 1885, by the party of which he is a member, and put into practice by that party in 1898, to the people of each province in Canada has been delegated the power to deal with the franchise, not only so far as provincial elections are concerned, but so far also as federal elections are concerned. He seems to forget also that not only by the terms of his leader's speeches in 1885 and 1898, but also by the exact terms of the resolution moved by his leader in 1885, to the provinces of Canada was to be confided the duty, and has been confided the duty, of preparing the voters' lists upon which members of this House are selected. Having regard to these facts, he sees fit this afternoon, in a speech full of sound and fury, if nothing else, to inform the people of Manitoba of the ignorance and ineptitude of their legislators, and to instruct them how the lists of that province should in his opinion be prepared. May I suggest to the members of this House that the speech which has just been delivered, shows the absolute absurdity of the government's proposal from the very first; because here we have 215 or 216 men, or as many of them as chose to be present for the purpose of hearing the hon. gentleman, listening to a long and somewhat rambling discussion which if proper at all, would have been proper in the legislature of Manitoba and not in the parliament of Canada. Is it to be pretended, under the principles which have been laid down by the Prime Minister of Canada, both since his advent to power and while in opposition, that the parliament of Canada is the proper tribunal to settle the franchise and to prepare the voters' list for the province of Manitoba? Why, every word, every motion, uttered or proposed by the right hon. gentleman, both in opposition and since his advent to power gives an absolute denial to the whole trend of the argument of the hon. member for Carleton.

The hon. gentleman dilated upon events that have occurred in Manitoba, by which, as he asserts, some persons who were entitled to be upon the list are not found there, and some persons whose names should be omitted from the list appear there. Let me point out to him and every hon. gentleman in this House that under any system, whether it is a system of registration or based upon municipal assessment, injustices of that kind are bound to occur. Let me point out that frauds are bound to occur under any possible system. Why, the hon. gentleman, in his discussion of the preparation of the voters' lists in the province of New Brunswick, did not see fit to mention—undoubtedly for reasons very satisfactory to himself—the stuffing of the Rothesay ballot lists to the extent of 400 names. I have a complete history of that most outrageous swindle under my hand. I shall not trouble the House with it today, but I venture to think that before

the discussion is concluded we shall have occasion to refer to it more in detail. It is sufficient to say that a list which should have contained only ninety names, was found, when forwarded to the proper officers, to have had 400 names added to it; and from that day to this, although the matter was brought up in the legislature of New Brunswick and the government urged to take action by Mr. Hazen, the leader of the opposition and his supporters, no attempt whatever has been made to discover and prosecute the guilty parties and they have gone unpunished, to the infinite satisfaction no doubt of my hon. friend from Carleton.

Mr. CARVELL. Will the hon. gentleman not admit that the legislature took action the next session by striking those names from the list and providing by legislation against the possibility of such a thing happening again?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Yet the hon. gentleman complains against the Manitoba government for having done the same.

Mr. CARVELL. Because you did not remedy the wrong complained of.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman says it was remedied at the next session of the legislature. I understood that proceedings were taken, in the first place, in the courts, and that those proceedings had resulted in striking the names off the lists. I am under the impression that application was made to the Supreme Court of New Brunswick to have the 400 names struck off which had been added by fraud to those lists. I am under the impression that a motion was presented in the legislature of New Brunswick calling upon the Attorney General of that province, now a member of this government (Mr. Pugsley), to take action by way of investigation and have the guilty men punished, but nothing was done.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend is begging the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to remind the leader of the opposition as well as my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) that the government of the day, of which the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) was then Attorney General, instructed counsel to appear on behalf of that local government in the case which was tried before the court, in order to uphold this stuffing of the lists.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman is begging the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the hon. gentleman was sensitive about frauds. He is apparently sensitive about alleged frauds in Manitoba, but absolutely callous to frauds in his own province. Let me read to him, for his information, the language of the Chief Justice of the province of New Brunswick with regard to that particular incident. The Chief Justice said of the crime:

> For its enormity it is unparalleled in the history of this country and I should think that the law officers of the Crown, if there are any law officers of the Crown, ought to take some steps to bring the guilty parties to justice. These allegations are made, and it appears they are true, and I say then that some person has been guilty of forgery and perjury—some person has been guilty of an awful crime, the guilty persons are somewhere and ought to be punished. The proper list was given to Mr. Gilland and by some means it was altered and I think 400 names were added—it seems to me that it ought to be probed to the bottom and that the Crown officers ought to use what diligence is in their power to discover the offenders and if discovered they ought to be brought to justice.

Judge Landry said:—I think it is a very brazen attempt to commit a most serious violation of the law, and includes forgery, perjury and theft.

At the session of the legislature immediately following Mr. Hazen moved:

> That in the opinion of this House steps ought to be taken at once to discover, convict and punish the criminals.

Does my hon. friend from Carleton think that was a proper motion? Does he think it was one which should have commended itself to the government and legislature of New Brunswick?

Mr. CARVELL. Will my hon. friend be kind enough to answer me one question? Will he not admit that at the next session of the legislature, the non-residents voters' lists were absolutely abolished and consequently this non-resident list was abolished, and there are no such lists in New Brunswick to-day except at St. John?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not dispute what the hon. gentleman says if he asserts it. I was not dealing with that particular phase of the subject. I was dealing with the failure of himself and his political friends in New Brunswick to take any steps whatever to discover the perpetrators of this crime and bring them to punishment. I invite an expression of the opinion of the hon. gentleman upon the merits of Mr. Hazen's motion, but I am bound to say that, with unusual modesty, he does not see fit to vouchsafe an opinion to the House. Let me point out what action was taken by his political friends in New Brunswick. The motion of Mr. Hazen was amended by a majority vote and the amendment declared that the House 'expresses full confidence in the Attorney General and does not express any opinion as to what steps he should take.' Well, the Attorney General took no steps, and the

men who perpetrated the fraud have gone unpunished from that day to this. I want to illustrate that particular instance for the benefit of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. Before the right hon. gentleman entered this House a moment ago, I declared and I declare again, that the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) illustrates the absurdity of the position of the government in this matter. In that speech the hon. gentleman sought to convince 215 or 216 members of this House, gathered from all parts of Canada, that he knows best the proper method of making up the voters' lists for the province of Manitoba. We have the declaration of the right hon. gentleman himself, we have his motion in 1885 declaring that the people of the province of Manitoba are the proper judges of that, yet we have a long speech from the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) in which he seeks to instruct the people of Manitoba how they should make up their voters' lists. Apparently he knows far better than they how to meet these difficulties of time and place and method, and what steps are necessary, so far as the provincial voters' lists are concerned, to be taken by the provincial legislature. He wishes to convince this House that he knows more about these matters than the local legislature can possibly know. In saying that, I am not departing at all from the attitude we took in 1898, but I shall come to that a little later on. What I seek now to impress on the House is that when you once recognize and assert this principle, affirmed by the party now in power, that to the legislature of each province shall be confided the duty of preparing its own voters' lists as well as regulating its own franchise, it is utter folly for any man to go into the details of time and place and method and seek to convince the two hundred and sixteen members of this House that the forty or forty-five members from Manitoba are so absolutely ignorant of their local requirements that they should be instructed by us as to what is the best and most convenient method of dealing with this matter for that province.

Now, I will not follow my hon. friend into the details into which he wandered this afternoon. I want to come for a moment to some of the observations of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That right hon. gentleman referred to the question of granting Supply. He laid stress upon the attitude of his party in 1885. But I did not observe that the incidents of 1896 were clearly present to his recollection. Perhaps, if he had been reminded of these, he would have been inclined to qualify a little the language which he used as to the attitude of the opposition in this regard. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was Finance Minister in 1896, and he has refreshed his memory by reference to the record. That hon. gentleman declares that in that year, the opposition in this country deliberately left Canada without one single dollar of provision for the public service after the 30th of June—there is no doubt about that. My hon. friend from North Toronto pleaded for two months' Supply in order that the public service might not suffer. And what was the answer? Men on the opposition side of the House, sitting behind the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) then leader of the opposition, shook their fists in his face and declared that he should not have one dollar to carry on the public service. So, if we are to go back to precedent, while it is well to refer to the precedent of 1885, we should not altogether forget that of 1896 as well.

Now, the right hon. gentleman seems to think that he has not been treated with absolute fairness in the quotations from his speeches of 1885 made by my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) and myself. I do not know of any word in the right hon. gentleman's speeches which qualifies the express declaration of his motion in 1885. That motion was as follows:

> In the opinion of this House it is preferable to continue the plan which has been adopted ever since confederation of utilizing for the elections to this House the provincial franchise and voters' lists.

That is absolutely plain, distinct and unqualified. The right hon. gentleman did lay especial stress upon certain words which were not quoted by my hon. friend from Prince Edward or by me, and they were not quoted because it did nt seem to us that in the circumstances brought to the attention of the House there was the slightest occasion for quoting them. But, as the right hon. gentleman has laid stress on these words, I will read them:

> But if the day comes when a fraud is committed against this parliament, when legislation of a hostile character is brought forward in the legislature, then it will be always open to this parliament to resume its own powers and to enact a franchise law of its own.

If these words are regarded by the Prime Minister as important, they merit a moment's attention. In the first place, the declaration is that this parliament may intervene when a fraud is committed against this parliament, when legislation of a hostile character is brought forward in the legislature. Where is the fraud in the legislation of Manitoba? Has any hon. gentleman on the other side—has the right hon. gentleman himself?—been able to point it out? of what fraud was he speaking? Was he speaking of a fraud against one political party or the other, or of fraud against the electorate as a whole? So far as any pretence of one or the other under the legisla-

tion of Manitoba is concerned, there is not the slightest foundation for saying that such a condition exists. If there is any inconvenience, if, as a necessary result of the legislation of the province of Manitoba, some names may be left off the lists which should be thereon, or some names may be included in the list which should not be included, I say that the legislation of Manitoba possesses that characteristic in common with the legislation of every other province in Canada touching the preparation of the voters' lists; and I will give my right hon. friend some illustrations from the province of Nova Scotia in that regard before I sit down. Then, the right hon. gentleman, in the concluding part of the sentence which has just been quoted, says that 'It will always be open for this parliament to resume its own powers and to enact a franchise law of its own.' I do not understand that the right hon. gentleman intended by that—though he may have a contrary impression—that the parliament of Canada was to have a franchise law of its own for one particular province or two provinces and was to confide to the legislatures of all the other provinces power to regulate their own franchise and prepare their own voters' lists.

Now, let us look a moment at the situation in the legislature of Manitoba. I have pointed out that, when the fraud to which I have alluded was committed in the province of New Brunswick, the leader of the opposition in the legislature, then Mr. Hazen, brought up the matter at once and asked that proper action should be taken by the government to bring to punishment the men who had been guilty of the crime. Does the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell), does the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), suggest to the House that the Liberal members of the legislature of Mantioba are so absolutely devoid of intelligence, of courage, that they will not or dare not bring to the attention of the legislature of that province any defects which exist in the electoral law? Is that the meaning of the argument? Up to the present time, I have not heard any hon. gentleman state to the House any case in the legislature of Manitoba where any amendment has been brought forward and that amendment has been refused. Of what use is the party system in the province of Manitoba if the Liberal members of the legislature are not prepared to come forward and put upon record their opinions of this law so far as they regard it as defective and unjust and to ask that that injustice and those defects should be remedied? In the province of Nova Scotia, if my memory serves me correctly, we have, on more than one occasion, asked the government of the day, asked the legislature of the province, that the present appeal to the partisan sheriffs of the province should be done away with and that an appeal may be allowed to the county court judges in that province. And I say that the Conservatives of Nova Scotia today would acclaim, would hail with delight, any proposal to put in force in the province of Nova Scotia a measure so absolutely fair and reasonable as that which has been discussed so much in this House and which is to-day the law of the province of Manitoba. I have been surprised that so little fault could be found with this legislation of Manitoba. We know that the laws enacted by this parliament, even after most careful revision of two branches of the legislature, are over and over again found defective. We know that the government comes down every year with amendments. And this law, enacted by the legislature of Manitoba, under a Conservative administration has been subject to so little criticism that I say here that I believe there is not in the Dominion of Canada a single province which can show legislation more satisfactory, more fair and more effective than that which we have been discussing.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) refers to municipal lists, and he fixes his faith on municipal lists. Let me point out to him that there may be partisan officers who create lists under a municipal system. Let me point out to the right hon. gentleman that partisan officers appointed by a municipal council are not one whit more acceptable to the people than are partisan officers appointed by any provincial government. In the province of Manitoba registration clerks are appointed, as I understand by the government of the province. They discharge their duty when they examine the applications brought to them, and if they find that these applications are in accordance with the law, they then put the names upon the list. In the province of Manitoba the real fight must take place before the county judge, who is a judicial officer, whereas in the province of Nova Scotia it must take place before the sheriff, an officer appointed by the local government of the province. Let me read to the right hon. gentleman a criticism which I have in my hand, and which I asked for a few days ago from a Conservative in the province of Nova Scotia, a gentleman who has had a good deal to do with fighting voters' lists in that province. This by no means exhausts the information I have as to the injustice and errors that have taken place in the province of Nova Scotia, over and over again, under the municipal system for which the Prime Minister claims so much merit:

> By one of the provisions of the Nova Scotia Franchise Act, any male British subject of the full age of twenty-one years is entitled to have his name registered as a voter if assessed for $150 of real estate. A father can also qualify one son for each $150 that he may be assessed for, over and above the $150 required to qualify himself.

This provision carried into effect by Liberal officials has bedevilled the whole system of assessment in the province. Liberals are assessed for a qualifying amount whether owners or not and Conservatives where at all possible are assessed just below the qualifying amount.

Such cases as the following are very common. In Port George, Annapolis county, Willet Oliver bought a property and paid $17 for it. The next year it was assessed for $150.

The object, of course, a very obvious one, is to give a vote to this gentleman, who is I understand a good Liberal.

Last year a son of Oliver came of age without any qualifications as a voter unless his father could qualify him. Although Oliver's property had not changed at all in value, his assessment went up to $300. George Foster of the same place has for two or three years been assessed for $300. This qualified him and his son for registration. Last year another son became of age and the father's assessment was immediately raised to $450.

A father's property qualifications cannot qualify the son unless that son resides with him for at least eight months in the year. To overcome this the sons of Liberal fathers residing in the States are assessed as joint owners with their fathers. They can accordingly be registered although married and with families in the United States and without the slightest qualification here. Last election there were almost two hundred of such voters brought home to Annapolis county to vote for the Liberal candidate. They will not be back again until next election.

The Act places the revision of the lists in the hands of officers unacquainted with the construing of statutes and usually the most partisan men in the locality. Three revisers are appointed for each revisal section and are paid usually about $6 a piece. These men are supposed to administer a law which is full of ambiguities and is pre-eminently adapted to be interpreted in one way or another as party exigencies may demand, and there is nothing in the law to afford protection against the most glaring discrimination. In a section where there happen to be a Conservative assessors the assessment roll is not considered conclusive evidence of the qualification for registration, but revisers hold that they can go back of the Act and inquire into the value of the property assessed. Where the assessing happens to be done by Liberal assessors the assessed values are taken to be conclusive.

Each year on the 20th of January a preliminary voters' list is prepared and posted by the revisers. This is made up from last year's voters' list, the assessment roll and application to be registered. In preparing this the revisers are given a great deal of discretionary power as they are empowered to drop from the old list any name they think no longer qualified.

A most wide discretion is given to the assessors in that regard, and one of which full advantage is taken not unfrequently in Nova Scotia.

This means that the name of every Conservative for which there is the slightest excuse is dropped. If the Conservative whose name is thus dropped happens to notice the omission in time he may be able to prove himself on again at the revision court on the fifth of March, but as names are often dropped of the most eligible persons who are taken altogether off their guard, the omission often goes unnoticed, on the other hand names of Liberals when once registered are almost impossible to get removed.

I gave some illustrations the other day. In the city of Halifax, at the last general election there were dozens of men whose names had been dropped from the list. I cannot recall them all, but I remember two of them. Mr. John Y. Payzant, president of the Bank of Nova Scotia, a very large property owner in Halifax and Dartmouth, found his name absent from the list when the elections came on. George S. Campbell, one of the most prominent merchants in Halifax, also found that he had no vote in that election. Those are the only names I remember, but many others came to me and were intensely indignant to find that, although their names had been on the voters' lists for many years before that election, they were disfranchised, and there was absolutely no remedy.

From the decision of the partisan and biased revisers there is no appeal except to that of equally biased and partisan sheriffs. With one or two exceptions these men are appointed to their positions merely upon the ground of some party service and their former occupations was not such as to qualify them to interpret such an Act.

I do not desire to be understood as reflecting upon all the sheriffs of Nova Scotia. On the contrary, I may mention Mr. Donald Archibald, sheriff of the county of Halifax. Although a strong Liberal, and a Liberal candidate on many occasions, and a member of the legislature, he is as fair a man as there is in the Dominion of Canada. I have perfect confidence in his justice and in his integrity in every way. Unfortunately there are sheriffs in the province of Nova Scotia of whom that can by no means be said. There are sheriffs in the province of Nova Scotia who are regarded and I believe justly regarded, as absolutely part of the Liberal organization, of the Liberal machine, for the particular county in which they are appointed.

The most of them refuse to give their decision during the holding of their court for the reason that they would be then supposed to support their decision with argument. A notable case of this kind is sheriff Edwin Gates of Annapolis.

Arthur Carter of Deep Brook was last year assessed for over $500 but the revisers refused to register his name and an appeal was made to the sheriff. The assessment roll was produced to the sheriff who admitted that the name should be registered, but when the final list was filed with the county clerk the name was not on. Robert Craig applied to be registered at Midleton on income qualification. The revisers put him on although the law requires an income voter to register where he

resides and Craig did not reside in this district. This was admitted before the sheriff and the name was decided to be dropped but it appeared on the final list.

I would like to mention in this connection that to such an extent has this evil gone in the county of Annapolis in particular, that men in that county, one man at least, brought an action a few years ago against the revising officer for intentionally omitting his name from the ist, and he got judgment for $200 and costs against the revising officer. Nevertheless he was disfranchised.

At Torbrook Mines in the same county fifteen miners made personal applications accompanied by affidavits showing qualification and were registered by the revisers. An appeal was made to the sheriff to have them struck off and in the absence of a tittle of proof the sheriff dropped these names.

At a trial of a reviser for failing to put into the sheriff original papers on an appeal, sheriff Gates admitted in September 1906, that he added the name of Millidge Best to the voters' list in polling district No. 1, notwithstanding that the name was ruled off by the advisers and no appeal was taken from the revisers' decision.

He gave as his excuse that he had received a letter from some one stating that Best was qualified.

That is the character of the judicial revision of the lists imposed upon the Conservatives of Nova Scotia. I would ask the right hon. gentleman in all fairness whether in view of all these illustrations he does not think that his attention should be centered to some extent upon Nova Scotia and that it should not be wholly devoted to the province of Manitoba where a Conservative governmet happens to be in power.

Very frequently names are found on the final lists which were never before the revisers court or the sheriff on appeal. It is impossible to tell who does this padding, whether it is the sheriff or the clerk in whose custody the lists are placed. In either event there is no punishment provided for the culprit who does it.

I have already said, under any system there will be injustice even without any intent to defraud, or at least that which you might call injustice. Men will not make their applications in time or some default of that kind will occur. My hon. friend from Carleton spoke of men whose names were not upon the lists in Manitoba, but he did not tell us what diligence these men had used to get their names upon the lists. It is impossible to make any statute which will provide against the negligence of voters or the inaction of the party to which they may happen to belong. So long as you find a statute which is clear and plain and ordinary reasonable upon its face, it does not seem to me there is any justification for interfering simply because a particular political party happens to be in power at the time being in any province.

My right hon. friend was pretty frank about his motive for interfering in this case, and I would direct the attention of the House to his argument at page 8572 unrevised 'Hansard' where he said :

But, Sir, I ask my hon. friends if they will not admit that although the legislation which to-day exists in Manitoba and the manner in which it is administered may be satisfactory to the Tories it is not satisfactory to the Grits, and that is the reason why we have introduced this legislation.

Well, that is a pretty plain and frank statement on the part of the Prime Minister, but after all what does it amount to? It amounts to this: The Liberal party moved a resolution in this House in 1885 that the principle of observance of the provincial voters' lists should be followed ; in 1898 they came into power and they put that principle into operation by placing the Dominion Franchise Act upon the statute-books, and then in 1908 they come to us not to make a new Franchise Act, not to revert to that policy which they condemned when in opposition and when in power as well, but to declare to this parliament that because under the legislation of Manitoba, under the administration of the government selected by the people of that province, the voters' lists are not satisfactory to the Liberal party, therefore this parliament of Canada shall legislate. To what result will that lead us in this country? When the Conservative party comes into power, assuming that the present system of provincial lists is adhered to, what would be expected of them? Are they to adopt the same principle ? With respect to the province of Quebec or the province of Nova Scotia if the government of these provinces should be Liberal, are the Conservatives in power at Ottawa to come to this parliament and say : We will leave British Columbia alone, we will leave Ontario alone, we will leave Manitoba alone because our friends are in power there but we will go into Quebec and Nova Scotia and make voters' lists of our own in those provinces. Is that the principle which my right hon. friend proposes in all seriousness as a principle which should be carried out by either political party in this country ? It does not seem to me it would make for good government. So long as you adopt this principle of provincial voters' lists, who are the best judges in respect of time and place and convenience and method in any province. Can the 215 members of this House judge better for the province of Manitoba, or of British Columbia, than can the people of these provinces by their representatives in the legislatures. If they can, why is it that the 215 members of this House cannot judge better for the province of Quebec and the province of Nova Scotia than can their legislatures.

I once more confess that I am utterly unable to discover any real considerations of public policy which could justify the government in proceeding with the first clause of this Bill. You must deal with the franchise either on one principle or the other. It was open to the rigtht hon. gentleman in 1898, and it is open to him still to adopt a Dominion non-partisan franchise and to give the preparation and final revision of the voters' lists all over Canada to the judges and to persons appointed by the judges in order that there might be no suspicion of partisan interference. That would be a perfectly intelligible principle for the hon. gentleman to proceed upon ; it is one which I could understand and I think appreciate, or it was open to him to adopt the principle which the right hon. gentleman did adopt in 1898 by giving to each province in Canada the full right to determine the franchise and prepare the voters' lists not only for the election of members to the provincial legislature, but for the election of members to this House as well. There are the two systems, and the latter system has been adopted by the government. Then comes the question which has been raised by the right hon. gentleman as to what shall be our duty when any complaint is made from any province that the voters' lists are not fair. Well, Mr. Speaker, assuming that you do not depart from the right hon. gentleman's words reiterated over and over again in 1898, no matter what takes place this is a question for the people of each province. And in any case if you depart from that system, you could only depart from it in a reasonable way and by means of a reasonable inquiry. Therefore I say it would be absolutely unheard of discrimination, invidious, impolitic, unjustifiable to attempt to do this without the fullest possible investigation and inquiry by this House into the systems of every province in Canada. Why should the system of Manitoba be inquired into and their voters' lists superseded simply because the Liberal party is in a minority in the legislature there; why should you refrain from inquiring into the evils that I have brought to the attention of the House in the province of Nova Scotia? I do not doubt that if you examine the systems prevailing in the province of Ontario, or of Quebec, or of New Brunswick for that matter, you would find that just as serious errors and as many injustices have taken place under their systems as are alleged to have taken place in the province of Manitoba. The principle is a vicious one which says that because the Liberal party is in power in certain other provinces but in a minority in Manitoba, therefore the power of this parliament shall be directed against Manitoba and not against Nova Scotia and Quebec.

There is no statesmanship in that, there is no good sense in that, there is nothing in it which will commend itself to the judgment of the people of this country. If the right hon. gentleman and his followers desired any investigation into the laws of the various provinces, or into the administration of those laws with respect to the preparation of voters' lists, why did they not bring down this Bill on the first day of this session, have that inquiry made and let us determine whether any unfairness or injustice prevails by reason of the laws of Manitoba, British Columbia, Quebec, Nova Scotia, Ontario or any other province which requires correction by the people of this country through their parliament ? Statements have been bandied about from the other side of the House and controverted on this side of the House, and you say that you shall lay hands on the province of British Columbia and the province of Manitoba simply because the Liberal representatives of these two provinces are complaining that they want different lists, that they want lists prepared by their own partisans. This Bill, when it was first brought down, was so absolutely absurd that I am astonished that the Prime Minister should have ever lent his name to its introduction. What was the proposition? The proposition was that because the voters' lists in Manitoba and British Columbia were prepared under the administration of persons appointed by the Conservative governments of those provinces, with recourse, in every case, to judges of the county court as the ultimate authority to decide upon the addition or subtraction of any name, therefore you put all that to one side as being partisan and unfair and you appoint your own partisans, without any express or effective reason that there should be the slightest appeal to any judicial authority. A proposition of that kind needs only to be stated to be laughed out of any House of Commons or out of any legislature in the country. If there is any good reason why these lists in Manitoba should be dealt with by this parliament, let us have an inquiry and an investigation and I am prepared to stay here to make it if the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are prepared to do so. It was the duty of the government to have had it made long ago. But let us not, in the language of the Prime Minister, seek to impose new lists upon the province of Manitoba simply for the reason that the right hon. gentleman's friends in Manitoba come to him and complain that these lists are not satisfactory. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but there is another observation that I would like to make, and it is one which deserves to be emphasized. You are proposing to do this in Manitoba and British Columbia without the slightest question as to the fairness of the lists having been raised in the legislature of either province. Are the Liberal

members of the legislature of Manitoba, or the Liberal members of the legislature of British Columbia so absolutely devoid of intelligence, common sense and courage that they do not bring to the attention of the legislature and the people of those provinces these alleged defects which have been proclaimed before this House. What is the meaning of it? If this government concluded that there was in the complaint of its partisans in Manitoba—I have not heard any complaint by its partisans in the province of British Columbia—any ground for the amendment of the law, or for reform in the administration of the law, why did not this government, having once adopted the system of provincial voters' lists, make representations on that subject to the governments of British Columbia and Manitoba? Has there been one word, one syllable, directed to either government, to the government of British Columbia or to the government of Manitoba, pointing out these complaints, asking them for their reply before parliament should proceed to interfere with the voters' lists of these provinces? One would have thought that that would have been the reasonable and proper course for the hon. gentleman to take before he sought to introduce this Bill.

With regard to the right hon. gentleman's proposals made in this House last night, I frankly confess that I am not fully able to understand perfectly just exactly what the Prime Minister did intend to suggest. I have no doubt that he will make me acquainted with his intentions; in fact he has promised to do so. But, at the present time I understand that the Prime Minister proposes that the allocation of voters in a polling division cut in two by the boundary of a federal division shall be made, not as it is now by the returning officer within any riding, but by a county court judge. There has been no difficulty, outside of Manitoba, in doing that. There would be no difficulty in Manitoba in doing that provided the returning officers discharged their duties honestly and impartially and with a full sense of their responsibility. But, inasmuch as we have had some experience in Manitoba pointing to the conclusion that this is not always the case, we are quite prepared to accept the hon. gentleman's proposition which we regard as a desirable one from that standpoint, so that there may be no suspicion by one party or the other as to the manner in which these voters are allocated.

But, beyond that whether the right hon. gentleman intends to adhere absolutely to the terms of this Bill or not, I do not know. I think he said that he was not wedded to its terms, but that is a very general expression indeed and I confess that I have not been able so to seize myself of the hon. gentleman's intentions in regard to the Bill as to understand that he is willing to make any considerable departure from its terms. We think, on this side of the House, subject to what I have already said, that the first section of the Bill ought to be withdrawn altogether. We do not consider it fair that two provinces which have reasonable laws upon their statute-books for the preparation of the voters' lists, should be singled out merely for the reason that some persons within those provinces have made complaints to this government as to the alleged unfair operation of those laws. I do not think that you should propose to amend laws for such reasons or in that way.

We believe further, that you should certainly withdraw or completely modify the provisions of section 17. I am disposed to believe, from what the Prime Minister said in that regard, that it is not his desire or intention to interfere with the secrecy of the ballot. I firmly believe that he is impressed as much as I am with the necessity of preserving that as a vital principle of our election law. The right hon. gentleman has pointed out, and his Minister of Justice has also pointed out, that cases may occur where men are disfranchised through inadvertent marks or through marks made by design upon one ballot or upon a number of ballots. It has been pointed out that all the votes at a particular poll might be thrown out simply because a mark has been placed inadvertently upon the ballots. Even if there were no other remedy than that which the right hon. gentleman suggests, I would not be disposed to concur in the provisions of section 17, because I would regard it as infinitely preferable that we should have a new election now and then, wherever that did occur, than that we should place on the statute-book of this country an amendment which would have the effect of absolutely destroying the vital principle of our election law. I was rather surprised, on looking pretty carefully over the election Act some days ago for this purpose, to discover that among the sections providing for punishment there seems to be no particular section aimed at the returning officer who shall make any marks on the ballots before he places them in the box. There is a general provision under which I think he would be included, but there is no special and distinct provision relating to that offence by a returning officer. I would be inclined to suggest, instead of the proposed legislation, that the instructions to every deputy returning officer should be made so absolutely plain and distinct that he could not fail to understand their important meaning, and that a special provision should be placed upon the statute-book for the punishment of any deputy returning officer who should fail to comply with those instructions. I would not be inclined to limit the punishment to the man who did it intentionally; I would hold that the man who did it even

by inadvertence and negligence should be subject to some measure of punishment, leaving it in every case to the discretion of the judge to dismiss him with a nominal fine or a reprimand. If you would put a provision of that kind on the statute-book, I think you would find it more in the interest of the country than that which is proposed by the government.

Lastly, I would invite the attention of the Prime Minister to the question of absolutely simultaneous elections in this country. We have this for the most part, but there are some cases of deferred elections in the province of British Columbia and in the province of Manitoba, and there may be one or two in the province of Quebec. I do not profess to speak for the province of Quebec on that point, but bow to the superior knowledge of my friends from that province. But I have made pretty careful inquiry with regard to all the provinces except the province of Quebec, and I am thoroughly satisfied that there is no need whatever of postponing any election except the election in the Yukon. I concede at once that that election would have to be postponed. In the province of British Columbia the provincial elections are held all on the same day. That was the case in the last provincial election, and I am assured from a great many sources in that province that there is absolutely no need whatever for postponement.

The Prime Minister has appealed to me in a portion of his speech for fair and reasonable consideration of this Bill. I may say to him in all sincerity that I have endeavoured to give it a fair and reasonable consideration, and I think that I have done so ; but I cannot bring myself to that condition of mind which would justify me in concurring in the imposition upon the province of Manitoba or upon the province of British Columbia of such an invidious and unjustifiable discrimination as that which I find to be contained in the first clause of this Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to. and debate adjourned.

THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—MAINLAND CABLE.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Prince Edward Island). I wish to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister, as the ministers who have control of this service are not in their places, a paragraph in one of our papers which says that the Anglo-American cable from Prince Edward Island to the mainland was broken on Saturday. As the right hon. gentleman knows, this is a service which is under the control of the Dominion government. This is an old cable which has been in use for thirty years, and we have often called the attention of the government to the necessity of laying a second cable. The province is now without telegraphic communication, and I would like to know what the government propose to do in the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that we have any jurisdiction over a matter of this kind. If my hon. friend has any suggestion to offer, we would be glad to help him if we have the power.

Mr. MARTIN. The suggestion I made some time ago was that we should have a second cable. When the cable was broken over a year ago, I called the attention of the government to this necessity. Now it is broken again, and the whole province has to depend only on the steamers for communication with the mainland. I am merely calling the attention of the government to the matter, and I hope they will act with despatch in regard to it.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, May 14, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUEBEC BRIDGE SUBSIDY—APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). A few weeks ago the House ordered the appointment of a committee to investigate certain conditions under which the government grant to the Quebec Bridge Company had been made. All the papers connected with the bridge having now been printed, the time has come when the committee may be appointed. I therefore move :

That the select committee ordered by this House for the purpose of investigating the conditions and guarantees under which this government paid moneys to the Quebec Bridge Company and endorsed or guaranteed the bonds of the said company, and what measures were adopted by the government to ensure the preparation of suitable plans of construction and the proper execution of the same, and what security the government at present possesses for the sums already received by and guarantees given to the company, be composed of Messrs. Maclean (Lunenburg), Talbot, Galliher, Chisholm (Antigonish), Monk, Barker and Walsh (Huntingdon).

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—ISSUE OF BONDS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What amount of bonds have been guaranteed and issued to date in respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, how many of these

have been sold or otherwise disposed of, and what amount has been netted by the company therefor?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Bonds to the amount of £3,200,000, par value, have been guaranteed by the government and issued to date in respect of the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

These bonds have been delivered to purchasers.

The proceeds of these bonds, remitted to Canada, amounted to the sum of $14.559,673.68. This sum includes interim interest accretions on instalment payments up to date of remittance.

ICE-BREAKER 'MONTCALM.'

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. What was the purchase price or first cost of the government steamer or ice-breaker 'Montcalm'?
2. What amount has been expended on said steamer for repairs since purchased or built, up to first of May, 1908, year by year?
3. What amount has been expended for furnishings, viz.: furniture, carpeting, floor cloth, bedding, crockery, silverware, cutlery, &c.?
4. What has been the total expenditure in connection with said steamer including salaries of crew, clothing, provisions, &c.?
5. What revenue has been received for work done by said steamer since acquired?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Contract price of steamer, $265,233.32.

2.	1904-5	$ 12,693 94
	1905-6	47,545 18
	1906-7	38,355 61
	1907-8	20,782 49
		$119,377 22
3.	1904-5	$3,908 12
	1905-6	955 60
	1906-7	815 16
	1907-8	1,174 31
		$6,853 19
4.	1904-5	$336,423 86
	1905-6	135,638 19
	1906-7	93,741 56
	1907-8	91,921 80
		$657,725 41

5. This is not a revenue producing steamer. It is used for ice-breaking purposes and for carrying supplies for lighthouse maintenance and construction work.

REBATES OF DUTY TO MASSEY-HARRIS COMPANY.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked:

What amount has been paid in rebate of duty to the Massey-Harris Company during the last three fiscal years, specifying each year separately?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

On goods manufactured for export:—

1905-6	$ 83,153 59
1906-7 (9 months)	90,554 16
1907-8	142,410 56

On goods manufactured for home consumption:—

1905-6	Nil.
1906-7 (9 months)	Nil.
1907-8	$34,486 32

BAYONETS FROM ROSS RIFLE COMPANY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. On what date was the contract entered into between the government and the Ross Rifle Company for the supply of bayonets?
2. When was the order in council passed respecting the same?
3. If tenders were called for, on what dates and in what manner was this done?
4. What are the terms of the contract regarding delivery and payments?

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

1. May 4, 1908.
2. May 4, 1908.
3. Tenders were called for by letters, dated January 18, 1908, addressed to—
   The Ross Rifle Company, Quebec.
   The Ottawa Car Company, Ltd., Ottawa.
4. The contractor undertakes to deliver 52,000 bayonets and scabbards within three years after the delivery to the contractor of an approved standard pattern, specifications and drawings. Deliveries to be made in even monthly quantities, as nearly as may be, and to begin within one month of the completion by the contractor of the necessary machinery, fixtures and gauges; notice of such completion to be immediately given to the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Payments to be made upon delivery; provided that in any year during the continuance of the contract, if the contractor is not in default in respect of deliveries, he shall be entitled, in advance of delivery, to payment of moneys actually expended upon all bayonets and scabbards or parts thereof to be delivered in that year; such payments in no case to exceed 75 per cent of the price of such bayonets and scabbards. These advances to be made upon the contractor's certificate of the amount so spent, attested by the signature of government chartered accountant, who shall first satisfy himself of the fact of such expenditure.

ARREARS IN ALLOWANCES TO MILITIA.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Is the government in arrears for allowances to any militia regiments? If so, to what regiments, to what amounts, and for what periods?

2. What is the reason some regiments have not received allowances?

3. Is the government aware that officers of some regiments, including one Ottawa regiment, have been obliged to borrow money to meet requirements that should have been met by such arrears in allowances?

4. If so, will the government repay such officers the interest paid by them on such loans?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Mr. Speaker, I would call your attention to the third part of this question which it seems to me is not in order, as it contains a matter of argument. If this question is put in proper form the answer is ready, but I would ask your ruling. The words to which I object are 'that should have been met by such arrears in allowances.'

Mr. SPEAKER. I would rule that that was not in order. The question will stand for amendment.

Question allowed to stand.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. R. N. WALSH—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the Beauharnois canal been transferred to the Robert Company, or is it still under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals?

2. Is Mr. Deschene, of Valleyfield, in the employ of the government? If so, what are his duties?

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

1. The Beauharnois canal is under lease to Messrs. William C. McIntyre and Edmund C. Robert, dated 10th of December, 1907.

2. No; Mr. Deschesne is not now in the employ of the government.

GOODS FOR ANGLO-FRENCH EXHIBITION.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What amount of goods has been purchased by the government for the purpose of the Anglo-French exhibition in London?

2. What is the total sum due or paid for such goods to date?

3. What is the amount of goods purchased from Messrs. Bryson, Graham & Company of this city?

4. Are the goods so acquired to be exhibited, marked at their cost price?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Agriculture):

1. Total purchase of exhibits, $5,611.49.

2. Paid, $953.56.

3. $2,283.37.

4. No.

EXPENDITURE—ANGLO-FRENCH EXHIBITION.

Mr. MONK asked:

What is the total amount spent to date by the government in connection with the Anglo-French exhibition?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Agriculture). May 14, 1908, $91,525.46.

NEW GOVERNMENT STEAMER.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES asked:

1. Has a contract for the construction of the new ice-breaking steamer for the winter navigation of the Northumberland straits been let yet? If so, what shipbuilding firm has obtained the contract?

2. What will the ship cost, and when will she be ready for the service?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes. Messrs. Vickers, Sons & Maxim Limited, London, England.

2. £103,000. Ten months from signing of contract.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—NEWS CONTRACT.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. Were tenders called for the privilege of a news agency on the Prince Edward Island Railway for present contract? If so, what are the names of tenderers, and the amount of each tender?

2. Who holds the present contract, and at what figure per annum?

3. When were tenders last called for this service?

4. Did any party or parties, other than the present holder, put in tenders for this service since 1904? If so, what are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender?

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

1 and 4. Tenders were called for by newspaper advertisement in June, 1906, for the privilege of selling newspapers, periodicals, &c., on the Prince Edward Island Railway, for a term of three years, to date from September, 1906. Three tenders were received from the following, viz: Herbert T. Prowse, Charlottetown, P.E.I., $501 per annum; R. B. Norton, Charlottetown, P.E.I., $540 per annum; Sidney Grey, Charlottetown, P.E.I., $400 per annum. Mr. Grey was afterwards offered the privilege of news agency, at $550, which was accepted, by him.

2. Sidney Grey, at $550 per annum.

3. 1906.

LENNOX ISLAND WHARF.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. Who has the contract for building the Lennox island ferry wharf, and what is the contract price?

2. What money has been paid on account of said work and is the work proceeding?

3. Has the specification been found unsuitable for the structure at this point, and is it the intention of the government to alter same by using stone and brush instead of piles?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Joseph F. Arsenault. The contract price for the landing wharfs is $625.

2. The sum of $150 has been paid on account of contract. The work is not being proceeded with.

3. Yes. The question of using some other durable structure instead of piles is now under consideration.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I beg leave to apply to the House under Rule 37, for leave to discuss a certain question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member applies for leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss the following matter of urgent importance :

The present condition of the Marine and Fisheries Department, especially under the slow operation of the commission last appointed to examine certain matters therein.

Shall the hon. member have leave ?

And leave being granted.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House for a short time, as requested in the notice, to the position of the Marine and Fisheries Department as it at present appears. In order to do that it will be necessary very briefly to sum up the preceding circumstances which led up to the appointment of the last commission. The first commission for a number of months pursued its inquiry, mostly with reference to the Civil Service situation, conditions and requirements, and devoted a portion of its time to the investigation of the practical working of one portion of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and then, as the House knows, laid its report before the government ; that report was brought down to this House about the middle of March. The report of that commission was somewhat startling to the House and to the country. In brief it showed a state of things in the department which, to say the least, did not contribute to efficiency or tend to establish public confidence in the department, and seemed to call for vigorous and instant action in order to have the faults which had been shown and the bad conditions which had been described in the report remedied as quickly as possible. It is not necessary to recall the express words of that report and the many pointed allusions which were made to certain specific matters. That commission did not busy itself in the same way with any other department of the government, and in fine it came to the conclusion that the Department of Marine and Fisheries seemed to be without direct guidance, was in fact without a head and lacked a conscience. When that report came before this House it at once received the attention of the House and the government, and it was seen to be so important that full and instant action was necessary. The matter could not be left as it was left by the report of the first commission. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I think the leader of the government and others were particularly struck with the idea that under the report of the first commission the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries were left more or less under a cloud of suspicion of wrongdoing, and it made itself apparent to the government that it was an improper thing that the officers of one of the great departments of this government should be left in that position. It was destructive of faith and confidence in the department, it hung over the officers of the department and militated against their freedom and efficiency of work ; it was, in fine, a statement of circumstances and inferences which made it absolutely imperative that such steps as were proper should be taken immediately to investigate those matters and to remedy where remedy was necessary, to condemn and reform where condemnation was necessary. The government did not accede to the view of hon. members on this side of the House that it was proper that the second commission should be allowed to complete in all the departments of the government what the first commission had only in part completed in a small portion of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

It therefore appointed a second commission with limited power and limited scope, and limited as well in the methods by which it should be conducted. Whilst the other was a public inquiry and in the public interest, this was to be a departmental inquiry simply into what were considered the charges or insinuations or inferences against the officers of the department. On this side of the House we contended for a broad commission against which the door of no department should be shut and which would have unlimited power to carry on the investigations which had been left uncompleted by the first commission. Judge Cassels was appointed as the second commission, and there were given him two lawyers to, I suppose, watch the interests of the government. These two lawyers were, as has been stated in the House, supporters and partisans of the government. They received their instructions from the Minister of Justice and are practically under the direction of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine himself. It seems to be absolutely impossible, and I think it was not otherwise contended, that Judge Cassels should be put to the almost superhuman task of going through the whole records of the department in all its extensions, and therefore these lawyers were appointed into whose hands were entrusted the bringing of such matters before the commissioner as they might think proper and requisite for carrying out the purpose of the commission which was entrusted to him. It was known by the government

from the first that Judge Cassels was a busy man, that he had charge of the Exchequer Court of Canada, which was not only full of work, but work of a very diversified nature and which necessitated the judge of the Exchequer Court holding court all over the Dominion from the Pacific to the Atlantic. It was known also to the government that work had accumulated during the unfortunate illness of the late judge of the Exchequer Court. I do not think any member of the government who gave attention to it could have been unaware that for a vigorous man with his whole time and all his intelligence there was more than sufficient work in the Exchequer Court to keep him busily and faithfully employed. Judge Cassels being conscientious in the matter refused to undertake this commission unless either the government made provision for the Exchequer Court work, which would be unattended to whilst he was attending to this commission, or unless the government should give him, as I understood, parliamentary authorization to go on with the commission which they entrusted to his care. If the government insisted then under those circumstances in appointing Judge Cassels as commissioner they did it with their eyes open to the immense and arduous duties which fall to the judge of the Exchequer Court and with a complete advertisement of the fact that he would make the court his first work and that what he would do in the commission would be in his odd hours in which he was not engaged in the Exchequer Court. Under all these circumstances the government appointed him. They professed to be extremely anxious that the department should be relieved from the suspicions and charges which overhung it. They were specially anxious that every officer in that department might immediately and just as quickly as possible have an opportunity to be clear of the charge which they declared hung equally over all. They said that the honour of the department and fair and even justice to the officers of the department all ran in the direction of a thorough and immediate inquiry. Under those circumstances Judge Cassels undertook his work. He was not able until, I think, the 3rd or 4th of May to commence the commission, thus allowing a good many days to elapse between the time of his appointment and the time when he commenced his investigation. Two days were then devoted to this important and urgent work, two days in which the solicitors for the Crown and the department broke their force in vain against the adamantine front of the two old commissioners without obtaining any very great amount of information. Then an adjournment took place to the 12th or 13th of the month because Judge Cassels had his Exchequer Court duties to attend to and after that he took up again the work of investigating this department. Two days passed in the second investigation and they were expended entirely upon two gentlemen; getting testimony from the chief engineer of the department and from an outside contractor who had very many and very profitable relations with the Department of Marine and Fisheries. What does Judge Cassels himself say with regard to the scope of the commission? He did not exactly deplore but he did state the fact that his commission was limited in scope; it was not within his power to enlarge the scope and on the other hand within the scope :

He felt it his duty to have a thorough investigation. The Civil Service Commissioner's report had contained a statement that evidently some of the officials of the department were serving two masters and succeeded with both, scripture to the contrary notwithstanding. The report did not accuse any individual, but it was charged that the officials had in some cases profited by the receipt of commissions on contracts into which the department had entered. Unfortunately, however, the report did not mention any names and it was considered advisable in the interest of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and of the country in general that immediate steps should be taken to determine what officials, if any,——

Mind you, 'that immediate steps be taken.'

—to detemine what offiicials, if any, deserve condemnation and to give all an opportunity of meeting the charges implied. The charge, said the commissioner, is of great and serious nature. Every official of the Marine and Fisheries Department is under a cloud of suspicion. As I understand it the object of the commission is to enable each official of the department an opportunity to free himself from the charge, if the facts justify it, or if the facts sustain the principle of the charges to the official then it should be found out and the guilty official reported.

He then goes on to mention the difficulty as to the time; he sets himself an arbitrary time of about three or four years with the saving remark that if when these years are investigated it shall be found that it is necessary to go backward or forward that the scope of time in that respect may be widened :

As to the scope of the inquiry, his Lordship said, it was obvious that the contracts entered into by the department during the years under investigation either for work to be performed on the property of the Dominion or for supplies purchased must be investigated, that the price paid must be ascertained, that the current market prices for wages or goods at the time of such contracts or purchases should be obtained; also the prices governing such purchases for large quantities and the discounts, if any, usually allowed, and if it should appear that a larger amount had been contracted to be paid in any particular case, or cases, then it would become necessary to inquire into the reasons for such over-payments, and the official making such over-payments should have the opportunity afforded him of exculpating him-

self if possible. The task imposed would be an onerous one, and must necessarily occupy a good deal of time.

I read that to show not only the seriousness of the matter, but also the wide extent of the matter, and the great amount of investigation that is involved. Officials, not only in the department at Ottawa, but in every branch of the department outside of Ottawa, are involved, and the investigation of contracts, expenditures and prices has reference not simply to prices and expenditures at Ottawa, but to prices and expenditures made by the department all the Dominion over. Taking that into account, one easily sees what a very large and serious piece of business has been imposed on the commissioner. Now, Mr. Justice Cassels was prompt to state then, as he had stated before, the fact that his first duty was to his own office as judge of the Exchequer Court :

Mr. Justice Cassels enumerated a long string of Exchequer Court engagements. He would sit on the 11th and 12th, but beyond that he could not fix a date, as he had to go east and some cases at Sydney will take him fully a month.

That was on the occasion of the first meeting on the 11th and 12th, as has been stated, Judge Cassels again sat for the purposes of the commission, and two gentlemen were passed under examination. Whether the examination of these two gentlemen has been finished or not is not shown on the papers that I have ; but on the evening of the 12th Judge Cassels adjourned the court, and he broached the question of the next sitting of the commission :

He reminded counsel that he had to go to New Brunswick a day, then to Nova Scotia, that he would be away at least six weeks, there was also a number of cases standing for judgment which would keep him busy on his return to Ottawa. The long vacation would intervene and in the middle of September he had to go to Manitoba and then to British Columbia He suggested that counsel await his return from Sydney, Cape Breton, before a date was settled. This was agreed to and the court adjourned sine die.

What does that open up ? The impossibility of any further investigation for the next six weeks that the judge is away. The impossibility of taking up the investigation when he comes back, for he has an indefinite number of cases which he must attend to then. The intervention of the long vacation, in which I believe it is considered necessary for the health of the judges that they shall have their proper amount of fresh air in the open fields or by the river side or sea side ; and I am not sure that it is not considered a little infra dig for judges to do work in the time of this sacred long vacation. Then he has to go across the continent to British Columbia, to look after important cases there ; and under that indefiniteness in one way and that remarkable definiteness in another way, as proof of the long delay involved before this matter can be taken up again and passed, Judge Cassels adjourns the court, and it is adjourned accordingly. Now, the point that has arisen is this. The government with its eyes wide open, advised of the fact, still insisted on appointing Judge Cassels, and in the operation of the court it has worked out exactly as Judge Cassels himself intimated that it would be likely to do. What becomes of the assertions of the government ? What becomes of the equities of the case, so to speak ? That with a department every one of whose officers is under suspicion there shall be no effective investigation to clear those officers during the six months that follow, but that it shall be taken up only now and then as occasion gives opportunity. This is in reality a job-lot commission. The special work of the commissioner is there and it takes nine-tenths of his time. He has odd moments of time that he may devote to this investigation, and in those odd moments he takes it up. During all that time honest men, honourable men, thoroughly approved men, sit at their work in the Department of Marine and Fisheries with the shadow of a very grave and serious accusation over them by day and by night. What has happened? Your department is disorganized. Disorganized before, what can be said of it now? Without a deputy head, for his usefulness is gone until the charges are disposed of; probably gone entirely, because he shrinks from more work in that department, has asked for his superannuation, and is now I believe on leave of absence. The accountant has been suspended, and there is no accountant. The Commissioner of Lights, one of the most important officers of the department, is on suspicion, and there is no longer an efficient head of the Lights Branch. Mr. Gregory in the province of Quebec is not in his office. None of these gentlemen can be dismissed until the charges which lie against them and overhang them are thoroughly investigated and the truth is brought out. During all this time you have a department through whose hands five or six millions of money goes, and which is coming to this House to ask for its yearly vote of many millions of money ; and over this department there is this shadow of suspicion. No man can place his hand on any single officer and say that at the end of the investigation by Judge Cassels this officer will be found innocent ; no man can place his hand on another officer and say that at the end of that investigation, whenever it comes, this man will be found guilty. I have myself knowledge of many men in that department, and, after all that is said about it, I have no doubt that there, as in other departments, the great majority of the men are honest public servants, doing their duty faithfully

and well. But in what situation are they to do their duty now ? Anonymous writings and whisperings to the commissioner or to the lawyers, saying that papers are being destroyed, that such and such person is trying to do away with evidence ; one man brought up before these lawyers and questioned as to what suspicion he has of A. B., or J. C., or of some one else, men prompted and pressed, with all the force and ingenuity of these lawyers, to play the spy and the informer upon their companions in office.

There is the disorganization resulting from suspicion, no man feels like trusting his fellow, no one knows what is being carried on in order to save one and injure another, and all the time two partisan defenders of the government and the department are running through the records and the guilty persons in that department, if there are any, have opportunities for doing away with incriminating documents and evidence. And worse than all, during that whole time, this headless and conscienceless department, as it is characterized by the first commission, is spending the money of the country. What more has happened? An investigation has been made into the conduct of an officer down the St. Lawrence. What has been proved? That he has been guilty of padding pay sheets, and that there has been a conspiracy to defraud the government, and that the government have actually been defrauded. If in that single case fraud has been brought to the surface, in how many cases may it not be found that similar frauds have been committed, and so people will say until the commission has finished its report. For all we know, the whole of the river service—an immense and important service—is permeated and saturated by just such abuses and frauds. What is needed is a thorough and a speedy investigation, so that every honest man might have the chance to have the cloud lifted from him and every guilty man be punished. To-day the minister does not know but that there are in that department persons in positions of great trust who will be found guilty when this commission has finished its work. Yet these persons cannot be touched. They remain there. The point I make presses the more strongly the absolute necessity for an immediate investigation and the avoidance of the delays which are inevitable if the present commission continues the work. But delay is what the government seem to desire. Events quickly pass into oblivion and the reports of the first commission are being smothered by the lapse of time. Judge Cassels goes on his circuit and then takes his vacation, nobody is particularly at work, the old machine hums on in the best way it can, and the people become interested in the next thing that turns up and forget this. And all the time the solicitors, the partisan defenders of the government, have their wages going on, and I suppose are doing their investigation. And in the meanwhile the efficiency of the department is impaired and deteriorated and its officers are under a cloud.

We do not know all that has been brought out by the present commission so far, but some things have been brought out which do not tend to make public confidence greater. What has been brought out ? A carbide company is formed, it sells to the government, sells without competition, and in that carbide company you find a cabinet minister interested, we find that stock in it was given him by the promoter, and we find that same minister at the head of the Marine and Fisheries Department. That does not help us at all to have more confidence in that department than we had at the start.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman has said that we get our supply of carbide from a company without any competition. I may inform him that the carbide which is supplied to the department was obtained after public tender.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend mean that to explain the whole case? Let him go to Mr. Willson's evidence. What does Mr. Willson say? There are three carbide companies in this country. One is at St. Catharines and that is the company consisting of Mr. Willson and the late Mr. Sutherland, up to the time of his decease, and Mr. Little, who has succeeded to Mr. Sutherland's interest. Then there is the company in Ottawa. Who formed that company? Mr. Sutherland. Who sold the stock to the Bronsons? Mr. Sutherland. Who got 10,000 shares of the stock for that and other considerations, as Mr. Willson has sworn? Mr. Sutherland. Who has Mr. Sutherland's stock at present ? Mr. Sutherland's legatee. Then there is the company at Shawinigan, and there is nothing to show that that is an independent company. Then there is another company with a more liberal contract, the International Fog Signal Company, which makes little things that cost $300 and sells them to the department for $4,000, as shown by the testimony of the chief engineer. Does my hon. friend say there is any competition among these companies?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is very strong competition among them. In fact they are quarrelling. I know that of my own knowledge.

Mr. FOSTER. We can quite understand Mr. Willson quarrelling with Mr. Willson. We can quite understand Mr. Little quarrelling with Mr. Little. But we all know that the same men control these companies and have the same interest in them. And in any event, up to a very late period no tenders were called for and there was no competition. It is only within a very late

period that tenders have been asked and there has been any semblance of competition. These things have come out, and they have not added to the confidence of the community in that department. It is too much the habit for this government, either through its members or its closest friends, to be interested in companies which are doing business with the government. I propose to exploit another company just as soon as I can get at it before this House, and I think I can show that a prominent member of the cabinet at present has taken a special business interest in it. There is, I have said, that state of things brought out so far which leads people to wonder what would a thorough investigation show. This is not a healthy condition of things, but it is a condition which has been brought on by the government itself. This new and wasteful policy of the acetylene gas buoys and fog signals, these contracts, this division of the department so as to get a favourable report for the purposes of the minister—all this was brought about by Mr. Préfontaine himself. He was the man who, against the report of the chief engineer—a man of worth and through honesty—undertook this wasteful system of expenditure, to say nothing more about it, and laughed at the scruples of his chief engineer. Who was it that appointed the commissioner of lights, a young man—I say nothing against his ability—without experience in the department to any extent, put into a most responsible position in which he carried on things pretty much as he pleased. Who appointed Mr. Fraser? He was appointed by Mr. Préfontaine himself and for the very purpose of instituting this acetylene fog signal and gas buoy expenditure which, while good in many particulars, as the first engineer says, was pressed beyond the needs of the country and the requisites of proper economy. The whole plea to-day is that in some way the government is bound, if it can, and it can, to press the matter to speedier conclusions than it is being pressed to-day. That is the whole point of my plea, in the interests of the department, in the interests of the country, and in common justice to the employees of the department, which is historical, and which has been manned in the past by efficient men, and which to-day has within its bounds as honest, painstaking and competent officials as there are in any of the departments of this government. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Before I proceed to discuss the motion which my hon. friend has made, and the point which he has taken under it, I think it is my duty to take at once some exception to the manner in which he has discussed the motion. For myself I do not object to it, because I think it involves a point which is worth while clearing up at once. But the objection I take is that my hon. friend was slightly out of order in discussing what takes place before the commission until the commission has reported. I think that the rule which applies to committees of this House should apply for the very same reason to commissions appointed under the authority of the government and of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman quote the rule ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I do not quote the rule, because I do not intend to discuss the question to-day, and I did not interrupt my hon. friend. But I think the hon. gentleman was wrong for this reason, that until the matter is ascertained and concluded, the hon. gentleman draws wrong conclusions. One of the reasons which show the force of the rule is this : My hon. friend discussed the composition of the carbide company, and he concluded that all these companies were in the hands of the same parties. What grounds had he to make such an assertion ?

Mr. FOSTER. Sworn evidence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no sworn evidence to that effect, the hon. gentleman will not find any sworn evidence that the companies which are to-day organized in Canada to manufacture carbide are in the hands of the same men and under the same directorate. I say the evidence corroborates the statement made a moment ago by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the company which operates at Shawenegan is altogether separate from the other company.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be, I did not particularly allude to that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But if that may be, why did he venture to make the insinuation ? Did he not a moment ago say that he had reason to believe that all the companies were in the hands of the same parties ? Now he says that he did not do so, that he did not make the assertion. But he did make an insinuation, which is worse than an assertion. The hon. gentleman will have ample opportunity of discussing that later on the point of order. I do not take it to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask the right hon. gentleman whether there are not some of the same men in the three companies, because I was told that there were.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Speaking subject to correction I have reason to believe that the Shawenegan company is altogether separate from the other companies.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Willson owns the patents.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Here is a commission that has not yet reported, and already assertions are made and conclusions are drawn. We will have an opportunity of taking up the subject later on. I do not go into it at this moment because, as I say, I am not prepared to discuss the point of order. But it seems to me that if there is any sense in the point of order that we are not allowed here to discuss an investigation by committees of this House, a parity of reasoning would apply to investigations by commissions. Now I come to the point of my hon. friend's motion. He says that because Judge Cassels owes his first duty, as he states himself, to his own court, this investigation has to be put off, and must be put off for some time. Sir, that is a point well taken; the investigation by Judge Cassels has to be put off because Judge Cassels very properly insists that his first duty is to his court. My answer is this, that if Judge Cassels has not been permitted to proceed with the investigation because his first duty is to his own court, the fault is not with this government, but the fault is with my hon. friend and those who sit around him. Perhaps my statement will cause some wonder among hon. gentlemen opposite, and I see that there are some doubting Thomases on the other side. Let me give the evidence. We have had some correspondence with Judge Cassels on this point, and he pointed out to us at the very outset that he could not undertake to carry on this investigation unless he was provided with assistance to carry on the work of his court. On the 6th of April Judge Cassels addressed to me the following letter:

Ottawa, April 6, 1908.

Dear Sir Wilfrid,—Your kind letter of April 3 instant was duly received. As mentioned to Mr. Aylesworth, the fact of my not having been consulted prior to my name being mentioned did not in the slightest degree cause me to think that I had been in any way slighted or treated discourteously. Possibly I should feel that some members of the press understood me better than I understand myself, but the fact, however, is as I have stated.

You ask me to give you my views of what provision should be made for the despatch of business in the Exchequer Court.

First. I think statutory provision should be conferred upon me to perform as judge the duties desired by parliament, and that provision should also be made for the disposal of the business before the court.

Second. As to the business of the court, my views are as follows: I would not make any suggestions had you not asked me to do so. During the last three weeks I have had occasion to acquire a fairly accurate notion of the work to be performed. The work of the Exchequer Court is increasing rapidly. At present no summons or order can be made unless signed by me, no cheque can be issued unless countersigned by me. The circuit engagements are necessarily numerous. I have this morning arranged a circuit commencing in May for the trial of actions in Toronto, Quebec, Charlottetown, St. John and Sydney. In September I must go to Winnipeg, and as far west as Victoria in order to try cases that may be ready for trial. It is obvious that while I am absent all procedure of an interlocutory nature must stand over, much to the annoyance and delay of suitors. I understand that the Minister of Justice proposes an amendment to the statute which will confer upon the registrar of the court authority to deal with chamber applications. This Act, if it becomes law, will help matters. A large number of cases to be tried are actions arising out of the expropriation of land by the government. The registrar of the court, Mr. Audette, has been registrar ever since the reorganization of the court in 1887. In the past few years he has, as referee, been performing judicial duties of a very important character, notably, in the matter of the winding up of the Quebec Southern Railway, and of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway; and it is only necessary to read his voluminous reports to appreciate his work. His work has, I think, been appreciated by the profession.

From his long experience in the court, Mr. Audette has acquired a very thorough knowledge of both law and practice. In cases of expropriation of land and numerous other forms of action against the Crown, especially in the province of Quebec, he is probably better qualified than I am, to sit in judgment. It would seem to me the best solution of the whole situation, having regard to the present business of the court and its increasing business, would be to appoint Mr. Audette deputy judge with all the powers I possess, If thought advisable, there could be an appeal in the usual way from his judgment to myself if the suitors so desired instead of going direct to the Supreme Court.

I would not make the suggestions contained in this letter had I not been asked to do so by yourself, but having given the subject a good deal of anxious consideration, and having a great desire to maintain the reputation of the court which under the presidency of the late judge it has obtained, I venture to put my views before you without, however, desiring to do more than make suggestions.

Believe me, dear Sir Wilfrid,
Yours faithfully,
WALTER CASSELS.

Now, Sir, in this letter, Judge Cassels, in answer to an inquiry from me as to the legislation we should enact in order to facilitate the business of the Court of Exchequer as well as the duties he is to discharge as commissioner investigating the Marine Department, made the suggestion that Mr. Audette should be given certain powers, and these powers given him, that is all he asked for. Now, if my hon. friend will look at the Order Paper, item 12, he will find that that order is Bill (No. 116), which proposes to give even wider powers than is asked for in this letter of Judge Cassels.

Mr. FOSTER. When was that Bill introduced?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was introduced even before Judge Cassels sent me his letter.

Mr. FOSTER. And will the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) tell me also, when, since its introduction it has been pressed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will come to that presently. But let me call the attention of my hon. friend, and of those behind him, and of the House and country, to what is in that Bill. Section 1 provides as follows :

In case of the illness of the judge of the court, or if the judge has leave of absence, the Governor in Council may specially appoint any person having the qualifications hereinbefore mentioned to discharge the duties of the judge during his illness or leave of absence, and the person so appointed shall, during the period aforesaid, have all the powers incident to the office of the judge of the court.

2. If the judge of the court—

(a) is interested in any cause or matter, or is disqualified by kinship to any party, or

(b) has been professionally engaged in any cause or matter as counsel or solicitor for any party previously to his appointment to the office of judge, and considers himself thereby incapacitated from sitting or adjudicating therein, the Governor in Council may, upon the written application of the judge, setting out such impediment, appoint any other person having the qualifications hereinbefore mentioned to act as a judge pro hac vice in relation to any such cause or matter.

3. Every such temporary judge, or judge pro hac vice, shall be sworn to the faithful performance of the duties of his office.

Now, in this clause there is provision made to appoint an assistant judge at the request of the judge in certain contingencies. I am not prepared to say that the contingency here provided for has arisen, but it is easy to make it applicable to the present contingency. Now, by section 2 of this Bill, the Exchequer Court Act is amended as follows :

2. Section 87 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:—

(f) for empowering the registrar to do any such thing and transact any such business as is specified in such rules or orders, and to exercise any such authority and jurisdiction in respect thereof as is now or may be hereafter done, transacted or exercised by the judge of the Exchequer Court sitting in chambers in virtue of any statute or custom or by the practice of the court.

—the very thing that is asked for by Judge Cassels in the letter I have read.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I may be allowed it seems to me to deal only with matters in chambers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I say this is the very matter asked by Judge Cassels, though, possibly, the request of the judge may have gone beyond this. But in this respect the Bill can easily be amended as soon as we take it up. Now, my hon. friend asks me: When has this Bill been taken up in the House? I ask my hon. friend: What business has been done in the House since then ? The very first thing we have to do in this House is to provide the appropriations in order to carry on the business of the country—to pay the civil service, to pay for the carrying of the mails, to pay the Mounted Police, to provide for the most elementary matters of civil government. We have been trying to get these appropriations through the House. We have moved the House into committee day after day. And day after day we have been met with deliberate obstruction, not avowed at first, but repeated and maintained. We did not know what was the matter, until some of the more candid amongst hon. gentlemen on the other side told us : You will get no estimates until you bring down your legislation ; bring down your Election Bill and we will give you Supply. We brought down the Election Bill, and then we are told : You shall not have any Supplies ; we will stop them altogether. If hon. gentlemen on the other side will give us facilities to do business, the very first thing we will do will be to take up and pass this Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Whenever the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has not a very good answer, he affects to fly into a passion. He is not in nearly so much of a rage to-day as he would have us believe, and he thoroughly understands that he has not a leg to stand upon in his argument with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). In the first place, he relies upon a measure introduced into this House by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) on the 9th of March, four weeks exactly before this letter was written by Mr. Justice Cassels, to persuade the House and the country that the reason why he has not complied with Judge Cassels' request is that the opposition has not brought on and passed that Bill. I am bound to say the right hon. gentleman is establishing an extraordinary reversal of the functions of government. I have been in parliament twelve or thirteen sessions, and this is the first time I have learned that the opposition has the right to call government orders and to decide in what precedence government measures shall be taken up. If the right hon. gentleman will confide that duty to us, we will bring on the Exchequer Court Bill the first thing after this debate closes. If he had consulted us, or had made us aware that we possessed this authority, we might have brought on this Bill long ago. But it would have been of no use to do so, for this Bill does not, as it stands, make provision for that which Judge Cassels requires, and the right hon. gentleman knows it and conceded it in his speech. The Bill makes provision for the appointment of a deputy judge in case of the illness of the judge of the Exchequer Court or in case he has leave of absence,

and the right hon. gentleman admits that is the purpose for which it was intended. Why, then, does he talk about the Bill, why does he put forward a Bill which does not provide for the difficulty that has arisen? Or, if he intended to utilize this Bill, why has not he, since the letter of Mr. Justice Cassels was written, submitted to the House the amendments necessary to make it provide for the difficulties referred to by Judge Cassels, and then ask the House, as a matter of urgency, to pass the Bill at once ? That is all he needed to do. When he desired a Bill put through with regard to immigration and stated that it was an urgent matter, it was put throught the same day and sent to the Senate. If he had called up this Bill and asked that amendments be made—and, by the way, I would ask if the amendments have yet been drafted ?—I venture to say it would have gone through in half an hour. Have the amendments been drafted, and if so, when were they drafted ? The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not reply. Well, if the amendments have not yet been drafted, is it not delicious to hear the right hon gentleman suggesting that the opposihon. gentleman suggesting that the opposigress? In the first place, the argument of the right hon. gentleman is that the opposition are responsible for not bringing on this Bill, and then, in the next place, that they are responsible for not passing through the House amendments which the government have not yet drafted. In that way and in that way only is the opposition responsible for the difficulty which has been created.

So far as the second clause of the Bill is concerned, a very hasty reading of it indicates to me that the jurisdiction proposed by this Bill to be conferred on the registrar of the Exchequer Court is jurisdiction to transact certain business in chambers and is not that jurisdiction which Mr. Justice Cassels proposed in his letter of the 6th of April.

Apart from all this delightful attempt by the right hon. gentleman to put forward an excuse which he at least knows does not exist, let us look at the situation. The situation may be summarized in three or four sentences. The government themselves have realized the necessity of this investigation by Mr. Justice Cassels or some one else, because on the very day on which the report of the Civil Service Commission was laid on the table of this House, the Minister of Marine arose and made the announcement of the proposed action of the government. Mr. Justice Cassels was consulted and placed his position frankly before the government, declaring that he regarded his judicial duties as his first concern, that he must give his attention, in the first place, to them. He went further, he suggested the amendments (which have not yet been drafted) which would enable the government to deal with the situation as it has not yet been dealt with. So that, apart from the appointment of Mr. Justice Cassels to fulfil duties which the time at his command does not enable him to adequately to discharge, the government have done nothing and the situation is as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has described it. An investigation is proposed to clear the Department of Marine and Fisheries of certain charges made against it, and to make such an investigation as may be necessary to discover any officers of that department who are worthy of punishment. That investigation is being delayed by reason of the very circumstances pointed out by Mr. Justice Cassels six weeks ago; those circumstances exist to-day and they exist by reason of the inaction of the government. The obvious injury to the public service, the neglect of public interests, cannot be too strongly emphasized and I sincerely trust that steps will be taken by the government immediately to enable that investigation to be carried on promptly and effectually in order that right may be done, those who are innocent may be cleared and those who are guilty, if there be any guilty, may be properly punished.

Motion (Mr. Foster) to adjourn, negatived.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. CYR.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I would like at the request of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Cyr), who is sick and unable to be present, to raise a question of privilege on his behalf arising out of remarks made in this House yesterday by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and affecting Mr. Cyr's standing in this House. I have here a letter received by me this afternoon from Mr. Cyr which, with the consent of the House, I would like to read.

Mr. SPEAKER. It must be a question of privilege affecting the hon. member ; if Mr. Cyr is claiming the right it is must affect him.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The letter is as follows :

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. In what position am I ? The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. S. J. Jackson) does not make the allegation that I stated something which I knew to be untrue, but he reads a letter from a gentleman——

Mr. PATERSON. A member of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. — a member of this House, but he is not present, and he declares in that letter that I stated what I

knew was untrue. Who is to make the renunciation, the member for Selkirk or the absent member? I state myself that I made no statement which I knew to be untrue, that is incorrect, and the member, being a member, who has read the letter and the member, being a member, who has written the letter have both of them to take it back and I shall have to ask the member for Selkirk to take it back twice, once for himself and once for Mr. Cyr.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. As to the point of order raised by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I might say that if there is anything in the letter which is contrary to the rules of the House I do, on behalf of Mr. Cyr, take it back.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you a power of attorney from Mr. Cyr?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to see it.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I shall read the balance of the letter.

Mr. SPEAKER. As far as the letter contains a statement which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says is untrue, that portion of the letter should be eliminated.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. It is a little harder later on.

Ottawa, May 14, 1908.

S. J. Jackson, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

My Dear Mr. Jackson,—I noticed in the Ottawa 'Morning Citizen' of to-day that the Hon. Mr. Foster did yesterday make a statement in the House to the effect that I was elected in Provencher at the last general election through fraudulent means employed by one Duggan, who acted there as returning officer for the constituency of Selkirk. The hon. gentleman could not show in a plainer way his ignorance of the facts. I am sorry that on account of ill-health I am unable to be in the House and give the hon. gentleman the castigation which he so well deserves. At last the hordes of Tories who have been hounding my returning officer, Mr. Ayotte, for three years have not yet been able to find a single evidence against him of corruption in any way, and in face of the fact that the election petition against my return was dismissed by the court, Mr. Foster has the effrontery to make in the House a statement which he knows to be untrue——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. (reading):

—and which brands him as a falsifier——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That statement must be withdrawn.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. On behalf of the hon. gentleman who has written the letter, I would make the same statement as before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

—and one who has no respect for truth.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I am not taking it back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement must be unreservedly withdrawn.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. As far as I have power I withdraw it.

And for the reputation of his colleagues in the House I would ask you as a favour, if you feel justified in doing it, to rise in the House on a question of privilege——

Mr. SPROULE. I wish your ruling as to whether an hon. member of this House can bring a letter from another who is outside the House making a charge against another member of the House, but which does not affect himself. If I understand correctly an hon. member, as a question of privilege, can only bring up something that affects himself, not that affects some other person who is not here. I wish your ruling.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I asked the permission of the House to read the letter and was given it; that matter is settled, and I was just beginning——

Mr. FOSTER. The House did not know what the letter was.

Mr. SPEAKER. A question of privilege, of course, is something affecting the standing of a member as a member of the House, and I am not at all clear that one member may not take up a question of privilege dealing with another member. Just at the moment, my own idea would be that that could be done, but in so far as the letter goes beyond what a member would himself be allowed to state in this House, it will be checked by me as it proceeds.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to raise another point of order. It is not proper for a member of this House to bring a letter from another person, whether a member or not, which contains expressions that he knows to be absolutely against the order and decorum of this House and proceed to read them, and as he is called to order in respect to one expression withdraw it and say there is worse coming later on and proceed, time after time, to insult the order and decorum of this House by improper and injurious expressions respecting another member. I have a great deal of doubt whether a question of privilege can be delegated from one member to another, but putting that aside for the moment, it seems to me the other point is plain if decorum is to be observed in this House.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I would say regarding Mr. Speaker's decision that the hon. member for North Toronto should qualify

the expression that he made use of yesterday——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jackson) speaks to the point of order he is within his right, but he cannot discuss some other matter until that is disposed of.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, as a favour——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think that if the statement of the hon. member be correct, that this letter later on contains stronger expressions than those he has already read to the House, it would be hardly appropriate or proper for him to proceed with the reading of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. To my mind there is nothing stronger than I have already read.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has stated to the House that this letter contains stronger expressions than those he has read. The whole question seems to me to be open to some doubt as to whether an hon. member can delegate a question of privilege to another member, and that being the case it would be preferable that the hon. gentleman should not proceed.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. In the balance of the letter I will not read anything that is improper.

Mr. SPEAKER. Under all the circumstances I think the whole letter had better be ruled out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course all this illegal and improper stuff will not appear on 'Hansard'

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Certainly it will.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I may say that Mr. Cyr denies in toto the statement made by the hon. member for North Toronto yesterday in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. He only goes on to show the ignorance of the hon. member for North Toronto——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Take it back.

Mr. FOSTER. I demand a retraction of that. No member has a right to say anything derogatory of any member of the House, and I want an implicit retraction of that.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. If that is the rule of the House and it is carried out it would keep the hon. member for North Toronto from speaking——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. It is quite impossible to deal with a question of order if there is constant interruption while the point is being discussed. At all events, when questions of privilege are being discussed, hon. members on both sides should see that they are treated with great seriousness, because on them depends the decorum of the House. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jackson) should withdraw the statement that has been objected to by the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The word ignorant is not unparliamentary.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is now sliding out of the question by a very unworthy method, it seems to me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Would the hon. member for North Toronto repeat the statement which he takes exception to?

Mr. FOSTER. I will. I will repeat it as far as my recollection goes. What he did say in reality was to accuse me of ignorance with reference to a matter——

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Ignorance of the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, well. That is disrespectful to me as a member of this House, and I think the hon. member ought to make an absolute retraction and do it in a manly way, that is as manly as he can.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I have nothing to retract as far as the ignorance of the hon. gentleman is concerned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would ask hon. gentlemen to keep order. If some hon. members consider this as a matter of levity the chair considers it to be quite the reverse.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. Any matter affecting the privilege of the House or decorum in debate is a serious matter and it is not one which should be treated with levity.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. The chair is of opinion that any direct accusation made by one member against another of being ignorant is one of those insulting expressions which should not be used. On the other hand, if the expression only goes to the extent of saying that an hon. member is ignorant of the facts concerning a certain matter, that might be a parliamentary expression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. LORENZO ROBITAILLE (Quebec County). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. As this question of privilege is a special thing I wish to appeal to your good judgment, Mr. Speaker, to say that it is really a question of privilege. The question of privilege is brought forth by insulting remarks made by Mr. Hunter, who is deputy Minister of Public Works against the French Canadians in his department, and as one belonging to that nationality I am personally insulted.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will see that is not a question of privilege. A question of privilege against which affects only hon. members of the House in something connected with their membership of the House.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. He insults me as a member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is quite impossible to say that the matter to which the hon. gentleman refers, not being personal to himself or affecting his position as a member of this House, is a question of privilege.

BRITISH COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEAL.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

Resolved, That it is expedient to make provision for payment of annual salaries to judges to be appointed to the Court of Appeal in the province of British Columbia, as follows:—

The Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal, $8,000.

Three Justices of Appeal, each, $7,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why does the Prime Minister not go on with the Exchequer Court Bill ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We shall.

Mr. FOSTER. Are we to have no explanation of this resolution ?

Mr AYLESWORTH. The object of this resolution is simply to found on it a Bill for the provision of salaries in furtherance of the legislation of the provincial legislature passed at the session which concluded about a year ago. An Act was then passed by the British Columbia legislature to establish a court of appeal for the province ; the court to consist of a chief justice with three justices of appeal. The Act contains provision that it is not to come into force until proclamation be issued by the lieutenant-governor in council, and so far as I am aware no such proclamation has as yet been issued. But there have been official communications between the Attorney General of the province and the Department of Justice on the subject, and with the object of providing the salaries in order that the court may be properly constituted when it pleases the lieutenant governor of the province to bring the provincial legislation into force, the legislation which I propose, if this resolution is adopted, has been prepared.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not hear the hon. gentleman very distinctly. I understand there has been provincial legislation establishing a court of appeal which has to be brought into force by proclamation by the lieutenant governor in council of British Columbia.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And that they intend passing the necessary order in council some time in the early future, and therefore it is necessary to make provision for the salary of these judges.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The Act passed by the legislature of British Columbia establishing a court of appeal for the province, contains a clause that the legislation is not to come into effect until it shall be proclaimed. Of course no court can be actually constituted until there is provision for the salaries of its judges, and that is the legislation which we will propose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is all right.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. AYLESWORTH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 165) respecting the Court of Appeal of British Columbia. He said : Perhaps I may explain the purpose of the Bill. It contains not only a clause providing for the salaries at the figures just adopted, but also two or three sections amending the Criminal Code, the Winding-Up Act and the Disfranchising Act, to confer upon the court when constituted the appellate powers which the Supreme Court of the province setting en banc now exercises.

Mr. MONK. In this connection I would ask the government if there has been legislation on similar lines providing for the appointment of three new judges for the district of Montreal ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No such legislation has yet been introduced into this House. Legislation of similar character, I understand, has been passed by the legislature of Quebec, and the question of passing in this House legislation for the province of Quebec of similar character to that which I am now proposing for British Columbia is under consideration.

Mr. MONK. It was in that connection that I put the question, because there is a congestion of judicial business in the district of Montreal, and the provincial legis-

lation has provided for the nomination of new judges. I suppose that during the present session the salaries of those additional judges will be provided for ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is under consideration.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXCHANGE OF SCHOOL LANDS.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER moved second reading of Bill (No. 163) to authorize the exchange of certain school lands for other Dominion lands. He said : Sections 11 and 29 in every surveyed township in the three prairie provinces are dedicated to school purposes for the use and benefit of the province, and are administered as a trust by this government. The procedure of utilizing these lands for the benefit of the province is laid down in the statute as being by auction sale only. There is, however, a provision that where the lands are settled upon before survey, an exchange may be made by order of the Governor in Council ; but where they have not been settled upon before survey, they must be disposed of by auction sale. Therefore when and where an occasion arises to make it necessary to deal with any of these lands otherwise than by auction sale, a special Act of parliament is required. In regard to the lands with which this Bill is concerned, I will take the liberty of reading to the House the explanation that has been furnished by the officers of the Interior Department :

Ottawa, February 21, 1908.

Memorandum.

With reference to the Bill which it is proposed to submit to parliament to authorize the sale of section 11-20-2-5, west fifth meridian, to Mr. Joseph Fisher, of Millarville, Alberta, and to set apart another section of equal value in lieu thereof as school lands, I beg to submit the following explanation:

On July 17, 1901, Messrs. Joseph Fisher, Henry H. Barnes, George Stagg, E. Stagg, W. G. Hanna and J. S. Hanna applied for permission to divert water from the south fork of Sheep creek for the irrigation of certain lands in township 20, ranges 1 and 2, west of the fifth meridian. These gentlemen had entered into an agreement for the joint construction by them of the necessary works for the irrigation of lands in that vicinity which they individually held under homestead entry or had applied to purchase under the terms of the Irrigation Act, each of them to bear the expense of constructing parts of the said works in proportion to the acreage of land held by him which could be served by the works. Authorization for the construction of the works was issued on November 18, 1901.

As the works were not completed within the allotted time, investigations were made by the department from which it appears that:

1st. Messrs. J. S. Hanna, W. G. Hanna and Edwin Stagg held under homestead entry the north half and southwest quarter of section 10-20-2-5. The Messrs. Hanna practically repudiated the agreement and did no work on the ditch. Mr. Edwin Stagg left his homestead without making any improvements and did no work on the ditch.

2nd. Mr. George Stagg purchased the southeast quarter of section 10 of the same township, did work to the value of $10, which amount Mr. Fisher paid him, and assigned his interest in his homestead to Mr. Fisher, having paid $160 thereon.

3rd. Messrs. Fisher and Barnes proceeded with the construction of the ditch, but the latter has not appeared to be very actively interested in the work and has left it largely to Mr. Fisher to construct and to finance. Mr. Fisher's lands lie nearest the point of intake for the ditch and his portion of the work has been the most costly and the most difficult to construct. A recent inspection shows that the cost of the works constructed has been paid as follows by Messrs Fisher and Barnes:

Paid by Mr. Barnes..	$1,107 70
Paid by Mr. Fisher..	6,382 82
	$7,490 52

whereas, if the cost had been borne by them in proportion to the lands held by each, in accordance with the original agreement, the account should stand:

Expended by Mr. Barnes..	$2,931 07
Expended by Mr. Fisher..	4,559 45
	7,490 52

thus leaving Barnes indebted to Fisher in the sum of $1,823.37, plus such interest as may be subsequently agreed upon, or judicially determined.

Mr. Barnes was permitted to purchase under the terms of the Irrigation Act the east half of section 18-20-1-5 and the south half of section 24-20-2-5, but the sale of the northeast quarter-section 18 was subsequently cancelled. He has paid $480 thereon. Mr. Fisher was permitted, by order in council dated January 10, 1902, to purchase the south half-section 14, north half-section 2 and the southeast quarter-section 12-20-2-5. Mr. Fisher was under the impression that the southwest quarter of section 12 had been sold to him and he later applied to have the error rectified, but, although the southwest quarter of section 12, has been reserved for sale to him, it does not appear that authority for the sale has been obtained. He has paid $600 on account of these lands. The abandoned homestead of Mr. Edwin Stagg on southwest quarter-section 10-20-2-5 is also now reserved for sale to Mr. Fisher.

From the nature of the tract which it is proposed to irrigate it appears that section 11-20-2-5 is the central and most essential portion of the scheme. Mr. Fisher desired to purchase it but, owing to its being a school section, he could not be permitted to do so. He was, however, permitted to lease it for grazing purposes and still holds it on such lease. He was informed repeatedly that no sale of this section could be made to him, but he does not appear to have clearly understood the situation and has expended a large sum of money in the construction of irrigation works, which would involve a consider-

able loss to him if the section were disposed of to any other person.

The fact that authorization was granted for the construction of works to irrigate lands which included this school section has, to some extent at least, committed the department to the sale of the land, if the necessary authority can be obtained, and in consideration of this and of the difficulties which Mr. Fisher has encountered in completing this irrigation scheme, the minister has decided to submit a Bill to parliament for authority to sell section 11-20-2-5 to Mr. Fisher, under the terms of the Irrigation Act, and to set apart another section of equal value in lieu thereof for school purposes. The commissioner of irrigation recommends this sale.

That is with regard to section one of the Act. With regard to section 2, the memorandum of the department is as follows :

The application for homestead entry is based on the grounds that by the Acts 56 Victoria, chapter 18, and 58-59 Victoria, chapter 34, the granting of homestead entry is authorized to the persons mentioned in the said Acts on their proving that they were in bona fide residence on, and occupation of the school land applied for prior to January 1, 1880, and that they had continued to reside upon and cultivate the land in accordance with the homestead provisions of the Dominion Lands Act.

The first application on behalf of Martin Aitken was for the southwest quarter of this section and was filed in the department in March, 1895, with his declaration and that of George Spencer, to the effect that Spencer had settled on the southwest quarter of section 29, in township 10, range 6, east, in 1878, and had cultivated it at intervals until 1880 when he sold it to Aitken, who began to reside on it in 1881, and has continued to do so from that time.

It was, however, impossible to grant Aitken's application as the land had already been sold at public auction, and the patent issued.

In any case, however, the application would not have been granted at that time, as the meaning of the Acts 56 Victoria, chapter 18, and 58-59 Victoria, chapter 34, was so interpreted that only actual residence in person by the applicant prior to January 1, 1880, was recognized, while in this case Aitken was not in residence prior to that date, but claimed through the purchase from Spencer, who had settled prior to January 1, 1880. His name is therefore not included in the Act 58-59 Victoria, chapter 34, nor in 56 Victoria, chapter 18, which was passed prior to his application.

It will be observed that the application at that time was for the southwest quarter.

In September, 1900, however, the application of Martin Aitken was again filed here, but this time for the northwest quarter, but as his name was not included in either of the Acts before-mentioned, and as the said Acts were still interpreted so as to exclude any claim through the purchase from one who had settled on the land prior to January 1, 1880, his application was refused.

Since that date, however, this interpretation has been reversed, and in the cases of William and Jackson Holmes their claim through their purchase from one Huggard, who settled on the east half of section 29, in township 10, range 6, east, prior to January 1, 1880, was recognized, and homestead entry was granted them for the southwest and northeast quarters respectively of section 29, in township 10, range 6, east.

In view of the ruling in these cases, application was again made on behalf of Martin Aitken, and it was pointed out that the original application for the southwest quarter was clearly a clerical error on his part, as he was perfectly aware at the time that that quarter-section had already been sold and patented, and that it was his intention to have applied for the northwest quarter, for which land application has since been made.

It is claimed that in view of the action taken in the cases of William and Jackson Holmes that Martin Aitken is entitled on the same grounds to homestead entry for the northwest quarter of section 29, which is part of the same section on which homestead entry has been granted to the Messrs. Holmes, it being pointed out that in his case, as well as in that of the Messrs. Holmes the claim through purchase from the person who settled on the land prior to January 1, 1880, should be recognized, and as Aitken's name was not included in either of the Acts before mentioned that the authority of parliament should be sought to place him in the same position as those who have already obtained entry on the same grounds.

It is urged that had his aplication been originally made as intended for the northwest quarter of this section and had the present ruling as to the right of homestead entry of those persons who purchased the claim of one who settled prior to January 1, 1880, been then in force, his name would have been included in the Act, 58-59 Vic., chap. 34, and that under all the circumstances he is equitably entitled to homestead entry for the northwest quarter of section 29, in township 10, range 6 east, and that entry for that land should now be authorized by legislation.

Mr. HERRON. Were all the parties interested notified ?

Mr. OLIVER. The only parties concerned are Barnes and Fisher, and the statement I have already given sets out the agreement between them and the carrying out of that agreement by them. It shows that Mr. Fisher is entitled to land in proportion to the amount of money he has paid towards the irrigation of the total area irrigated. He would not get his proper share of the total area which the joint money of Fisher and Barnes irrigated unless this land is sold to him.

Mr. SPROULE. How does the hon. gentleman determine that the land he has set apart for school purposes in lieu of this land, is of equal value ? The land will be enhanced in value by this irrigation ditch, if we are to credit the prospectuses sent out by irrigation companies. According to these prospectuses, the irrigated land is worth $25 an acre whereas formerly it was worth only $3 to $5 an acre. That irrigation would enhance the value of the school land, and if some other lands, which are at a re-

mote distance from the irrigation ditch, be taken in exchange, the school fund would lose to the extent of the difference.

Mr. OLIVER. I have pointed out that the irrigation involved in this scheme has cost the two parties $7,490.

Mr. SPROULE. But are not the school lands more valuable than the lands to be given in exchange ?

Mr. OLIVER. I say the school section that is involved is part of the area that is irrigated as a result of the expenditure of this amount of money. Unless the parties who have expended this money, receive the benefit of this particular school section they will lose the return on a large proportion of the money they have expended.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be, but it appears to be one of the accidents of life. Is there any provision in the land law which allows the levying of a rate on school lands for irrigation purposes where other parties irrigate the section?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not. And there is no question of levying a rate in this case. Two private individuals undertake an irrigation scheme——

Mr. FOSTER. In a certain section?

Mr. OLIVER. In a certain locality. And this scheme involves certain sections of land. The parties go on and expend their money and bring their scheme to completion. Now, the expenditure of their money gives, unquestionably, a largely enhanced value to the land on which they have spent their money—otherwise, they would not spend it. Part of the land affected by the expenditure of the money is this particular school question, which was included in their original application, and which they believed they would be able to acquire. But, as the fact is, they cannot acquire it under the law except by auction sale; which would, of course, put the man who had spent his money in making the section valuable at the mercy of any buyer who chose to pay for the land up to the amount that Mr. Fisher had spent in order to irrigate it, and who would, in that case, still be better off than Mr. Fisher if he got it for nothing. It would seem to me eminently unfair to put Mr. Fisher in that position. Of course, it is because there is no law to cover the case that I ask parliament to sanction the sale of this section to Mr. Fisher and the authority to take a section of equal value elsewhere—that is, of value equal to that of this land before Mr. Fisher's money was spent upon irrigation to make it valuable, not of value equal to it after Mr. Fisher's money had been spent upon it.

Mr. SPROULE. That is where I think the whole thing is wrong. It was contemplated that the land would increase in value by virtue of settlement and other things and that the school fund would have the increased value. This irrigation is one means by which the school land is enhanced in value, and, if you give other land in lieu of it which is not enhanced in value, the school fund must lose the amount of money to which it is entitled. Therefore, this seems an injustice to the school fund.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose John Smith held these sections of land, how could he be dealt with under the irrigation scheme? He would have an absolute right to his sections, and he would gain by the expenditure of other people's money without having to make compensation to them. Was there any guarantee to these gentlemen that they would have all the lands within that area?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, why should not the government have its chance of increased value owing to the labours of these irrigationists as well as private individuals?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, that is the question that is before parliament at the moment. If parliament should see fit to hold that view, it is within the right of parliament to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the minister think it fair?

Mr. OLIVER. No, my view is that it is desirable to facilitate the bringing under irrigation of land that requires irrigation and is susceptible of it; and that it is not well for the government, having the general interests of the country in view, because it owns a certain piece of land, to use its ownership of that piece of land as a means of preventing the completion of a scheme of irrigation that would be to the general benefit of the country at large and to the special benefit of that particular locality. But let me emphasize the point brought out in this report, that this particular section is the central point of the tract irrigated and that without the benefit of that particular section the rest of the scheme would not be undertaken—that is to say there would not be sufficient other land irrigable to warrant the expenditure of the $7,000 or $8,000 necessary to make the scheme complete.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that absolutely so?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, that is the fact, and that is set out in the report.

Mr. LAKE. May I ask the minster what effect this will have upon large irrigation schemes like that of the Canadian Pacific Railway ? What has been the practice with regard to school sections contained in the tracts covered by such schemes? Will this cause claims to be put in by these

companies for the purchase at cheap rates of school sections within their irrigation districts?

Mr. OLIVER. Each case stands upon its own merits, as, of course, must be the case when we come to parliament for authority.

Mr. LAKE. But you are creating a precedent in this case.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but it is only a precedent for the consideration of parliament, which is no precedent, for the right of parliament to give or withhold is absolute. In regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway irrigation scheme, the lands which they have been authorized to take as an irrigation proposition are in the country lying east of Calgary. In that case they were allowed the school sections, and school sections are to be taken elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. Done by act of this House?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer off hand how it was done, but that is how it is. The Canadian Pacific Railway, when they were allowed to take the odd-numbered sections which they were entitled to select in other parts of the country and to select for them even-numbered sections within the tract, in order to get as solid a block as possible, to facilitate and advantage the irrigation scheme, at the same time, were given the privilege of taking school sections, and school sections in lieu of these have been selected and set aside elsewhere. I think the same thing was done in regard to the Alberta Railway and Coal Company's tract—that is, the part of their irrigation tract that they acquired as a railway land grant, which stands on all fours with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am not able to answer as to the additional tracts that they acquired by purchase under irrigation conditions, but I am under the impression that there the same conditions prevailed. In regard to the tract acquired by the Roblins Irrigation Company the school sections are not disposed of, they remain the property of the school fund within that tract, without any claim from the company.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister think that we can properly take away land that was set apart by Act of parliament in trust for the benefit of the provincial school fund, and exchange it at any time? We have exchanged land before, but by what authority? From the arguments I have heard in this House many years ago I think it was held that we could not do it. Would it not be a great injustice to the province and to the school fund if, by settlement, or by the making of an irrigation ditch, school lands that were set apart in trust for the benefit of the educational fund of the province were enhanced in value, and that then we disposed of these lands and took other lands in lieu thereof where there was no development, lands which were comparatively in a primeval state? If these lands are worth $12 to-day, and are exchanged for lands in some remote parts worth only $3 or $5, the province has a just right to claim the difference in value, in the interests of their school fund.

Mr. FOSTER. In what province is this land?

Mr. OLIVER. In Alberta.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) has made a strong appeal. This land does not belong to this government, this government holds it in trust for the school fund of the province of Alberta. Is it right for one party, while the other party for whom it is held in trust is living, to dispose of that land and thereby diminish its value to the party for whom it is held in trust, without the consent of the latter? This land has appreciated in value until it is worth $12 an acre. The Alberta government says that this increase in value belongs to their school fund. You take land in some other place, it may be of equal fertility, but which is worth only $3 or $5; and there is no certainty that it ever will come up to $12, but if it does, it will be many years.

Mr. HERRON. It is hard to get any other land of equal value to this land owing to its being peculiarly fit for irrigation. For that reason there is scarcely any other land that is as valuable. I have no particular objection to this Bill, I have no instructions from any party concerning it. It may be all right to make the exchange. But I suppose the minister has a report from some of his own officers which justifies him in making the exchange. I have known cases where people have bought half and quarter-sections under the irrigation law in that country, bought at a low rate, about $3 an acre, with a rebate when they had constructed a ditch. I know some cases where the value put upon the construction of the ditch was five times more than its actual value; in fact I think in one case the patent was put through and the sale was completed without there having been any water on the land, and I do not think any water was ever put on the land, nevertheless they got the patent and the rebate.

Mr. SPROULE. At what figure does the department propose to sell this land?

Mr. OLIVER. The regulations under which the land is disposed of for irrigation purposes are as stated by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) that is to say, we sell the land at $3 an acre subject to a reduction for work done on the ditch to the amount of $2 per acre, so the land may stand the purchaser only $1 an acre. This

policy is adopted with the view of encouraging enterprises to bring the land under irrigation. It is a policy which has been in force for a number of years, and I think has proved generally acceptable. Where any part of the country requires irrigation, where the land is capable of being irrigated, and where there is water that can be used for the purpose, it is considered desirable in the interest of everybody that the water should be brought to the land. In order to encourage the employment of capital for that purpose the system of sale which has been alluded to was adopted. It has been generally acceptable, and fairly successful in bringing into operation a considerable number of irrigation propositions, and very useful ones. My hon. friend from Alberta has suggested that in the past there have been cases where work done on the ditch was credited at too high a figure, and where sales were made although actual irrigation had not taken place. Possibly that has been the case in the past. When the irrigation law was administered by the deputy Minister of Public Works for the territories and when he was also Commissioner of Irrigation, he had a great deal more to do than he could attend to. At that time there may have been cases such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned. But when the provinces were divided and it was impossible to continue the previous system, a Commissioner of Irrigation was appointed with residence at Calgary; and I think I am safe in saying that since then there has been no case such as the hon. gentleman has alluded to. We have been very particular as to the merits of any scheme that is proposed. When an irrigation scheme is proposed to us, we have the locality surveyed by our own officers to see whether the scheme is practicable before we accede to it. After the work is completed, we have it inspected and reported upon before any transfer of the land is made. I think if the hon. gentleman will inquire he will find that any recent transactions which have taken place since the appointment of a Commissioner of Irrigation with residence at Calgary, have not been of the class he has mentioned.

Mr. HERRON. The case I have reference to was over four years ago.

Mr. LAKE. There is an important principle involved in this question of the exchange of school lands. The proceeds of the sale of school lands are to be put aside and invested in a fund for the purpose of advancing education in the northwestern provinces. A Bill was introduced a couple of sessions ago in regard to the exchange of certain school lands; one of the pieces of land which had to be exchanged was very valuable, close to the town of Indian Head, and was being used as a nursery for trees by the government. I pointed out at that time that it was a valuable piece of land and it would probably be difficult to find an equally valuable plot to place at the disposal of the school funds. Can the minister state the actual facts in connection with that exchange?

With regard to the question immediately at issue here I would not like to see discrimination against any particular individuals. Whatever the general plan which we decide upon is it appears from the statements of the Minister that in the case of some of the larger companies the acquisition of school lands has been permitted, other lands of supposedly equal value being given to the school fund. I would suggest that it might be better if some arrangement could be made by which when application is made for purchases of land for irrigation purposes, if it was found that school lands would be involved in the irrigation scheme, these lands should be disposed of in advance by public auction and their full value in their natural state obtained.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister had any communication with the province, which is of course deeply interested in this and what position do they take on it?

Mr. OLIVER. We have had no communication with the province on this matter. As my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has said, the precedent has been established and no objection has been taken to that position, because I am satisfied that the authorities of the province feel practically quite as much interested in the development of irrigation in that country as the authorities here because by the development of an irrigation scheme the taxable value of the land of course increases very greatly. Therefore, from a provincial point of view, there is no objection to the exchange which is suggested here for such a purpose as this. The very fact that there is no general provision for the exchange of the lands which have once been surveyed shows how carefully the trust is guarded. In each particular case we have to lay the facts before parliament and it is within the judgment of parliament whether the permission is granted or not. Irrigation propositions such as this one, it will be agreed in fact by every one who understands the question, are on a very different footing from any other cases. My friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) hardly appreciates the position in this case. This is not the case of the mere enhancement of value of the land by reason of conditions surrounding it or near it.

Mr. SPROULE. That is one important element.

Mr. OLIVER. No, not in this case. That was the case in the instance alluded to by the hon. member from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) but this case is entirely different. In this case the completion of the scheme de-

pends upon the acquisition of this very land by the projectors of the scheme. Suppose that parliament should not permit this exchange to be made ; if the projectors had known that such permission would not be granted at the beginning they never would have undertaken the scheme.

Mr. SPROULE. Were they ignorant of the land law ?

Mr. OLIVER. They assume, I presume, that the same consideration that had been granted to others would be granted to them. The scheme would not have been undertaken if this section could not have been made part of it: then none of the land involved in the scheme would have had the advantage of irrigation and none of it would have been increased in value by the expenditure of this large amount of money upon it. It is not an ordinary case of land which has increased in value by reason of surrounding conditions.

As to the question raised by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) I am not able to give any information directly on that point. The land was required for the purposes of the forestry farm at Indian Head and it did not seem to be advisable or in the public interest or necessary or fair, as it seemed to us, that the government in order to apply that land to a different purpose, which was essential for the benefit of the province in which it was situated as well as in the other provinces, should be required to pay a price for that land because of the surrounding conditions having increased in value, when it was possible to set aside elsewhere land which had an equal intrinsic value. However, that question is a fair subject for consideration and it has been before me for consideration. I have done what I think my friend will admit was fair. Where we find that land has been held under reservation for some particular reason for a considerable length of time, and during that time has come into value, instead of opening that to homestead entry, we have, in certain cases, set aside these quarter-sections of the school lands so that the school fund would have the same advantage in these cases of increased value by reason of surrounding conditions as occurred in the case of the Indian Head farm, and as may occur in numerous cases in which it would be desirable to secure an exchange of school lands.

Mr. LAKE. To what kind of reserves does the minister refer?

Mr. OLIVER. I can hardly give any general statement of the classes and I would not say that it was done in cases where there is no special value to consider. But where there was special value in the land, for instance, where there is a preemption taken 15 or 20 years ago which has been held possibly in the centre of a well settled piece of country, and which has been cancelled, instead of opening that up for homestead entry we may set aside that for the school fund so that the school fund will get the increased value of that land by reason of the surrounding settlement. Another instance is this: In the opening of the Doukhobor reserves, right adjoining the town of Langham was a quarter-section of land which was entered for as a Doukhobor by a man who was afterwards proven not to be a Doukhobor, and therefore had not the right of prior entry on this land. It was necessary to cancel his entry. This land was immediately adjoining the town of Langham and of course if it were opened up for ordinary homestead entry it would have been a snap for whoever got it. Instead of opening it for homestead entry or selling it by auction for the benefit of the treasury at large, we thought it right to take that quarter-section in exchange for some of the school lands that we have secured exchange for. My hon. friend may consider if he pleases that we exchanged a quarter-section at the Indian Head farm for a quarter-section adjoining the town of Langham. At any rate we have adopted this principle and I think have thus evened up with the provinces for such cases as he mentions.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 1,

Mr. SPROULE. If I understand it correctly, parliament formerly reached the conclusion that we cannot divest ourselves of a trust once it is created nor can we divert these school lands for any other purpose than that provided for in the law creating the trust. In view of that, I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if he has secured the advice of the Department of Justice as to the authority of this House to deal with these school lands in such a way as is proposed?

Mr. OLIVER. I imagine this Bill has been referred to the Department of Justice, but I cannot answer for it specifically. I may say, however, that the trust of which my hon. friend speaks is a trust existing by Act of Parliament, and inasmuch as any Act of Parliament can be amended so that Act can be amended as it is being amended by this Bill. This Bill is only one of several that have been passed to meet such cases as these now before the House. The Acts hitherto passed have not been questioned as to their legality, and the only question for consideration is as to their wisdom in dealing with the circumstances of each case.

Mr. SPROULE. At one time Manitoba wanted her school lands given up and it was strongly contended by eminent lawyers in this House that we could not divest

ourselves of the trust. Have we any better authority for divesting ourselves of this trust? On that point the opinion of the Department of Justice should have been secured.

Mr. OLIVER. We are not divesting ourselves of the trust in this case. We are making a certain exchange of lands in accordance with precedents established during all the years since the trust was created. In the general operation of settlement in the country it has been found necessary from time to time to make such exchanges as are contemplated in this Bill. I think there can be no doubt that the precedent has been established for cause, that it has the sanction of law, and that there can, therefore, be no objection to this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. It is of no importance to me personally, and I do not want to object to the Bill, but I would point out that many bad precedents are established and we should not follow them. The impression left on my mind from the discussion in this House was that we could only dispossess ourselves of such land in accordance with the terms of the trust.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not recall the debate to which my hon. friend refers and while no doubt some expressed the view he has presented, others possibly took the contrary view.

Mr. SPROULE. I believe it was generally conceded that we could not do it with respect to the Manitoba school lands, and I would like to know what authority we have for doing it in this case.

Mr. OLIVER. I still think there must be a very radical difference between handing over the ownership of lands to some organization or person and merely exchanging one piece of land for another, which is rendered necessary in the administration of the lands by the settlement of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. When the progress of settlement enhances the value of certain land to $10 or $20 an acre, and you exchange that for some other land worth only $2 an acre, surely the school fund must lose the difference. Could not the province demand from us an accounting for that difference, and claim, equitably if not legally, that we should pay to the province the $18 an acre that was lost as a result of the exchange?

Mr. OLIVER. It is quite possible that in a close scrutiny of the case that might be done. But, on the other hand, there have been instances in which an exchange has been made of lands less valuable for lands more valuable; for instance, the two sections in the Canadian Pacific Railway irrigation tract, which undoubtedly were of less value, aside from the question of irrigation, then the land for which they were exchanged, which was in a part of the country where irrigation was not necessary. In that case the school fund benefited by the exchange; so that, while it is perhaps a matter for discussion, it does not at all follow that by this proposed exchange the school fund will ultimately suffer.

Section agreed to.

On the preamble,

Mr. SPROULE. It would have been interesting to see the correspondence in connection with this exchange. I do not assume that there is anything wrong in it, but there are so many crooked kinks in these land transactions that one becomes a little suspicious about them.

Mr. OLIVER. It was not contemplated to bring the papers down; but if the hon. gentleman wishes them, I will see that they are brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to go into the matter.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

LAND TITLES ACT ASSURANCE FUND.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER Minister of the Interior) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That the Minister of Finance may, under the authority of the Governor in Council, pay the proper authorities of each of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, out of the Assurance Fund formed under the Territories Real Property Act, chapter 26, of the statutes of 1886, and continued under The Land Titles Act, 1894, chapter 28, of the statutes of the year, so much thereof as has arisen from transactions relating to lands now within such province.

He said: This resolution is practically to complete the Autonomy Bills. It is to provide for handing over to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta certain moneys which have accumulated in the Assurance Fund in the hands of this government under the operation of the Land Titles Act. Under the provisions of that Act, which gives absolute title to lands, and takes the responsibility of mistakes made in the administration of the Act, a certain tax is levied on each transaction, which tax goes to form an assurance fund out of which to pay claims arising as the result of these mistakes. When the two new provinces were organized, they were given control of the registration of titles, and the administration of the Land Titles Act passed to them. They have been operating the Act in those provinces since, but the assurance fund, which had accumulated to the Dominion treasury during the period when the Dominion operated the Act, has not yet been handed over to the new provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the money go into the consolidated revenue?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it was a separate fund created for the sole purpose of meeting claims that might be made upon it, arising out of mistakes which might occur in the operation of the Land Titles Act. But the transactions against which that fund stands as an assurance are now in the jurisdiction of the provinces, and as the provinces have assumed the responsibility of administering the Act and consequently any liability for mistakes that may occur, it is only reasonable that this fund should be transferred to them.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the amount of the fund now?

Mr. HAGGART. How does the government divest itself of the responsibility?

Mr. OLIVER. By the provisions of the Autonomy Acts. The fund amounts at present to $118,912.62.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the assent of the Governor General been given? That was not announced when the hon. minister gave notice of the resolution.

Mr. OLIVER. I neglected to give that announcement but the requisite authority has been received.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. LAKE. Could the hon. minister state the amount for each province?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the Bill is for the purpose of handing over the money and providing for its division between the two provinces in proportion to the transactions within each province.

Mr. HAGGART. How does the Dominion government divest itself of liability to the parties assured?

Mr. OLIVER. The government cannot divest itself absolutely of liability, but the two provinces have given an undertaking that they will assume that liability.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 168) to authorize payment to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta of a part of the Assurance Fund under the Land Titles Act of 1894.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

YUKON PLACER MINING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 150) to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act. He said: Until last session the placer mining in the Yukon was regulated by order in council. That system was necessary under the circumstances prevailing in the Yukon for so many years. But, as time went on, and the conditions in regard to mining there became better known, not only did that condition of the law become less necessary, but it became less and less to the liking of the people who were affected by it. The very facility which the administration of the mining law by regulation gave to meet changed conditions, or conditions which had been misunderstood, grew objectionable under conditions which had become to a great extent fixed and when people wished to know, from time to time and from year to year, just what their rights were without any question of alteration. In accepting the view that the time had come for regulation to be succeeded by enactment, the Yukon Placer Mining Bill was introduced and accepted by the House. We were aware that, at this distance from the Yukon, and even with the advantages we have of being in touch with conditions in that country, there were difficulties in placing on the statute-book a law that would be in actual accord with those conditions unless there was close consultation with the people of the Yukon. The Yukon has a partially representative council or local government, and the representations of a committee of this council were accepted by the government and by the House last year in the terms of the Act which was passed. As I said, the intention of that Act, its very purpose, the desire which it was intended to meet, was that there should be stability in the placer mining law of the Yukon. Therefore, when we come forward at this, the next succeeding session, with a series of amendments, it may seem that either the people who were interested in the passage of the law last year did not know their own minds at the time or that they had changed their minds. The fact is, however, that there are serious difficulties in meeting the conditions, as they are found to exist And, as all legislation is necessarily imperfect and has to be amended from time to time —otherwise there would be no necessity for parliament—so in the case of the Yukon Placer Mining Act, which might be said to have been an experiment in legislation of that character for this parliament, it has been found in operation during the past year that there are faults and failings in it which require to be remedied, instances or conditions that were not foreseen that require to be met, or expressions used that were not sufficiently definite. There is no change in the principle of the Yukon Placer Mining Act in the amendments now before the House. These amendments are simply to give fuller effect to the principles contained in the Act of last session. These

amendments, as the Act itself was, were prepared by a committee of the Yukon council in the light of such experience as they have had under the Act and presented to the government here, endorsed by the Commissioner of the Yukon, who is an officer of this government, as being in the interest of mining in that country. The Bill, then is offered to the House under these circumstances.

In the preparation of the Bill for presentation to the House, there has been some little departure from the ordinary form. We have given the amendment in the ordinary wording; beneath that we have printed the section as it is and the section as it is proposed to be amended, with the amendments in italics and with an explanation following. It is hoped that by this arrangement a full understanding of the wording and the meaning of the various changes will be given. However, I may say that since the Bill was put in type there have been certain representations made as to the protection of certain interests in the Yukon which may be said to be an embodiment of a new principle. These I will place before the House as we reach them in the progress of the Bill, and will give the necessary explanations. But the Bill as it stands in print contains and continues only the principles contained in the original Bill.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

1. Paragraph (c) of section 2 of The Yukon Placer Mining Act is amended by adding the following words thereto:—but does not include streams which may be considered rivers under the provisions of the Dredging regulations, that is, streams having an average width of one hundred and fifty feet.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by the average width? I presume most streams are wider in some places than in others.

Mr. OLIVER. It is because they are wider in some places and narrower in others that we use the word average. There has to be some way of defining a stream to which dredging regulations may apply, as distinguished from a stream to which placer mining regulations may apply. We have to make some division, and the wording is the best we can make. We give a definition as to the measurement, and in the last resort the decision as to the average width is left to the gold commissioner.

On section 3,

Mr. SPROULE. I thought you only had one gold commissioner, but this seems to contemplate the appointment of several.

Mr. OLIVER. It may be that more than one would be necessary, and this permits the appointment of more than one. But at present there is only one gold commissioner in the Yukon.

Mr. LAKE. Do you mean mining commissioner or commissioner of the Yukon?

Mr. OLIVER. The gold commissioner, an officer whose business it is to administer the law in regard to mining, and to hear appeals from the decisions of the mining recorder.

Mr. DANIEL. What is meant by 'Governor in Council'? I did not know there was a Governor so-called in the Yukon.

Mr. OLIVER. The Governor in Council is the Governor of the Dominion Council. This is a law of the Dominion parliament, and the Governor in Council appoints a gold commissioner. This law is not administered by the local council of the Yukon; that council merely administers the ordinary business of the territory, and has nothing to do with the administration of gold mining.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the salary of those gold commissioners, and what are their duties? Is it necessary to have more than one?

Mr. OLIVER. There is only one gold commissioner at present, and there never has been more than one. There is no intent of appointing more unless occasion should arise. The use of the plural is simply to follow the wording of the Act of last year:

The Governor in Council may appoint gold commissioners, mining recorders and mining inspectors and deputies thereto, for carrying on the provisions of this Act|

I cannot say what is the salary of the gold commissioner, but I am under the impression it is $5,000.

On section 4,

Mr. SPROULE. Is it contemplated where you have mining districts that there shall be one gold commissioner for each district?

Mr. OLIVER. The section provides for the division of the territory into mining districts, in each of which there shall be a head office for recording mineral claims. That division is made by the commissioner in council at the present time. Now the commissioner in council at the present time means the commissioner of the Yukon territory sitting in council. As the council only sits once a year it follows that this division could only be made at a time when the council was in session. In case there is a stampede to any particular part of the country it may become desirable to constitute that part of the country a mining district with a mining recorder, and it should not be necessary to wait until the council sat in order to make that division. It is thought proper that the commissioner should have

power to declare any part of the country a mining district. Mr. Alexander Henderson is the Yukon commissioner now, he was formerly Judge Henderson, at Vancouver.

Mr. LAKE. In section 4 the word 'commissioner' means the commissioner of the Yukon; in section 3, in the 18th line, the word 'commissioner,' according to the minister's explanation, means the gold commissioner. There is likely to be confusion.

Mr. OLIVER. In section 3 the word used is gold commissioner. According to the Bill the Governor in Council may appoint gold commissioners and assistant gold commissioners for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. But mining recorders, mining inspectors and deputies thereto, shall be appointed by the commissioner subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and in this case the commissioner means the commissioner of the Yukon.

On section 12—Extension of boundaries of claim.

Mr. OLIVER moved to amend the section by adding the words:

Or which may be subject to the terms of any agreement with the Crown.

He said: This is to provide for a certain condition which was overlooked in the original Bill. There are cases in which there are certain rights which are not the rights of ownership but which are rights under agreement with the Crown. These rights will be ignored by the provisions of the Bill as it is printed, but, with the addition of the words which I have moved, will be protected.

Mr. SPROULE. I should think the more responsible officer would be the gold commissioner, and yet you include the mining recorder with him in this section.

Mr. OLIVER. The mining recorder is the officer most nearly acquainted with the actual circumstances and as the distances are great and the means of communication limited it is thought well that in such a case as this where it is really a question of fact, it might fairly be left to the mining recorder with an appeal always to the gold commissioner.

On section 13,

Mr. OLIVER. The purpose of this amendment is to allow a period to intervene between the abandonment and relocation so that the world will have notice that the claim is available for relocation and so that the person who abandons will not have priority of right in relocating as he would were he allowed to abandon to-day and relocate to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any official document filed establishing the abandonment?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. A man must abandon one claim before he can take another and under this amendment he cannot abandon for the purpose of relocating and thereby avoid paying his renewal fee or doing his assessment work.

On section 16,

Mr. OLIVER. I move that after the word 'following' in the second line, the words be inserted:

Subject to any right granted by the terms of any existing agreement with the Crown.

This is in order to protect certain rights which are not rights of ownership and yet are rights under agreement with the Crown and therefore entitled to be respected.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. What is the effect of that amendment?

Mr. OLIVER. There are certain rights to what are called reverted claims, which rights are held under an agreement with the Crown at the present time and this amendment will preserve these rights.

Mr. A. MACDONELL. Is that reserving to the Crown the right overlapping claims?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Are not these claims in many instances already granted to other parties in the event that they should lapse into the hands of the government. How would the amendment affect a position of that kind?

Mr. OLIVER. This condition exists; there are certain lease holders who have a lease of a large area of territory within which area there are situated individual claims. It is a condition of the lease that whenever any of these individual claims situated within the leasehold revert to the Crown or when the conditions upon them are not fulfilled, instead of reverting to the Crown they fall into the lease. It is to preserve that right of reversion of the claims within a lease to the leasehold that these words are inserted.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice in one of these sections, and perhaps it is the case in some others, that the word 'Commissioner' where it refers to the Commissioner of the Yukon is printed with a capital C, while in other sections it is not printed with a capital C. If the word 'Commissioner,' where it refers to the Commissioner of the Yukon, were printed with a capital C all through this Act it would be better in every way.

Mr. OLIVER. A very good idea.

On section 21—Performance of work by owners of adjoining claims.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that this is a means of enabling a few parties to get control of the whole district.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a means whereby a number of men may group their interests in order to a more economical working of the properties. This is a principle which was admitted in the Act of last year as well as under the previous regulations. It is, of course, a principle which is subject to abuse—something that must be carefully guarded against. The difference between the provision in the amendment and the provision in the Act of last year is that the number of claims was not defined in the provision of last year, and it was believed that abuses might readily arise under it; any number of claims might be grouped. The new provision is that ten claims may be grouped freely, but the grouping of a greater number shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioner of the Yukon on the report of the mining engineer. It is believed that no great harm can be done by the grouping of ten claims or less, while the grouping of more than ten might be subject to great abuse. At the same time, there may be occasions when it would be desirable that a larger number of claims should be grouped.

On section 22,

Section 52 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following subsection :

2. In granting the privilege allowed under this section the mining recorder shall charge the applicant two dollars and fifty cents for every three months or portion thereof for each claim during that portion of the year it is necessary to renew it to make all the claims renewable on the same day; and the representation work required for the fractional portion of the year for which each claim is renewed shall be allowed at the rate of fifty dollars for each three months or fraction thereof, and the said representation work shall be performed and recorded on or before the date from which all the claims are first made renewable.

Mr. SPROULE. At present a man must pay a full fee if he renews a claim for a portion of a year. Under this amendment he need only pay for a fraction of the year.

Mr. OLIVER. It is necessary perhaps to read the section as it stands in the present Act to catch the full meaning of the amendment :

Grants of claims in respect of which such permission has been granted, and grants of any claims within a mining district, owned by one person, may be made renewable by the mining recorder on the same day.

This provision is to permit broken periods to be brought together without requiring the miner to pay a full year's fee.

On section 23,

Section 54 of the said Act is amended by striking out the word 'ground' in the ninth line and inserting the word 'property' in lieu thereof.

Mr. SPROULE

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) sets a remarkably good example in the fullness of the printed explanations which he brings down to the House when he makes these amendments. It is a course I have advocated in respect of all Bills for several years. I am bound to say that any minister who does this will always succeed in getting his legislation through in one quarter of the time and with about one-tenth of the trouble it would otherwise involve. I congratulate the minister most heartily.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to add a proviso as follows :

Provided that before entering upon or constructing or repairing works upon the mining property of another person, such applicant shall give adequate security by bond or otherwise, to the satisfaction of the mining recorder, to secure payment to the owner of such mining property of all damage caused by such entry.

Mr. DANIEL. Who is to be the judge of that damage?

Mr. OLIVER. We necessarily give the right to one person to go upon the property of another, but the person who receives this right may not be a man of any substance, and should he, in the carrying out of his work, damage the property upon which he has been permitted to enter, the owner, though he may have legal recourse, may have no valuable recourse against him. This provision requires that before any one enteres on the property of another, he shall satisfy the mining recorder as to his being good for the damage. The owner will then have security should he require to take legal action.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the general effect of this section ?—not the portion of it which is amended but the portion which remains as it was before. I will read the section omitting the immaterial words :

A mining recorder may . . .grant . . the right to divert or take and use or sell the water from any stream or lake . . . and the right of way through, and entry upon any mining property, for the purpose of constructing and repairing ditches and flumes to convey such water.

Then follows the proviso which has been read by the minister as to security. Thus it will be seen that power is given to grant the right to divert water——

Mr. OLIVER. That is not the material point that is being amended.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know that; but the whole section is before us and we should consider what it means. The reason I mention it now is to understand exactly the effect of the amendment. You provide for the right of way through and entry upon mining property for the purpose of constructing or repairing ditches or flumes, and

then you provide that the person who exercises this right should give adequate security.

Mr. OLIVER. To the owner of the claim through which he is permitted to carry the water.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, security for payment to the owner of such mining property of all damages caused by such entry. Well, is that enough—'damage caused by such entry'. You do not say anything about the damage which may be occasioned by the construction and repair of ditches and flumes.

Mr. OLIVER. The security demanded is at the discretion of the mining recorder.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No. If it were that, I would not raise any objection. But you are to give security for 'damage caused by such entry,' thus the 'entry' is distinguished from 'the construction and repair of ditches and flumes.' You speak of 'entry' as one thing, of 'construction, and repair of ditches and flumes' as another thing, and of the diversion of water as still another thing, but you provide damages only for the entry.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no connection between the diversion of the water and the subsequent part of the section.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps not.

Mr. OLIVER. There is, of course, a direct connection between the construction or repair of works and the entry. Of course, my belief was that when you gave a person permission to enter upon the property you thereby took chances on what he was going to do when he got there, and you exacted beforehand security adequate to cover what he was likely to do after he got entry. If that is not clear, I would like it to be made clear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the minister had better ask his legal adviser about that. If I were asked to draft a section to cover what the minister obviously intends, I would make it a little wider than this. As I have mentioned the point, the minister can deal with it as he sees fit. When you give power to divert and take or use and sell water, does that mean power to go on any man's property and divert the water from it?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the water cannot be diverted except by the order of the mining recorder.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All the water that runs in that country is subject to the order of the mining recorder?

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. GALLIHER. In mining in British Columbia, we sometimes meet that difficulty. I think that the case in mind is this: You grant a man permission to divert water from a certain stream. If it is not necessary for him to take that water across another man's property in order to make it available for his own use, the latter part of this section does not apply. But, if he must bring the water across another man's property, he must receive permission to cross that man's property, but you protect the owner of that property under the latter part of the clause. You give the right of entry and right of way upon the property for a certain purpose, that of constructing and repairing ditches and flumes, and all this is taken into consideration in fixing the security. That is, the entry is directly connected with the construction and repair of ditches and flumes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEI. I do not agree that that view is right. But the minister will look into the matter.

Mr. GALLIHER. I mention it, not merely as a lawyer, but because we encounter the same thing in our own province and have had cases of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I dare say. But where you specify the entry and also specify something besides the entry, and when your damages are allowed for the entry alone, it seems to me it would be well to make the matter clear.

Mr. GALLIHER. But the entry is for a certain purpose and you provide for damages in respect of such entry for such purposes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand. But where you specify several things in one place, it seems to me they should be covered in the other place also.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to have the provision clear and adequate, and so I would like to make a suggestion. If it does not seem sufficient, I will reserve the section for further consideration of the law clerk of the department. Suppose the section were made to provide that 'before entering for the purpose of constructing or repairing works upon the mining property of any other person' security shall be given for 'all damage caused by such entry for such purpose.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it would be better to repeat the words at the commencement of the clause and provide that before entry the applicant shall give security to secure payment to the owner of such mining property 'for all damage caused by such entry, or construction, or repairing.' We want it to be placed beyond doubt.

Mr. OLIVER. We will sacrifice elegance for certainty; and I move in amendment that these words be introduced:

By such entry, or construction, or repairing.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 25,—amending section 1 of the old Act.

Mr. MACDONELL. The change proposed here is rather important, and the minister might explain the reason for it.

Mr. OLIVER. The amendment consists in inserting the word 'first' in two places. The case which it is intended to meet arises where there has been a diversion of water from any stream for the purpose of working claims which are either not on the stream or are at some considerable distance down the stream from where the water is taken out, and where there are claims discovered upon the creek below the ditch-head and above the return of the water to the creek. These claims are not workable, and this clause is intended to restore to those claims the inherent right which they are in mining custom supposed to have, to some reasonable measure of the natural flow of the water of that creek.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The water is diverted from the creek into a ditch?

Mr. OLIVER. This is intended to meet such a case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then there is a claim situated above the place where the water returns to the creek from the ditch; cannot that person be served by the ditch in the ordinary course ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You intend to provide that a certain portion of the water must come down the creek to that man's claim, and that only the balance of it shall go into the ditch for the purpose of serving the parties for whose use the ditch was created ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The insertion of the word 'first' is rendered necessary by an interpretation that it seems has been placed upon the section as it now stands in the Act, that the right of the miner upon the creek to a share of the water only accrued after the owner of the ditch had satisfied his own requirements. Of course that in most cases would mean no relief at all, would mean that the conditions intended to be met would not be met. Therefore it is proposed to meet the conditions which the Bill as passed last year were intended to meet, by inserting the word 'first,' so that the first 40 inches or 20 inches of water, as the case might be, will be available on these streams to which that water naturally belongs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand how it came to pass that the authorities deprived the person of forty inches under the law as at present.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. Because he was not there when the first grant of water was given.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The statute is only intended to apply to persons who were there at the time the ditch was constructed ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the statute is intended to apply to people who were not there when the ditch was constructed. If they were there when the ditch was constructed, then the water could not be diverted. They were not there when the right to the ditch was granted, and this is to maintain the natural right of the gold-bearing gravel along the stream to some reasonable portion of the water of that stream for the purpose of production.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. There may be a case or cases that require some remedy. It seems to me that the language of this amendment goes beyond any case of that kind. The minister's explanation is this, that under the Act as it now stands a person who acquired property on a creek below the ditch-head is entitled to 20 per cent of the water diverted. Under the amendment the claim owner is entitled to the first forty or sixty inches of water, as the case may be, whether the owner of the ditch obtains his quantity or not. Now you are making a general amendment to the law which means this : At the present time the owner of the ditch can only be called upon to give up twenty per cent of his water; according to the amendment he can be called upon to give up the first 40 or 60 inches, as the case may be, and whether he gets any water or not. The case I have in mind is this, the case of companies that have acquired rights there now, who are operating on those creeks, and who have vested rights to the extent of whatever those rights may be. Those people can now be called upon to give up 20 per cent of the water. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, provided they are workable claims to which that water would be applied, and not otherwise, bona fide claims, subject always to the decision of the mining recorder or gold commissioner that they are entitled to the water by reason of having workable claims.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. That is assumed. But assuming that, and assuming that these claims are bona fide, these newcomers are down below the ditch-head, and at the present time they can only call upon a man to give up 20 per cent. of his water, whether that be great or small, whether the season be dry or wet; he can only be asked to give up 20 per cent of his supply, whatever it is. Now, by the amendment, an old established company who have rights there might be called upon in a dry season to give up to the newcomer the entire flow

of water that goes through the ditch. That certainly seems to me to be going a little too far. You are interfering with the rights which have been acquired and in a dry season the company above might be compelled to give up their entire supply of water. Surely it was not intended to pass legislation as far-reaching as that. The water might be shared proportionately if the flow is small or great, but do not provide that the newcomer or any one may be entitled to take the whole flow.

Mr. OLIVER. The proposed provision is exactly the same as the previous provision except that the new provision contemplates that the claim holder on the original stream shall have the first 40 or 60 inches, as the case may be, even if that is all. There was no provision for a division of water in the first instance and there is no such provision intended now ; unless there is enough water to work a claim there is no use in any water being taken, and it is considered that less than 40 inches is not sufficient to do any good. Suppose there were just 40 inches of water in the stream, the percentage basis which my hon. friend suggests of giving 20 per cent to the holder of the claim on the original stream and 80 per cent to the holder on the ditch would not give enough to either to be of any use. It is better, therefore, that one man or the other should have enough if there was only sufficient water for one.

My hon. friend argues on the principle that there is an inherent right to the water resting in the capital employed to divert that water. That is not the principle which obtains in the distribution of water in a placer mining country any more than in an irrigation country. There is an inherent public right in the water in its natural flow and it is in maintenance of that inherent public right that this provision was made and that this amendment is being introduced. The public interest demands that if there is gold and if there is water by which that gold may be produced, the water shall be applied to produce the gold, and it is not in accordance with sound public policy that the water which is in its natural course available to produce the gold lying along that course should be diverted from that use or purpose to some other use or purpose, even although there should be an expenditure of capital. The water will flow for ever, the gold will ultimately be exhausted. There is in the long last enough water to produce gold and if there is water by which that is that, for the time being and for the immediate purpose, the water shall be first available to that gold which is most ready of access to it. It is in strict accordance with this principle that this legislation was introduced last year and is being amended this year. There is no change in principle between this year's amendment and last year's legislation, the amendment of this year is merely to make as definite as possible the intent of the legislation of last year.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not quite understand the wording of the section. The intention of the section, I understand, is that the person who establishes works below the ditch shall be entitled to the first 40 inches of water. The section says he shall be entitled to that if 200 inches are diverted. I do not understand this diversion very well but it looks as if he does not get the first 40 inches unless 200 inches are diverted.

Mr. OLIVER. That might be the meaning that is taken out of the section. The English languige is peculiar and it is difficult to so frame it that two meanings cannot be taken. When the committee of the Yukon council drafted the section which appeared last year they fully believed that they had met the case, but under the criticism of legal gentlemen they found they had not met the case. They have made another attempt, perhaps they have failed again. I understand this is the way they have presented the Bill.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. What was the law prior to last session ? Last year the Act was amended so that the man who had the ditch was obliged to give up 20 per cent of it in a certain event, scarcity of water. You have given the man who builds this ditch certain rights; I presume you have, because they have proceeded and constructed this ditch and watercourse and, after having done that and invested their money and capital you curtail their powers. Last session apparently these rights were curtailed so as to oblige them to give up a certain percentage of that water. You come again this session and say you want that further amended by obliging them to give up what might be the whole flow of water, thereby rendering their works entirely useless, unless there be water sufficient to supply the owners of claims on the creek below the ditch-head. Am I correct in that ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. So it practically means confiscation of the works and property of the people who invested their money under the laws that existed which permitted this to be done, and under which they acquired these rights. It is a very important matter. The minister seems to have satisfied himself as to the desirability of a change in the law but it certainly looks as if the result would be to inflict hardship. For instance, there is a creek and there is a ditch-head and water is diverted from that creek. The law is known to be that a man who has a ditch has the right to divert the water of the stream for his own use and possibly for the use of those below him. Under that condition rights have been acquired and under

that condition rights have been abandoned. Rights have been acquired on the ditch and with the knowledge of the law rights have been abandoned on the creek, because those who took up claims on the creek below the ditch-head knew they were doing so subject to the prior right of the man who owned the ditch, if they located below the ditch-head. There would be no hardship in asking the gentlemen to abide by the law as it stood, because whatever rights they have acquired on the creek below the ditch-head were acquired with the full knowledge that the owner of the ditch had the right to divert the stream. If you are going to give one man what may be in certain seasons all of the water and the other man none, it would seem to me that it would be in the interests of justice and according to the faith of the contract entered into with the government that the man who has the ditch and who has previously acquired the right to the flow of water from it by legislation of this parliament, should be preserved in his rights, or if there is not sufficient water for both there should be a division or partition of whatever water is available. They may both have to abate their works to a certain extent, but do not give it all to one man and let the other man's works go dry. It does seem to me that if there be a partition of this water it should be on a percentage basis so as to give them both an opportunity to continue their works. If there is not enough water for both they must both abate their operation, and if there is abundance of water they have both full rights. It seems to me the matter is well worthy the consideration of the government and that the parties interested should be heard. This is a public Bill discussed in Committee of the House and the parties have no right to appear here and make known their claims as they would if it were a private Bill considered in a special committee. There should be an opportunity given to the parties to be heard. I hope the minister has informed himself well and wisely as to the effect of this legislation and as to its desirability. I am informed that there are companies who have invested large sums of money in these ditches and in the undertakings and works and they should be reasonably accorded a hearing or some means of informing the minister of their position. Let me ask the minister if he has had any representations made to him along these lines, and if so, how he is considering them ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have had representations such as my hon. friend has made and they have been carefully considered. In fact the Commissioner of the Yukon came here specially for the purpose of considering, amongst other things, this particular question. He has considered it, I have consulted with him on it, and he is of opinion that the legislation proposed is in the public interest and is necessary. I am of the same opinion for the reasons which I have already given to the House. I might add further—I have already said that the gold is there in limited quantities, and that by continuous working the gold will eventually be exhausted in the one claim or in the other, but the water will continue to flow from year to year for all eternity. The application of the water to the claims containing the gold is an absolute necessity to the production of the gold. Therefore, the man who has acquired the right to the water, to all intents and purposes practically owns all the gold, that is subject to the application of that water in order to secure its production. Therefore unless some provision such as this is inserted, the man who has been fortunate in the early days to acquire the right to the water of a small stream and has for reasons of his own diverted that water and carried it we will say down the stream a mile or two or three miles ; unless there is some intervention of this kind, that man to all intents and purposes has locked up in his strong box and owns against all the world all the gold along the banks of that stream between the ditch-head and where his water is returned to the creek. That is a condition which, of course, cannot be maintained as being in the public interest. This provision is inserted for the purpose of meeting that condition. Of course the right under this section can only be exercised bona fide on the approval of the mining recorder or the gold commissioner or on appeal to the territorial court of the Yukon. But the point is that it is necessary that the inherent right of the people at large to the use of that water shall be asserted and shall be maintained and established by legislation. We cannot afford to have the gold of the Yukon locked up by the locking up of the water.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I have not even suggested any such thing. The minister has spoken about those who acquire rights to the water. Now, the man who has acquired the right to the water is the man to whom this government has given the right to divert the stream. No one is suggesting that this man who has acquired this right should be allowed to divert the whole flow of the water or that either party should, but that there should be a partition of the water. The minister speaks about the gold being taken out in a certain time and he says that the water flows on for ever. That is quite true, but that is no reason why a man should be postponed in his right to take out his gold, to the advantage of another man who is to have the use of the water immediately. Surely the minister would be facilitating the getting out of the gold of that country by extending the area over which the water rights shall be acquired rather than by confining these water rights either to a particular channel or to a ditch. It surely is more in the inter-

ests of the production of gold in that country that the water should be spread over as large an area as possible. Give the ditch owner what water will serve him, if there is water to serve him, and give the owner of the creek claim the same right. If there is a dearth of water, then do the best you can with what there is: give each man a portion. It seems to me that in that way you would be best serving the gold-mining industry of that country. Parliament has, wisely or unwisely, given the owners of these ditches certain vested rights in the waters of these creeks and streams, and it seems to me to be a great hardship to deprive them of those rights. Curtail those rights if they have too much water; but it seems to me to be a pretty high-handed proceeding to take them away altogether, so that in a dry season they will get no water.

Mr. OLIVER. I must repeat that the Act as it now stands is identical with the Act as it is proposed, except that the first right shall be to the claim-holder on the original creek. That was the intention in the original Act, and to my mind it is so expressed, but it seems that it is not so held by some authorities. The proposal before the House is the proposal of practical men best acquainted with the conditions and anxious to conserve the water for the production of gold, and I think the House is warranted in accepting their judgment.

Mr GALLIHER. My hon. friend from Toronto overlooks the principle underlying the distribution of water in placer mining districts; that is, that the owners of gold-bearing ground along the natural course of any stream are entitled to the waters of that stream to work their claims. Any one whose property is not along the natural course of the stream, and who in order to work his property has to apply to divert a portion of that water from its natural channel, has to return that water into its natural channel within a certain distance. The cases which my hon. friend has mentioned would only be such as would apply between the head of the ditch, where the water is diverted from the stream, and the tail, where the water re-enters it, and they would not be very serious. When a diversion is to be made for a supply of water not in the natural course and flow of the stream, that diversion must be taken with the rights preserved to those who are first and always entitled to the water for operating properties along the banks of the stream.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. My hon. friend is speaking just as if this were a virgin country and as if no rights had been granted. I quite understand all that he has said, but he is overlooking the fact that rights have been granted on these streams to certain persons to divert these waters, and they have made their investments on the faith of those rights. Conditions have changed because of the intervening rights that have been thus acquired. I think the effect of this amendment would simply be to encourage people working claims or pretending to work claims to exact from people who are affected by this legislation certain payments in order that they may be protected in their mining rights. That is not new in mining countries, and I think that you will find history repeating itself here.

Mr. GALLIHER. That diversion does not do away with the basic principle that the people having gold-bearing grounds on a stream, even after the water is diverted, are entitled to the flow of that water.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire how much water any bona fide worker would be entitled to if there were 150 inches diverted, and how much if there were 250 inches diverted?

Mr. OLIVER. He would be entitled to 40 inches if 250 inches were diverted, or to 60 inches if 300 inches or over were diverted. What my hon. friend from Toronto says is correct, that if there were only 40 inches in the stream and the owner of the ditch had a right to divert 40 inches, and a claim were established below the ditch-head, and the mining recorder gave permission, the owner of the claim would be entitled to that 40 inches as against the owner of the ditch. Forty inches is the amount of water which is considered sufficient for the efficient working of a placer claim; less than that is not considered to be sufficient.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it not be better to say that he shall be entitled to the first forty inches of water if not more than 200 are diverted?

Mr. GALLIHER. I think that would be a good amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. He will be entitled to forty inches if not more than three hundred are diverted and to sixty inches if more than three hundred are diverted. How would that do?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would be plainer to the ordinary layman.

Mr. OLIVER. I would then move in amendment that he shall be entitled to the first forty inches of water, if not more than three hundred are diverted, and to the first sixty inches if more than three hundred are diverted.

Mr. GALLIHER. Then he would be entitled to forty inches if two hundred and ninety-nine inches were diverted, but as soon as three hundred inches are diverted the sixty inches would start and that is all he can get.

Mr. OLIVER. Unless he pays for more.

Mr. GALLIHER. They will ask for two hundred and ninety-nine and then he will get only forty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose two hundred inches are diverted, do you mean that there shall be two hundred and forty inches altogether in the original channel of which forty shall be retained by the person working below, or does it mean that there are two hundred altogether in the channel and one hundred and sixty to go into the ditch?

Mr. OLIVER One hundred and sixty in the ditch and forty in the channel.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think it says that.

Mr. OLIVER. I am under the impression that the Act, as it stood last year, really conveyed the idea desired.

Mr. GALLIHER. The trouble about the Act last year was that it did not give a prior right to the man to have the forty or the sixty inches.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it did. They did not allow it that way, but I think it did.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difficulty arises in the use of the word 'diverted.' You speak of the forty inches as part of that diverted.

Mr. GALLIHER. It does not say the water was diverted, but the stream :

If after a grant has been made, any one locates bona fide works on any claim below the ditch-head on any stream so diverted, he shall be entitled to the first forty inches of water if not more than 200 inches are diverted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN Perhaps under the new form of expression the difficutly does not arise so much. I do not think it does.

Mr. GALLIHER. It means absolutely not the water in the river, but the water in the ditch.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the difficulty would arise very much under the form of expression now selected.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not know about that, because the man does not get his forty inches out of the water diverted into that ditch, as I understand it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has used the expression, 'if not more than three hundred inches are diverted.' So, if nothing were diverted, the man would be entitled to his forty inches.

Mr. GALLIHER. But that would have to be of the water left in the stream to go in its natural course. He does not get anything of the water diverted, for later on, it speaks of that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The second branch of the expression—yes, it might leave it open to that difficulty.

Mr. GALLIHER. The idea is to leave at least forty inches in the stream undiverted for three hundred diverted, or sixty inches if over three hundred are diverted. Let us suppose that there are 1,000 inches in a stream——

Mr. CLARKE. What does 'inches' mean in this case?

Mr. GALLIHER. It means miner's inches. That is all defined. They can measure exactly how much goes through a certain head in a ditch or flume. Suppose there are 1,000 inches in a creek. Now, if 900 inches were diverted, there would still be one hundred inches left in the stream for the man below. But the water he would get would be that in the natural course of the stream—I take it that, necessarily, he could not get the water in the ditch, for he is not on the line of the ditch.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another difficulty. Suppose there were a dozen persons located below, each person would be entitled to forty inches, would he not?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. But the same forty inches would supply each one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The water is not used up, then?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it passes from claim to claim. The trouble, as I see it, arises from the insertion of the word 'first.' As I read the original clause, it states exactly what is intended, but, by inserting the word 'first' you alter the meaning and produce the confusion we are discussing. To meet the difficulty pointed out by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) I would suggest that we make it read, 'He shall be entitled to the first forty inches of water if not more than three hundred inches may be diverted, and the first sixty inches of water if more than three hundred inches may be diverted.' 'May be diverted'—that is, if the license permits the diversion.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not sure that that will remove the difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Johnson). Carried.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think it would be better, Mr. Chairman. to come back to this section, even though we leave it in the meantime.

Mr. OLIVER. In view of the discussion we have had on this section, perhaps it would be as well to let the section stand and the Bill can be considered again in committee with a view to the amendment of this section. Let section 25 stand.

Progress reported.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 116) to amend the Exchequer Court Act.—Mr. Aylesworth—was read the second time, House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. AYLESWORTH It will be observed that this clause is substituted for the present sections 8 and 9 of the statute. The two clauses 8 and 9 are recast, are repeated in a slightly different form, and are made wider in application. At present, section 8 deals with the appointment of a substitute or temporary judge in case of the illness of the judge of the court or his absence from Canada. It will be observed that the section now under consideration widens that slightly, making it apply to the case, not only of illness or absence from Canada, but to leave of absence. Then section 9 as it now stands provides for cases in which an ad hoc judge may be appointed for some particular cause or matter. Those cases, according to the present clause 9, are covered simply by the phrase 'any case in which the judge is interested.' The clause as drafted in the printed Bill applies to the case, first, of the judge being interested in any cause or matter, and then is added 'or disqualified by kinship to any of the parties.' That ground of disqualification is not expressly mentioned in the statute as it now stands; it is practically covered by the general expression of the present Act that the judge should not adjudicate upon any case in which he is interested. But it was thought better that it should be expressly mentioned, and also a similar provision as to the judge having been professionally engaged in any cause or matter as counsel or solicitor before his appointment to the bench. In the present Act that reason of disqualification is not expressly mentioned, but is simply covered by the general expression referring to the judge's possible interest. Then the present statute says that the judge ad hoc for a particular cause may be appointed upon the application of the judge of the court, and the word 'written' is now inserted, so that there will be a record preserved of the application for the appointment of a judge for some particular cause. The provision as to taking the oath of office in each of these cases is at present in the law as it stands, and is not changed.

Then as regards the present fourth subsection, that is a provision the necessity for which appeared in the events which happened a few days before this Bill was drafted. The death of Mr. Justice Burbidge necessarily worked an immediate cessation of the jurisdiction of his substitute, Sir Thomas Taylor. There were some cases standing for judgment, and in a few of them judgment was in fact delivered on the very morning of the death of Mr. Justice Burbidge. Sir Thomas Taylor was not aware at the time he was sitting in the court and delivering these judgments of what had taken place a few hours earlier in the day, a circumstance which had ended his jurisdiction under the statute. A question has been raised as to the validity of the judgments so pronounced, and whether those cases will have to be tried again or argued again before the judge who has now been appointed to the court. The view has been taken by some of the counsel interested that those judgments would not be affected by the circumstance of the death of Mr. Justice Burbidge earlier in the day on which they were delivered, in the view that the law takes no account of fractions of a day, that the delivery of the judgments being a step in legal proceedings, must have reference to the earliest hour of the day, and that at the earliest hour of the day had begun Mr. Justice Burbidge was still alive. But it was thought that such a thing ought not to be left to any possible uncertainty. This clause was on that account drafted, and that there might be no possible question about it, I have drafted an amendment which I move to add to this subsection 4 in the shape of a fifth subsection, in these words :

This section shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of January, 1908.

That amendment has application, it will be seen, in terms, to the whole of section 1. But to the first and second and third subsections of the section as here printed there can never be any practical application of it, because the time having gone by since the 1st of January until the present time without there having been in fact any action under these subparagraphs of the clause, it would have application simply to the giving of the judgments under subsection 4, and would prevent any doubt as to the validity of these judgments.

Then reference was made this afternoon to the judicial duties of the judge of the court which might interfere with his transacting the pending business of the court with such expedition as was desirable. I propose to meet that case by the insertion of subparagraph (c) in the second subsection, which is the subsection providing for the appointment of a judge ad hoc in a particular case or matter with regard to which there is such necessity. I propose to insert this subclause (c) in the following words:

Or if the other judicial duties of the judge make it impossible for him to hear without undue delay any cause or matter.

Then will follow the concluding words of the section :

The Governor in Council may in that event, upon the written application of the judge, appoint any other person having the qualifications mentioned in the statute, to act as judge for that particular cause.

Mr. A A. McLEAN. There is another matter that I think ought to be provided for in this Bill. At the present time there are, I think, only six members of the Supreme Court of Canada, and if at any time two of these gentlemen were unable to act, there would be no quorum. It has been suggested to me that this Bill should contain a clause providing that the judge of the Exchequer Court should in a case of that kind be a judge ad hoc of the Supreme Court of Canada. I think this Bill would be the proper statute in which to insert such a clause. In case of the illness or inability at the same time of two judges, a great loss might happen to litigants, and there is no provision in the law for the appointment of another judge. The Exchequer Court judge would in my opinion be a gentleman well qualified for that position.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The subject the hon. gentleman has mentioned is one to which a good deal of consideration has been given, because it certainly is an impediment to the transaction of the business of the Supreme Court if at any time there should be the misfortune of lack of the necessary quorum. But it will be seen, of course, that the present measure is one for the relief of the judge of the Exchequer Court who feels, at the present time at all events, that his judicial duties are much more burdensome than the time at his disposal will permit his attending to. It would be rather an anomaly to increase those duties by imposing upon him the necessity, it may be, of sitting in the Supreme Court as well. But the suggestion which the hon. gentleman has made is one certainly worthy of very serious consideration and one with regard to which an attempt is being made to think out some means of preventing there being any such difficulty as is mentioned in the Supreme Court.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as the proposed amendment to section 1 by the addition of subsection 5 is concerned, there could, I think, be no reasonable objection provided the persons interested in the litigation in question have been consulted, and have expressed their consent to have the judgments, already pronounced, confirmed by this amendment. It would, I presume, be a matter of course that they would be consulted and be given an opportunity for being heard before the legislation shall be passed. I presume that they have been consulted by the Justice Department.

It is perfectly apparent that this Bill had no relation whatever, when introduced, to the additional duties which have been imposed upon Mr. Justice Cassels. It was framed by reason of certain questions arising during the illness of Mr. Justice Burbidge, and the Minister of Justice very properly prepared the Bill and brought it to the House in order that the inconveniences of which he has spoken might not be experienced again. It had no relation whatever to anything that has occurred in connection with the appointment of Mr. Justice Cassels to be commissioner for the purpose of investigating certain matters in connection with the Department of Marine and Fisheries ; and, indeed, the remarkably fresh appearance of the amendments which have been submitted by the Minister of Justice indicate that those amendments have been prepared not many hours ago.

So far as the proposed subsection (c) is concerned, I entirely agree in the necessity for some such amendment. I do not know that I would have selected exactly the phrasing which has commended itself to the Minister of Justice. His amendment reads :

> If the other judicial duties make it impossible for him to hear without undue delay any cause or matter.

I am unable to appreciate the use of the word 'other,' in that connection. What is intended to be distinguished by the use of the word 'other'? I would also invite the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to the expression 'judicial duties.' I am not prepared to say at the moment that the expression 'judicial duties' would not include duties imposed by the chapter of the revised statutes which enables the government to appoint Mr. Justice Cassels; but it is fairly open to question whether some broader and more comprehensive expression ought not to be used. It is not precisely a judicial proceeding in the ordinary sense of the word ; you do not have two parties before that commissioner, the one attacking and the other resisting some particular judgment or decree which that learned judge will be invited to pronounce as such commissioner. Whether you can properly apply the term 'judicial' would, I think, be open to a great deal of doubt. It should be made absolutely and perfectly plain. I concur entirely in the object aimed at by this section, but without any present consideration of the exact words of the statute providing for the investigation, I am not perfectly clear that the best form of words has been selected.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The history of this Bill is simply that the clause which is here given as No. 2 was suggested by the late Mr. Justice Burbidge in December last as a measure of relief to his work in empowering the registrar of the court to do routine work in chambers and other work of that character. The learned judge wrote me very fully on the subject at that time, making a suggestion with regard to clause 9 of the Act, the appointing of a judge for a particular cause. What is now the second section of this Bill was then drafted. The

first section was not then thought of because it was not then apprehended that any such difficulty would arise as afterwards did take place. After the appointment of Sir Thomas Taylor as substitute judge, and at or about the time of the death of Mr. Justice Burbidge, that which is now the first clause of this Bill was drawn and the Bill was introduced in the House on March 9. I do not remember at the moment whether Mr. Justice Cassels had yet been appointed at that date, but certainly there was no thought at that time of the new judicial duty wkich since then has been put on the learned judge with reference to the investigation he is now engaged in. The report of the Civil Service Commission had not then been made and there was in nobody's mind any thought of what has since taken place.

The amendment which I first read, that is the amendment to cover the case of the two judgments which were in effect delivered after Mr. Justice Burbidge had actually passed away, was prepared some weeks ago. The possibility of difficulty was imminent and whether the question should arise or not, legislation would be necessary to place beyond question the validity of the decisions which had so been pronounced. I am not in a position to say whether the unsuccessful litigants, the parties against whom the judgments have been pronounced, have been consulted or not. The successful litigant, the party in whose favour the judgments have been given, will of course be interested in having these judgments validated if they need any validation, and it does not seem necessary to consult that party with reference to this clause. I fully concede the great impropriety, ordinarily speaking, and except in the most extraordinary circumstances, of any legislation which is to be of ex post facto operation. This is legislation of that character and I would never propose it to this House if it did not seem plainly in the interests of justice that it should in this particular instance be enacted, and if it did not seem that no possible harm could ensue from it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not maintaining that the legislation should not be passed even when an unsuccessful litigant should object, but I do think it is only right that notice of the proposed legislation should be given to the unsuccessful litigant in order that he might place, either before a committee of the House or before the government, his contention, if he has any, against its enactment. Before any legislation of an ex post facto character is passed, the person who is to be affected thereby ought surely to have the right to be heard. Whether we concur in the view he may put forward is another consideration. I am contending merely that he has the right to be heard.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have no objection whatever to the party being notified. I think in one instance the Crown is the party. There is no objection to that. With regard to the second amendment I may state with absolute candour that the surmise of my hon. friend is entirely correct that the amendment was not prepared many hours ago. The reason for that is very simple. I had no expectation until a few hours ago that this Bill would come up for consideration to-day. Having knowledge of the correspondence which passed between Mr. Justice Cassels and members of the government in relation to his duties, and having had personal conference with the learned judge on the subject, I had it always in mind that when the proper time arrived the insertion of a very brief amendment in this Bill would meet the difficulties which the learned judge had pointed out. But I had not done the actual work of draftsmanship until as I sat here this afternoon I was told by a friend that the suggestion was made in the House that the clause had not yet been drafted. That occurred to me as more or less amusing and the original draft I penned then and there in a couple of lines upon the margin of the copy of the Bill which now lies before me. I do not know that it is any better or any worse for that. Now as to the wording of it—the phrase 'judicial duties' is a statutory one and is the phrase in the section of the statute to which the learned judge referred in his communication which has been read in the House. Section 33 of the Judges' Act, chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes, is the section which provides that a judge is not to engage 'in any occupation or business other than his judicial duties.' A question was put in the House some time ago by some hon. gentleman asking for an interpretation of these words. In answering that question I disclaimed any right to pronounce ex cathedra the interpretation of any statute, but I stated that I had no objection, whatever my opinion was worth, to say what I thought the phrase 'judicial duties' meant, and in response to the question I proceeded to say that in my opinion any duty of judicial character which a judge undertook, thereby became a part of his judicial duties. This investigation is certainly work of a judicial character, and being of that nature —though it may perfectly well be thought it does not fall within the scope of the judge's ordinary duties—it is work of a judicial nature which he has been willing to assume the responsibility of, and once he has so assumed that responsibility it becomes part of his duty to carry it out; and part of his judicial duty, and the full scope and meaning of the phrase it would appear to me in either section 33 of the Judges' Act or in this amendment I am proposing would simply be that if the other

judicial work of the judge makes it impossible for him within a reasonable time to overtake the work of hearing and disposing of any particular cause, then he is empowered to make application to the government to appoint some substitute for that cause that he is unable so to try. It meets the exact objection which the learned judge has put before the government in the present instance, and leaves the appointment of a substitute judge for a particular cause to be made on his application if the circumstances seem to call for it. I am of course not wedded to the particular words I have adopted. I have merely tried in as brief way as I could to express the meaning, that if by reason of other work the judge was not able to hear some particular cause within a reasonable time, he might have authority to apply for some one to hear that cause for him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With all deference to the Minister of Justice I do not see that section 33 of chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes has any bearing at all upon the question which we are now discussing. The question which is before the committee is as to the meaning of the term 'judicial duties.' Section 33 to which the hon. gentleman alluded does not define judicial duties; it simply provides that every judge must attend exclusively to his judicial duties, or, to take the exact words:

> No judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or of the Exchequer Court of Canada or of any superior or county court in Canada shall either directly, or indirectly as director or manager of any corporation, company or firm, or in any other manner whatever, for himself or others, engage in any occupation or business other than his judicial duties; but every such judge shall devote himself exclusively to such judicial duties.

The assumption that this is a judicial duty would control the point I raised, if it were a correct assumption; but this inquiry by Mr. Justice Cassels is no more judicial than it would be if some person other than a judge had been selected to perform that duty, which is of an inquisitorial rather than of a judicial character. There are not two parties represented before him as I understand the situation, nor is it contemplated there shall be. It does not seem more a work of a judicial character than if the minister himself undertook the investigation or appointed some person other than a judge. It can only be followed by report; it cannot be followed by any action on the part of the judge which would directly result in affecting the status of any person in the department. There are no persons before the judge as litigants. It is perfectly true that he is making an inquiry, but so was the judge who was appointed to investigate matters connected with the operation of the insurance law in this country. He does not seem to be acting in a judicial character more than were Judge McTavish and the two gentlemen who were associated with him in the work of that commission. For that reason it seemed to me that the expression 'judicial duties' was not the best expression to select for the purpose intended. I do not know whether or not the gentlemen who were the predecessors of Mr. Justice Cassels—Messrs. Courtney, Fyshe and Bazin—were to be regarded as performing judicial duties; but they were performing judicial duties to as great an extent as he is called upon to perform them under the commission issued to him. The other point of criticism, which is a very minor one, perhaps merely a verbal one, had reference to the use of the word 'other.' It seems to contrast judicial duty with a cause or matter with which judicial duty may be concerned, but which itself is not a judicial duty.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. My reference to section 33 of the Judges' Act was because that section was referred to by Mr. Justice Cassels in his letter to the First Minister, which has already been read to the House. He felt some hesitation in undertaking this work because of the presence on the statute-book of the section in question, confining him to the discharge of his judicial duties. Upon further consideration of the meaning of this very phrase he came to the conclusion that the duties of this commission, if he undertook them, would be of a judicial character and would fall within the distinct exception in this section of the Judges' Act. That was my reason for referring to the phrase found in that section. With reference to the larger question, whether or not these duties can be properly described as judicial, I would with all respect suggest to my hon friend that he is confusing the meaning of the word 'judicial' with the meaning of the word 'court.' I do not for a moment argue that Mr. Justice Cassels when sitting in this investigation is sitting as a court. A court is a tribunal having the power to impose an obligation on some person. That essential feature of a court is absent from the functions which Mr. Justice Cassels is discharging in this inquiry; nevertheless his duties in that inquiry are, it seems to me, of a judicial character. A judge has many duties outside of a court, which duties are of a judicial character, although the judge is in no sense a court while he is discharging them. I think, therefore, that the circumstances that there may not be two parties before the judge in this inquiry does not in any degree prevent it being a judicial one, and the duties devolving upon the commissioner under his appointment being duties of a judicial nature. I likened his duties some time ago to the duties of a coroner. The work of a coroner is of a

judicial character, although his tribunal may not be a court; I express no opinion on that question. Work of that inquisitorial nature may be, and in this instance I think clearly is, of a judicial nature. Then with regard to the word 'other' in the amendment, it is used in contradistinction to the judicial work of trying a cause, which the presence of these other judicial duties makes it impossible for the judge to do within a reasonable time. He has two pieces of judicial work upon his hands, and the clause I have drafted is intended to provide that where he is not able to do other judicial work of the Exchequer Court proper within a reasonable time he may ask in any particular case for the appointment of a substitute.

Mr R. L. BORDEN. I have already said that my criticism with regard to the word 'other' was of a verbal character, and while I cannot say that I am convinced by the explanation of the Minister of Justice, I do not think it worth pressing to any extent. As far as the use of the word 'judicial' is concerned, I may also say that I am not convinced. If any duties are imposed upon a judge, for the reason that he is a judge, you may perhaps properly describe those duties as of a judicial character, because it is as a judge that he performs them. But you must remember that it is not necessary to appoint a judge to do work of this kind. Any person in the country might be appointed for the purpose, and, therefore, it seems to me that you are bound in making the inquiry as to whether those duties are judicial or not, to consider the character of the work which the judge has to perform. He is to inquire and to report; he is not to hear and determine. If he were to hear and determine in the sense of hearing and determining between two litigants, or two parties in the relation of litigants, he would be performing work of a judicial character. Where he simply inquires and reports, he is not acting so much as a judge, but as an inquisitor. He is doing exactly the same kind of work, on a somewhat restricted scale, as that which Messrs. Courtney, Fyshe and Bazin were doing when they undertook the investigation of some of these departments. However, the responsiblity is with the government in respect to the language employed. Having expressed my views with regard to it, I am quite content to leave it there and not urge the matter further.

On section 2—Rules and orders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The suggestion of Mr. Justice Cassels, as I recollect it, was that the registrar of the court should receive some wider powers than those which are conferred by this section. Have the government taken that into consideration?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The learned judge suggests who in his judgment would be a proper person to be appointed to the position which is provided for by this legislation. That appointment will, of course, in any given instance be a matter for which the government is responsible, and the suggestion of the learned judge will be very carefully considered. I might draw attention to the circumstance that, under the law as it stands, the judge of the court has power to appoint the registrar a referee who would have practically the same power as would be given a substitute judge under this section.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I perfectly understand that. What was suggested by Mr. Justice Cassels in respect of the wider powers to be conferred upon the registrar will be covered by section 1, and therefore no amendment will be required to section 2. Would the Minister undertake, before the Bill finally passes, that those gentlemen will be consulted and given an opportunity of being heard.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That will be done certainly.

Bill as amended reported, read the third time and passed.

MEAFORD HARBOUR.

Bill (No. 158) respecting Meaford harbour—Mr. Brodeur—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see any list of dues set out in the Act.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). In the statute of 1866 the tolls are given concerning the township of St. Vincent. This harbour was formerly under the control of the township of St. Vincent.

Mr. SPROULE. Now you propose to put it under the control of the town, but you have no schedule.

Mr. BRODEUR. They will have to pass by-laws which will have to be approved by the Governor in Council.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SIGNAL DUES AT HALIFAX.

Bill (No. 152) respecting signal dues at Halifax—Mr. Brodeur—was read the second time, considered in committee, reported without amendment and read the third time and passed.

BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

On the order,

Consideration of Bill (No. 112), to amend the Railway Act as respects the constitution

of the Board of Railway Commissioners, as amended in Committee of the Whole.—Mr. Graham.

Mr. SPEAKER. I take it that this should read 'Consideration of amendments.'

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals. I will explain the situation, Mr. Speaker, as there seems to be some confusion in the Order Paper as to this Bill. As a matter of fact, if the Order Paper does not mean this, then this is what it ought to mean : This Bill is still in Committee of the Whole at the request of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). We went through it in committee, but did not take it out for the third reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. It seems to have been reported from the committee, but instead of the amendments being read, that was suspended.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then, I move, that this order be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It appears from 'Hansard' of March 13, that the Bill was reported, but nothing was said about it after it was reported.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. minister (Mr. Graham) did not so understand it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. minister says that I asked it to stand. Does he remember what was the reason given at that time ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We got through the Bill after discussing it in committee for quite a while. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) suggested that we should leave it in committee and I agreed.

Mr. FIELDING. Does the minister (Mr. Graham) wish to have it go back to committee for his own purposes ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, I want it referred back to committee for further consideration.

Motion agreed to, and House went again into committee on the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. It may be remembered that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) made a suggestion of an amendment that he thought should be made, to provide that the board may rehear a case. I have an amendment prepared which I propose as follows :

That section 29 be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

29. The board may re-hear any application before deciding, or may review, rescind, change, alter, or vary any order or decision made by it.

The only new words in that section are to provide that an application may be reheard.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM. Since the appointment of the new chairman of the board I referred this Bill to him, and he makes a suggestion which, I think, was discussed in committee. The provision he proposes is in force in at least one of the United States boards. The object is to provide that a single member of the board of commissioners may be sent with power to hear evidence and investigate a matter and report to the board.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought you had that in the existing Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, but it is recommended by the chief commissioner. There are little cases arising where one member could be sent out to take evidence, and the case may be so clear that his recommendation may be made the order of the board. I have read up some of the cases in the New York Board, and they seem to do a lot of business in this way. The effect is to greatly expedite the work. I propose the amendment as follows :

Section 13 of the said Act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:

13. Two commissioners shall form a quorum, and not less than two commissioners shall attend at the hearing of every case, provided

(a) In any case where there is no opposing party and no notice to be given to any interested party, any one commissioner may act alone for the board.

(b) The board, or the chief commissioner, may authorize any one of the commissioners to report to the board upon any question or matter arising in connection with the business of the board, and when so authorized, such commissioner shall have all the powers of two commissioners sitting together for the purpose of taking evidence or acquiring the necessary information for the purpose of such report, and upon such report being made to the board, the same may be adopted as the order of the board, or otherwise dealt with as to the board may seem proper.

2. The chief commissioner, when present, shall preside, and the assistant chief commissioner, when present, in the absence of the chief commissioner, shall preside, and the opinion of either of them upon any question arising when he is presiding, which, in the opinion of the commissioners, is a question of law, shall prevail.

3. No vacancy in the board shall impair the right of the remaining commissioners to act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The board will consist of six members as constituted under this Act, of whom two may constitute a quorum. It is possible then for the board to sit in three divisions. There is provision made for a chief commissioner and his

assistant, and there was provision made for a deputy.

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the old Act there was a deputy. There will be three heads in case they want to sit in three divisions, a chief, an assistant and a deputy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there provision as to a ruling upon questions of law by other than the commissioner and his assistants ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is in the old Act, section 12.

Mr. MONK. Before this Bill is reported I would like to make a representation to the Minister of Railways and Canals. Many people in the province of Quebec have represented to me that the commission ought to have a French secretary. The board does a very large amount of business in the province of Quebec; its jurisdiction extends over many matters, in many localities where the English language is not as well understood as it is for instance in the cities of Montreal and Quebec. I believe it was always contemplated that the board should have a French secretary. At the time the board was organized a young lawyer was named who now occupies, I understand, the position of accountant in the organization of the board. But for purposes of correspondence it is a very important matter in the province of Quebec. There is really only one secretary. I have had a number of representations made to me by members of the bar, from country parts particularly in the province of Quebec, and by other people, to the effect that such an important tribunal as this ought to have a clerk who thoroughly understands the French language. I know that at the time this young lawyer was named it was supposed that he would act as French secretary of the board; as a matter of fact he occupies the position of accountant. I believe the absence of a French secretary has been felt as an inconvenience on several occasions. I make that representation to my hon. friend, and hope that the government will be able to remedy the grievance.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have stenographers and translators who are able to answer letters in French that are written to the board in French. The secretary himself of course is appointed by the government, but the other officials are appointed by the commission itself. The matter suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is worthy of consideration, and I will suggest it to the commission, and they will no doubt take it into consideration. Perhaps with a French translator we would not need another secretary who could speak the French language. But the commission ought certainly to be provided with some person who can handle the correspondence in French. I think that is quite reasonable, and I will confer with the chairman of the commission on that point.

Mr. MONK. I am glad to hear what my hon. friend says. There is a great deal of correspondence which is conducted in French, and I believe that the lawyer who acts as accountant or some other person, performs the necessary translation. But I think as a matter of right, if I may use that expression, a French secretary should be appointed to the board, as this is a tribunal which has a great deal to do throughout the whole province of Quebec. It seems to me that if the clerk is not qualified in both languages there ought to be a French clerk as well. I invite my hon. friend to consider that point because I know it has often been matter of comment in my province.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is very difficult to understand, without having the original statute before me, whether or not the matter which I mentioned a moment ago is put in proper shape by this Bill. I hope that whoever is charged with the duty of seeing that the library is provided with a sufficient number of copies of the revised statutes of Canada, 1906, will give some attention to the matter. I have been trying for the last two hours to get the volume of the statutes which contains the section with regard to the appointing of commissions for public purposes, and also the volume which contains the Railway Act, but up to the present time my efforts have been absolutely unsuccessful. For that reason I cannot come to an understanding as to whether or not the legislation now submitted to the House covers the point which I mentioned a moment ago. If it is the intention that one commissioner in certain cases shall make an investigation and report to the board, and if it is also the intention that the board may sit officially in three divisions, each composed of two members, then it is important to provide that each one of these three divisions shall be properly constituted and that the person who presides shall have some power of pronouncing on questions of law. There is provision that the divisions which are presided over by the chief commissioner and the assistant commissioner respectively shall be so constituted ; whether or not there is any similar provision in respect of the third division I do not know. If that provision has not been made, it seems to me it ought to be made. However, having brought the matter to the attention of the Minister of Railways and in view of my inability to obtain a copy of the statute in order to satisfy myself, I think that for the present I have sufficiently discharged my duty by bringing it to his attention.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it proposed to go into Supply to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what department ?

Mr. FIELDING. At the point at which we left off, in the estimates of the Minister of Public Works. Possibly if he gets through we may take up the estimates of the Minister of Railways.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 15, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MAJOR HODGINS' CHARGES.

Mr. GEOFFRION presented the first report of the special committee appointed to investigate Major Hodgins' charges re Transcontinental Railway, as follows :

The special committee appointed to investigate Major Hodgins' charges re Transcontinental Railway, beg to request that leave be granted to them to sit while the House is in session.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I beg to move :

That the first report of the special committee appointed to investigate Major Hodgins' charges re Transcontinental Railway be now concurred in.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the chairman of that committee if any provision has been made for taking a stenographic report of the committee's work and having it furnished from day to day ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. Not yet.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman not think it would be wise that provision should be made for a stenographic report ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I will submit the question to the committee.

Motion agreed to.

THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND CABLE.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask what steps have been taken towards establishing telegraphic communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The day before yesterday I received a communication from the solicitor of the Commercial Cable Company asking if I would interview my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) in regard to the breaking of the cable and also to obtain if possible, permission for the use of the steamer 'Stanley' in the work of effecting repairs. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries very kindly, at once, consented to the use of the steamer and telegraphed to the agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Charlottetown to that effect. I take it for granted that the seamer is now in use or that the necessary steps are being taken to employ her at once toward making the necessary repairs.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. If it is found that the cable cannot be repaired within a reasonable time, will the government take steps to establish telegraphic communication by the Marconi system ? I presume that would be the next best thing to do.

Mr. BRODEUR. If it is impossible to make repairs we will find means by which the Marconi system may be used.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) if he can give me any idea when the returns I asked for on April 6 will be brought down ?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM. I think they are practically ready now.

ANGLO-AMERICAN TREATIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) any information as to when the treaties between Great Britain and the United States will be laid on the table ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The treaties, Mr. Speaker, can be laid on the table of the House on Monday. The correspondence will not be ready.

CIVIL SERVICE BILL.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) at what probable date we may expect the Civil Service Bill ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. I am not able to give any answer to my hon. friend's question.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—INVESTIGATION BY MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the right hon. Prime Minister considered the practica-

bility of laying upon the table of the House the evidence taken before Mr. Justice Cassels' commission ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I see no objection to that.

Mr. FIELDING. I presume that what my hon. friend means is that a file might be placed on the table as was done in the case of the Insurance Commission ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, precisely.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see why it should not be done.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public Works—chargeable to income—Brandon drill hall, $20,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I may say that we have allowed military buildings in Ontario to stand over. I think probably there will be no reason for allowing the Brandon drill hall item to stand over because the building is under construction. This is a revote which I am asking of $20,000 to make provision for the erection of the Brandon drill hall. The site is a lot situated on the corner of Eleventh and Victoria streets, being 215 by 120 feet. The building consists of a drill hall 120 by 75 feet and an armoury having a frontage of 90 feet and a depth of 120. The total cost of building, including drill hall, armoury, electric wiring, fittings, furniture, &c., is $70,881.92.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is the contractor ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Messrs. Dumais and Lachance, Hull, Quebec.

Mr. J. D. REID. What was the difference in the amount of the tenders ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Four tenders were received, the lowest was $52,754 and the highest $56,500. The lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much has been spent already ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure to December 31, 1907, was $12,445.92.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the tender of $52,000 was accepted, that would mean that that was what the building was to cost. In this case the minister states that $70,000 is what it will cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman must remember that that is the tender for the construction of the building. In addition to that there is the cost of the site, $3,100 ; survey of site, legal and travelling expenses and other items, $835.92; heating and ventilation $2,500 ; electric wiring and fixtures, $1,000 ; fittings and furniture $1,500; sidewalk and fencing $500 ; contingencies and superintendence, $4,837. There is also to be paid to the contractor for additional work for the erection of a shooting gallery, $3,855.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has there been any extra work other than the shooting gallery? Has the contractor been instructed to make any changes, or will he have any claim for extras ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not so far as we know.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is the architect ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Thomas Sinclair is supervising architect and clerk of works. He receives 2 per cent commission. The plans were made in the department.

Mr. WARD. Can the minister furnish any particulars as to the number of troops to be served by that drill hall ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have a memorandum that Brandon is the headquarters of the 12th Manitoba Dragoons and 'D' squadron.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What was the original estimated cost ? I understand it is going to cost a great deal more than it was estimated it would.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no information as to that.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I think the citizens of Brandon do not expect that the votes taken last year and this year will finish the hall ; in fact they are counting on many more thousands being spent and depending on their representative having sufficient pull with the Public Works Department to increase the cost to a great deal more than the total amount estimated in the first place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That is the general talk among some of the citizens of Brandon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose that is because such an exceedingly fine building is being erected ; the contractor is doing his work well.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This is another case of what I complained of the other evening, the expenditure of such large amounts in one town to the exclusion of other towns of almost as much importance both generally and from a military standpoint. Brandon is of no more importance in this respect than Minnedosa or Souris. In Minnedosa, for instance, they have not a decent place to store the arms which are deteriorating, and I am informed that some of the militiamen there are so enthusiastic and at the same time so discouraged at the results of their appeals to the Militia Department for some kind of small drill hall that they have subscribed privately to put up a small build-

ing simply for the protection of the arms belonging to the government. It is not very much encouragement to the company there, in which there are a great many farmers' sons, who have to come long distances to attend drill and who have attended the annual camp and have acquitted themselves so creditably as to have carried off for two years in succession the main prize, to see so much done for Brandon and nothing done for the rural corps. I do not object to Brandon having a good drill hall; but I do object to such excessive expenditures for buildings in Brandon and Virden simply because they are represented by an ex-minister who seems to have a pull with the government, and at the expense of the rural militia.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that we should have the Minister of Militia here to give information on this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection to letting this item stand until he is here.

Dauphin public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This consists of a revote of $2,500 and a new vote of $12,500. It is to complete payments in connection with the purchase of a site and the erection of a building for post office purposes, &c. The lot is 75 feet by 132 feet.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Whom was the lot purchased from ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Thomas W. Iredale.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by '&c' ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building will have the land office as well.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost of this building when completed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated cost, including everything is $36,000. That does not include the site.

Mr. BENNETT. What has the site cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $6,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the population of Dauphin ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1901 it was 1,135, but I think it has grown considerably since then.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does the minister know whether any buildings were on this land before, or is it vacant ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to say whether or not there were any buildings upon it. I may say that an inspector from the department who has a very good knowledge of the value of real property was sent to inspect this land at Dauphin, and to compare its price with the price asked for other lots in the immediate vicinity, and he reported that this was a far and reasonable price for the lot.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I wish to say that I am very well acquainted with all the towns about that size in the west, and I do not hesitate to say that $80 per foot frontage is a very excessive price for a lot in a town the size of Dauphin. I do not object to Dauphin having a post office. I believe these smaller towns in the west are as much entitled to public buildings as other towns anywhere in the Dominion ; but I do say that a lot of 75 feet frontage could be bought in any town of the west of from 1,500 to 2,000 population for $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend know of the sale of any lot in the business part of Dauphin having been made within the last six months at less price ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I know the value of lots in other towns of similar size, and I know that Dauphin is not different in that respect from other towns. I do not hesitate for one moment to say that $6,000 for 75 feet frontage in any part of Dauphin is an absolutely extravagant price.

Mr. BARR. This is another instance of extravagance in erecting public buildings throughout the Dominion. Here is a village with only 1,000 inhabitants whose future is very uncertain, and yet the government are going to put up this expensive public building. In the village of Shelburne where I live, a village of 1,500, the headquarters of militia regiment for years, we have to rent a room on the third flat over a shop in which to keep the arms. The result is that on several occasions the rain has come through and injured the arms and accoutrements. Not a dollar has been spent on a public building in that village, yet in this village of 1,000 the government are going to spend $40,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This vote is not for an armoury but for a building for a post office and other public purposes.

Mr. BARR. The village of Shelburne has neither post office nor armoury. But it does not happen to be represented by an ex-minister or somebody with a pull. There is no big four in that section. But the big four can accomplish anything they want. All they have to do is to ask for something from the government and they get it. The time has come when we should have some pronounced policy on this question. We should have such a pronouncement before voting these large amounts of $50,000 or $60,000 for public buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the postal statistics ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The postal revenue for the nine months of last year was $4,310.65,

money orders issued, $34,118.43, money orders paid, $25,981.55.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the expenditure ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The expenditure for the rent of the post office was $275 and the other expenses $1,608 including salary to postmaster, $1,125, and commission on money orders, $100. My hon. friend (Mr. Barr) must see that he has put forth somewhat narrow views. He says we should not erect a public building in Dauphin because we do not know what its future is going to be and have not yet erected a public building at Shelburne. My hon. friend might not be able to get all the members of this House to agree with him. While I should be very glad to consider the claims of Shelburne as well as those of any other town, yet I think we should not stop all expenditure on public buildings simply because we cannot erect one in every town of Canada. The resolution of the municipal council of Dauphin sets forth that the postal business in 1905 stood the sixth in Manitoba, that Dauphin has a rapidly growing population, and its postal business will rank fourth in the near future. It is the trade and district centre of northwestern Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan. It is the centre of a large and fertile country which is rapidly increasing in population. In erecting public buildings, we have to look to the future. We have to consider whether or not the town is a railway centre or whether or not it is the centre of a fertile country with a rapidly growing population.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister the census figures of the last census ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BARR. I could give the hon. minister a similar resolution from Shelburne or any other village.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall have to go up to Shelburne.

Mr. BARR. That resolution does not prove anything. We know the population is only a little over 1,000 and it is a small place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Twenty years ago the whole province of Saskatchewan had only a few thousand. To-day its population numbers in the hundreds of thousands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Dauphin is one of the most thriving towns in the west to-day. It has nearly 2,000 of a population. The Canadian Northern has made it a divisional point and is spending a very large amount in shops and other buildings—possibly $100,000 or $150,000. There can be no question as to Dauphin's future.

Mr. STAPLES. Another railway runs in there ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is a little railway projected that runs down some twelve miles from Dauphin or very close to Dauphin.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is all Canadian Northern.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a little junction there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Prince Albert Junction and Edmonton Junction.

Mr. FOSTER. Under what circumstances was the land bought? All we have had from the minister is that some one told him that the price was not too high.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) missed part of what I said. I explained that an inspector was sent to examine the land and compare the price asked with the prices for which other lots similarly situated could be obtained, and he reported that the price is as low as that at which any lot suitable for public buildings could be obtained.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was the inspector ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Greenfield of Winnipeg.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Where is the lot situated ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is lot 16 and the easterly half of lot 17 in block 9, situated on Burrows avenue. It has a frontage of 75 feet.

Mr. BARR. Was the fact that a lot was required for a post office advertised ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that is not usual.

Mr. STAPLES. From whom was the lot purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From Mr. T. W. Iredale.

Mr. BARR. Is it a corner lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not appear to be.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would like to ask the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) if lots in Dauphin are more valuable than in his own town?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know that they are. There are lots in the town I live in held at $6,000 and $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What frontage?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Frontage of 30 feet, with a depth of 99 feet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This lot is two and a half times that size.

Mr. LALOR. I do not know anything about the claims of Dauphin for a post office, but I think that every member of the

House must be surprised to find $6,000 paid for a 75-foot lot in a town of 1,100.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In a rapidly growing town with a population, as we are told by the member (Mr. Crawford) of about 2,000.

Mr. LALOR. I do not see how it can be growing very rapidly. It is an old town; I have heard of it for a long time. And to pay $6,000 for a lot of that size in a town of 1,100 people must strike every member of this House as ridiculous.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The population was 1,100 last census, but it is about 2,000 now.

Mr. FOSTER. What authority has the minister for saying that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford).

Mr. FOSTER. Does he speak from census returns?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, but I understand it is about two thousand now.

Mr. BARR. Then, you do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not positively.

Mr. BENNETT. After the statement of the member for Portage la Prairie, it is quite evident that this has been a bargain day in this place Dauphin when they can sell land for $80 a foot. The member for Portage la Prairie tells us that in his own town, lots of a depth of only 90 feet, sell as a common occurrence——

Mr. CRAWFORD. I did not say, as a common occurrence.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman said that a lot 33 by 90 feet sold for $6,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, I did not.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, if the hon. gentleman will state what he did say ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You are making the statement. And I say your statement is not correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, if I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, how much did it sell for?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Some lots sell for $6,000, some for $5,000, or $3,000 or $2,000. It depends on the location.

Mr. BENNETT. I accept the statement of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, for I know if it was not true he would not say it. The hon. gentleman has repeated the statement that a 33-foot lot sells for $6.000. That is nearly $200 a foot. Well, I can tell him that if real estate is worth that there, it is worth more than in similar towns in Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER. Of course.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, from the hungry cry being sent up from the west now, it does not seem very far ahead of Ontario for the present. Is the report of the Postmaster General right in saying that about $200 a year is paid for rent, fuel and light for the post office premises in Dauphin?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount is $275.

Mr. BENNETT. The report of the Postmaster General gives it as $206.25.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps that would be for nine months.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, probably.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The hon. minster (Mr. Pugsley) will remember the purchase of a lot in Sandwich. This is the renowned town of Sandwich, one of the oldest in Ontario, and situated on the Detroit river, where property is naturally held at a high figure. The hon. minster will remember that he purchased a lot in Sandwich much larger than this one in Dauphin and paid only $1,600 for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That shows that we purchase as cheaply as we can.

Mr. CLEMENTS. And the former purchaser made a profit of 50 per cent. I state this case as a matter of comparison.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know that in some towns property can be purchased for a good deal less than other towns where the population is considerably less. A good deal depends upon the age of the town. A town may be fifty years old but if it is not growing very much even though it has a fairly large population, real estate will not have so high a value as in smaller but more progressive towns. It may be that the town of Sandwich is not growing rapidly, and it may be that there are many sites available for post office purposes. I happen to know some places in the west where land, many years ago when population was not nearly so large as it is now, was held at a higher figure than the same land can be bought for to-day. In the course of time, values settle down, for people realize just what the land is really worth. Dauphin has become a divisional point of the Canadian Northern Railway and is the distributing centre for all the fertile country to the west and northwest of it. It is rapidly increasing in population, I believe. From the knowledge I have of real estate. I am not prepared to say that this price for a lot and a half, well situated in the centre of business—for that is where we must select sites for post offices and custom houses—is an excessive price.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the contract been let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. In fact, we have not actually acquired the site, but we have agreed to buy on inspection by an inspector.

Mr. PORTER. The minister has emphasized the fact that an inspector was sent to examine the property before it was purchased by the government, and cites it, evidently, as though that must settle the matter. This House and this country have had some experience of the work of inspectors. There was a purchase in the city of Halifax where an inspector was sent down to determine the value of property, and yet, upon further investigation, it was found that we got very much the worse of the deal. I can recollect another case, in Moncton, where an inspector was sent down on behalf of this government to ascertain the value of land, and a similar circumstance seemed to exist there. But the government got the worst of the deal, and the middleman was introduced, as the evidence shows he has been frequently introduced by this government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman say that in the Public Works Department there is any evidence that lots have been purchased through middlemen?

Mr. PORTER. I said there was evidence that the government did this, I did not single out any department. I want to refer the minister to another case to show what an exorbitant price is being paid for this post office site in a small town of 1,000 inhabitants.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. The information I have is that the population of the town, by the census of 1901, was 1,135, and that it is about 2,000 to-day.

Mr. PORTER. If an increase of 100 in the population will help the minister, I am willing to concede that it has 1,100 or 1,200. But even that population does not seem to justify the expenditure of $6,000 for this small piece of land, when you compare it with a recent purchase by the same department in the city of Belleville. There they had occasion to purchase a piece of land for the erection of an armoury, a piece of land more than double the area that is being paid $6,000 for here. Not only is it double in area, but it is a corner lot, fronting on two of the most important streets in the city of Belleville, in the central portion of the town. Belleville is well known to be a very progressive Ontario city, situated in an old and well settled district, where land has a high value; yet the Department of Public Works was able to buy that piece of land for about the same price that is paid for this small piece of land in Dauphin. Now, I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works how frequently this piece of land for the post office has changed hands within a year or so before the government became the purchaser. In the Moncton land deal and in the Halifax land deal, we find by the investigation that took place that there were a number of transfers just before the government bought the land. Perhaps that is the cue to this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman ought not to make a suggestion like that without some evidence.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I may tell the hon. gentleman that Dauphin had a population of 1,135 in 1901 and 1,670 in 1906, and I think I am fairly within the mark in saying that to-day it has a population of nearly 2,000.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. As showing the increase in the value of land, I may mention that in my little town of Stonewall there were 585 inhabitants in 1901 and 1,087 in 1906. The Bank of Hamilton, a very conservative institution, two years ago bought a lot and paid $50 a foot for it. We have in that town perhaps one block of 550 feet square, and you cannot buy a foot of land in that block for less than $50 a foot.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that a corner lot?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Yes. They bought a corner lot for $50 a foot. That is a sample of the value of land. Nearly all the business is done in that one block. The bank is now putting up a building to cost $18,000. Hon. gentlemen coming from Ontario vilages do not realize how quickly land values go up in western towns. Take the town of Selkirk in the county of that name. We have a district there almost as large as a small province, 100 miles by 150, but there are very few public buildings at that point. Selkirk is 25 miles from any other town, and yet it will undoubtedly become a large town, because they have a water-power available at the St. Andrew's locks which will be utilized for manufacturing purposes and the town is sure to increase and prosper. It would not be good business to put up a small building in any of those western towns that are growing so rapidly, and the expenditure of $41,000 on a public building at Selkirk is justified by the situation of the town. Dauphin is in a similar position, 25 or 30 miles from any other place. It will likely become a very important point, and there should be a building put up there that will serve for the future.

Mr. NORTHRUP. We are told that in this town of Dauphin there is a building that has been occupied as a post office for some time back. That building must occupy a considerable space, and it cannot have much less than 75 feet frontage if it is used as a post office. It must cost something to heat and light that building, but the owner of it is willing to rent his property to the government at a figure equal to about $275 a year in view of the increased interest on the value of the land and of

the building and of the cost of heating and lighting. I suppose there would not be more than $75 for heating and lighting, and if we call heating and lighting $75, this gentleman owning that building is willing to rent it to the government for $200 a year, which at 10 per cent represents a value of $2,000 for that land with the building on it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What kind of building is it?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I do not care, it must be good enough to use as a post office or it would not be used as such. There is your lot, plus your building, which the man is willing to rent for $200 a year, or perhaps less. That will represent 10 per cent on $2,000 for this lot, including the building. Now, in this case we find $6,000 paid for a vacant lot. I think the statement in itself is sufficient to show that the figure is unreasonable. But apart altogether from the question of price, it is a pity that the minister just coming into office would not lay down some principle according to which these buildings might be erected.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This building is to be used as a custom house as well.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Add that if you like, and you have interest on a capital of $2,000, you have heating and lighting additional, your janitor, and probably an additional staff in the office, meaning $3,000 or $4,000 a year that this country will have to pay as against $275; or if you allow rent for the custom house of $75, you have $350 or $400 at the outside, to say nothing of repairs and incidentals of that nature. I am quite prepared to admit that the late government went further than I thought they should have gone in erecting public buildings in places not sufficiently large to justify it, but I think that if the late government punished the people with whips, the present government are certainly doing it with scorpions, because they have out-Heroded Herod since they came into office and each year seems to be worse than the preceding one. I would say to my hon. friend that it would meet with the approval not only of the people of the country, but of his own friends as well if he would lay down the rule that public buildings should only be erected in the same way that private individuals would erect buildings. If a city or a town is doing a large amount of business, if it would be necessary to pay a large rental and if the government can borrow money cheaply, by all means put up a public building. If a town is going to grow like Dauphin, when it has grown give it its public building. but it seems absurd to say that we will spend a large sum of money to erect a public building in a town because a few years hence it is expected to increase in size and importance.

Mr. NORTHRUP.

Mr. BERGERON. I think that we should follow a good deal of the advice which my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has given because the time will come when all this will have to be stopped. With reference to public buildings in British Columbia and the Northwest, I found when I was in the west, that the government are in the habit of buying property and paying a very large price for it. I will not say whether they buy it from their own friends or not. That is not the point I am making. But, the price that the government pay seems to regulate the price of property in the town in which the government purchase property. I would not be surprised that if a good deal of the prevailing scarcity of money in the west was due to the fact that a great many people have put their money into real estate and it is locked up there in the meantime. I was in a town where the government had bought a property for a public building for which they had paid a large amount of money. I could hardly believe that property in that place would bring as high a price as was paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where was that?

Mr. BERGERON. That was on the main street of Saskatoon. The government bought a piece of land and paid for it nearly a thousand dollars a running foot, the price being higher than would be paid in Montreal. You could not approach property on the main street in Saskatoon where the government are putting up a very costly post office. This is outside of the ordinary criticism that is made with reference to erecting post offices and public buildings here and there, but I wish to call attention to the speculative prices that the government are paying for property in these small towns. This has been going on to such a degree that a great many people have gone into speculation and there is a great scarcity of money in the west because it is locked up in that way. I heard not long ago that merchants in the west cannot pay what they owe to eastern merchants on account of their money being invested in speculative transactions, a large amount of which speculation is no doubt due to the fact that the government are paying these high prices for land. The government have lots of money and they can pay these prices. I do not mean to accuse them of buying property from their friends although I believe that they do buy most of the property from their friends. Probably their friends know of the intentions of the government in advance, buy the property at an ordinary price, then put up the price and the government pay it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. We heard that same absurd speech with regard to the post office property that was bought at Winnipeg. The government held that property but a very

few months when it could have turned it over at $100,000 advance on the price paid. That condition has prevailed in the west and we cannot understand it in the east. Take a city the size of Edmonton; I priced ordinary lots there last summer for which they wanted $700 a foot. Hon. gentlemen talk about the large buildings put up by the government. What are the banks doing? The banks are showing the greatest example of what they think of the future. There are no such buildings in this part of the country as the banks are erecting in the west, not only in Edmonton and Winnipeg but in the whole of the west. Even in the dull little town of Rossland the Bank of Montreal have a magnificent building. I was in Dauphin last summer and the people were claiming that there was a population of about 2,000 and 2,500. The most optimistic I met stated that there were at least 2,500 people. Dauphin is so situated that it is going to be a very important point. There is no doubt that it will be the distributing centre for the people all the way up to the Pas and Winnipegosis and I certainly think from what I ascertained as to the values of western land last fall that $6,000 for a lot in Dauphin is a very reasonable price. I am judging that from my own personal observation on the ground.

Mr. WARD. I think my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Zimmerman) forgets that he struck Edmonton just at the top of the boom and that the boom has fallen out. You cannot judge of the Northwest by boom prices, and I do not think it is fair to advance an argument of that kind especially when my hon. friend got the price just at the top of the boom. Everybody knows that you can buy land at Edmonton at a very much less figure than my hon. friend has quoted.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Not in the centre of the city.

Mr. WARD. Well, this same land. My object in rising is to ask the Minister of Public Works if he will comply with what my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) asked him; that is as to what transactions had taken place with this property in Dauphin during the past year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Ward) will see how impossible it would be to do that. I would have to send out and have a search made of the records of the registry office. We have no information whatever with regard to previous transactions.

Mr. WARD. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has stated that the government have decided to purchase this property. The Minister of Justice must have that very information in his office. The abstract must have been returned by the solicitor who is looking after the title for the government. Therefore, if my hon. friend would send down to the Minister of Justice he could probably get the information that has been asked for by my hon. friend from East Hastings. The Minister of Public Works has stated that they must look to the future of places like Dauphin in erecting these public buildings, but I would suggest to him that it is not necessary that we should allow the sellers of property to look to the future and fix their prices about ten years in advance, which, I venture to say, has been done in this instance.

Mr. ALCORN. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman) has not answered the argument of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). All he has done has been to take a particular instance of undue inflation in the value of property. May I ask the minister whether there were any other sites considered and at what price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only knowledge I have is that information came to the department that this site which was sultable could be obtained. A gentleman experienced in land values was sent there to make an examination and also to get values of other lots in the business part of the town which would be similarly situated. He reported that this was an exceedingly good lot and that the price was reasonable as compared with the values of other lots in the town.

Mr. LALOR. Is there a copy of that gentleman's report? If we had that we would throw a good deal of light on the former value of this property.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume that report is in the department and I will have it here on Monday.

Mr. ALCORN. Were there negotiations with any one else?

Mr. PATERSON. What strikes one from the east in going to the west is the value put on lots.

Mr. FOSTER. When he wants to buy them.

Mr. PATERSON. I happened to be in Edmonton on two occasions a few years ago. At the time of my first visit the Bank of Montreal had purchased a lot 50 by 300 feet for $15,000. A gentleman whom I knew took an option on a similar lot at the same price. I expressed surprise and said I would be afraid to take it. On my second visit I inquired about his transaction and was informed that the option had expired but that it was a bad thing for him as the lot had since been sold for one half more. The same thing applies in proportion to all of the western towns which are growing

and, of course, if we come to compare these prices with prices in a town like Belleville, they seem very high. I think it was the banks that set the pace in Edmonton.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I also asked the other day on what principle the government established public buildings in the different constituencies. In looking at these votes for Manitoba buildings it would appear that they are erected only in constituencies represented by followers of this government. We find public buildings in Brandon, Dauphin, Emerson, Neepawa, Selkirk, St. Boniface and Winnipeg, all represented by supporters of the present government. That may be a coincidence, but my belief is that it is not. The hon. member from Selkirk (Mr. S. J. Jackson) referred to one of the members here as coming from Ontario and not being able to understand the value of land for public buildings in western towns. I claim to be fairly familiar with land values in all Manitoba towns and I have no hesitation, while I am not opposing the building of a post office in Dauphin, in saying that $6,000 for this lot is an excessive price. Dauphin is not a very big place, it is a railway divisional point, but not a railway centre; only the Canadian Northern Railway goes into it.

The member for Hamilton was exceedingly unhappy in referring to the post office at Winnipeg. If the member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) had been here he would not have allowed him to speak as he did. He knew very well that the post office in Winnipeg had to be placed next the 'Free Press' office no matter what it cost. The 'Free Press' is owned very largely by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). While we are not going into that there is a very nice story in connection with that affair. The post office building had to be placed so near the 'Free Press' office that a light-well had to be placed between the two buildings. This is an exceedingly extravagant price, $6,000 for that lot 75 by 132 feet, even if it is in the very centre of Dauphin.

Mr. BURROWS. It is in the centre, where the old post office was.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Grant that, but the land was still not worth $6,000, and I do not think it helps matters to say it is where the old post office was because that land would not be so very valuable.

Mr. LAKE. Might I also urge on the minister to lay down some settled principle on which he intends to proceed in the erection of public buildings in the west?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I had done that two or three times already.

Mr. LAKE. Not in my hearing and I have been listening attentively for it. There are many growing towns in that country which will have considerable population in the near future, and I think the minister will find himself in all kinds of difficulties unless he can lay down some definite principle which will involve the postal and customs revenue or other indication of the business likely to be done in the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could hardly be expected upon such short notice to do what none of my predecessors since confederation, who have erected many public buildings in all parts of Canada, have done. I do not think it is possible to lay down a hard and fast rule, you cannot do that. You have to take into account very many things. We have to take into account not only the population of a place, but the business done and the revenue derived by the government. It may be a small town where the government derives a large inland or customs revenue. It is also fair to consider whether or not considerable sums of public money are being expended in a town. Take a town which is a seaport. With considerable money being expended for harbour work, dredging or wharfs, the claims of that town for the erection of a public building may not be so strong as the claims of a town which is inland and where there is no large expenditure of Dominion moneys. One has to have regard to a great many considerations, so that it is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule. All I can say is that I am prepared to listen to reasonable representations on behalf of the different cities and towns for the erection of public buildings. I am quite prepared to give careful consideration to any representations which are made by hon. gentlemen opposite as well as to those made by our friends on this side of the House. In the present estimates it will be seen that there are quite a number of public buildings being erected in constituencies represented by our opponents.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Not in Manitoba.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There may be some reason for that. A large majority of the constituencies in Manitoba are represented by gentlemen sitting on this side of the House, and it may be that the claims of the constituencies represented by our friends opposite have not been very strongly pressed upon the attention of the Minister of Public Works. However, the reasonable requirements of the people in all sections of the country will receive careful consideration.

Mr. LAKE. I understand then, that patronage is to enter very largely into this question?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not said so.

Mr. LAKE. Then, the other principle which the minister has laid down is the revenue derived by the government. Am I to take that as the principal reason he adduced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said that a large number of considerations had to be taken into account.

Mr. LAKE. Then I think we may conclude generally that the matter is to be left to the discretion of the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. To the sense of justice of the minister.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is this building on the main street of the town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is on Burrows avenue.

Mr. BURROWS. There are two business streets; one is Gartmore Road and the other Burrows Avenue.

Mr. GANONG. What is the customs revenue of the place ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The post office revenue is $4,310.

Mr. BURROWS. Customs revenue last year was $10,000.

Mr. GANONG. The present post office building is rented ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, at $275 rental.

Mr. ALCORN. What other demands, if any, have been made for this building, by whom and when, and how long has this project been before the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As long ago as 1906 a memorial was presented by the Board of Trade. It has also been pressed by the town council and the municipal council of Dauphin.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. member for Dauphin if the present post office building covers the whole 75 feet frontage ?

Mr. BURROWS. No.

Mr. BENNETT. How much vacant land is there on either side of it ?

Mr. BURROWS. The present post office building has about 30 feet frontage, and there is a vacant space on each side.

Mr. BENNETT. So that there is 45 feet vacant of the 75 feet. It looks strange, if this is such a desirable property and is worth this large amount, that 45 feet of it should have stood idle for years. One would have thought land of such great value would be built up completely.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is the present building a two-story building ?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is it occupied for any other purpose than a post office ?

Mr. BURROWS. The postmaster lives in it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the government bought the building as well ?

Mr. BURROWS. No. It is a frame building, and is not safe for a post office.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The owner of the building has sold the lot to the government ?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes. It has been the expectation of the postmaster for several years to sell this property for post office purposes.

Emerson public building, $3,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. The site has been purchased. It has a frontage of 60 feet on Main street by 140 feet on Dominion street. The building is required for post office and customs purposes.

Mr. BENNETT. How much was paid for the lot ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,000—60 feet by 150.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the population of Emerson ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 920.

Mr. BARR. That is not a very flourishing town, is it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is an ambitious town.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the total estimated cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $20,000.

Mr. STAPLES. The last three sessions of this parliament I have been making a claim for the little town of Carman. I have no objection to money being spent so long as the people are getting good value. I am only too anxious to see that Manitoba gets its share of the large public expenditure. Carman has a population of over 2,000. It is one of the oldest, and I think it is the prettiest town in southern Manitoba. It has three lines of railway running into it—the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Jim Hill railroad. Therefore I am quite within the mark when I call it a railway centre. It is a very convenient and necessary place for a port of entry. It has sent here petition after petition asking for some consideration out of the public chest but without success. Last year, as you will find by referring to Vol. 3 of 'Hansard,' I got the promise that this town would get some consideration or at least that its claim would be looked into. That promise has not yet been fulfilled. The town of Carman certainly deserves more consideration, especially when we see what other towns in Manitoba are getting. Last year its postal revenue was $3,415.38 whereas the postal revenue of Emerson is only $1,120, yet it is getting a public building that will cost some $20,000. Neepawa has a postal revenue of $4,783.30. Selkirk has a population of 2,700 and a postal revenue of $2,385.80. Dauphin has a postal revenue of $4,310.55. In my opinion the town of

Carman is better entitled to a building for a post office and custom house than any town in Manitoba.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what constituency is it ?

Mr. STAPLES. In the constituency of Macdonald which I have the honour to represent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is there any public building in the county ?

Mr. STAPLES. Only a provincial building, the lands title office. I might make a further claim on behalf of Manitoba as a province. I have a list of the appropriations for the little province of Nova Scotia but it would take too long to read it. Comparing these appropriations with those for Manitoba and the revenue in each province, I do not think that the province of Manitoba is getting a fair deal. All we ask is fair treatment. All we ask is to be dealt with as the other provinces. I hope that the Minister of Public Works will consider the claims of Carman and give me at least the further promise that these claims will be looked into and an appropriation made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very happy to say, in all sincerity, that I shall look carefully into the claims of Carman. My hon. friend cannot expect me to promise that an appropriation will be made. That is a matter for consideration.

Mr. STAPLES. Should the minister find that the conditions are as reported, will he make an appropriation for the town ?

Mr. FIELDING. Would not that be bribery ?

Mr. STAPLES. Not at all. If it would be bribery in any direction, it would be for the benefit of the government.

Mr. SPROULE. A part of this has been spent. What was that for ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site has been bought.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it paid for ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It appears in the statement up to the 31st of March, $1,500. I presume it has been paid for. An order in council was passed on the 27th of August last for the purchase of the site at $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Several years ago Emerson was a town of over 3,000 but to-day it is down to 900. I saw a public building put up in that town which cost $125,000 and is offered at $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a doleful picture.

Mr. SPROULE. I only mention it to remind the minister that it was not because of any great business ability that he was able to purchase a lot for $1,000 in a town of that importance. It is an unfortunate fact, as every one knows who has been in Emerson more than once, that it has greatly decreased in recent years both in population and in the value of land. It is on the boundary line, but, for some reason, which may be known better to the people there than to outsiders, the town has not been growing. I do not know that the minister would be doing wrong in providing a building there, because, as it is on the boundary, and an important customs port, a custom office as well as a post office are needed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may be of interest to the hon. member to know that for nine months of the last fiscal period the customs income was $15,677.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a place at which a great many Americans come in, bringing settlers' effects, and so will be an important port of entry notwithstanding the fact that there is not a very large village there at the present time. And I suppose that this building will house the post office and customs house and also the inland revenue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The post office and customs house, but as to the inland revenue I am not sure.

Mr. SPROULE. If it were so, it would be all the stronger justification for the expenditure. What is the amount to be spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated cost is $20,000.

Mr. STAPLES. When I was making my remarks, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) suggested that, if the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) made the promise I asked, it would be considered bribery.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some of our friends opposite might so regard it.

Mr. STAPLES. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) speaks of bribery in such a case, what would he consider the proper name to apply to his own case when there has been spent in his constituency, from the year 1897 down to 1900, the sum of $2,145,030.13? On the ground on which he takes exception to my request, I should say this was wholesale bribery actually committed.

Neepawa public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote, and is to make provision for a public building. The site has been purchased.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the size of the lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the figures before me. But the size of the building is 65 feet by 48 feet.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The lot is 99 feet square.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $3,000. It is made up of lots 14, 15 and 16, on the corner of Mountain avenue and Cameron street.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Have there been protests against the selection of the site for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not heard of any and my deputy tells me he has not heard of any.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Perhaps the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) can tell us?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No documentary evidence of it has been filed with me.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That so? I would like to read a little article that appeared in the Liberal paper of his own town, his own political organ.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Sure about that?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. About what? That it is the Liberal organ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You said my political organ.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Well, I am not going to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) entirely owns it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Don't say anything that is not according to the facts.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does the hon. gentleman deny that it is supporting him?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not making this speech.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. And that he is supporting it as well? When was the site purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was authorized by order in council in 1906, and steps immediately taken to purchase it after that.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This was the particular lot authorized to be purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the order in council always specifies the lot.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Here is the protest of the Liberal 'Press,' of Neepawa:

The post office site.

There is no getting away from the fact that there is very general and deep-rooted dissatisfaction with the site chosen for a federal government building to be erected in Neepawa for postal and customs purposes. It will be generally admitted that any public building should be so located as to be convenient for the greatest number of people and especially for those who use it most. A centre of population is desirable, but a centre of business is much more essential. In neither respect, however, does the site chosen in Neepawa fill the bill. It is so far north as to inconvenience almost everybody in the two south-end wards and not far enough to be any more convenient to the north-end people than if it were two or three blocks farther south, where it would have been in the business centre and near the territorial centre as well as the centre of population.

The site chosen never will be central. Conditions are such that there can be no clustering of business around the post office, while two-thirds of the population and four-fifths of the business is now south of the site.

That is a pretty large proportion.

The probabilities are that, five years hence, four-fifths of the population and nine-tenths of the business will be south of it. It is, and always will be, as unsatisfactory to the farmers as to the business man, for no matter which end of town a farmer may wish to do business at, he must go a considerable distance to the post office.

Perhaps that will refresh the memory of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie as to whether there have been protests. The town is divided into two portions, the north and the south. The major portion is the south. The north end is where the station is located, from which the street runs up to the business part of the town, perhaps, three-quarters of a mile. The business houses are almost entirely on the west side of this street, and it is on this street that the site has been selected. I think I am correct in saying that, except a butcher shop, grocery, Chinese laundry and implement warehouse, and a couple of blocks down from this post office site, a hotel, there are no business houses on that side of the street. I am personally aware that there has been great dissatisfaction with this choice of a site. I have seen many articles, not only in the Conservative newspapers but in Liberal newspapers as well, condemning the choice of these lots. I notice that the minister says that the order in council was passed in February, 1906. Right opposite this site is what is called the Liberal club room. There is a lot and a half in that property, and it cost $600, or at the rate of $400 a lot. The property bought for the post office cost at the rate of $1,000 a lot.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was that a corner lot?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I am not sure. At any rate it was nearer the south side which was the business side of the town.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When was that purchased?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The article I am reading was in 1906. I will tell you what this lot cost when it was bought. By looking up the land titles office records it will be found that on January 5, 1906, this lot for the post office was purchased from W.

J. Mathers for $2,000, and it was transferred by him to W. J. Harrison on March 30, 1906. In less than two months afterwards the property was transferred from Harrison to the King for $3,000; in less than two months it had increased from $2,000 to $3,000. It may be significant that the hon. member who represents the constituency and who lives in the north end of this town has property north of the site of this post office. The business end of the town is almost entirely south, and businessmen, irrespective of politics, protested against this site. This article in the press says the site is inconvenient, not only for businessmen, but for farmers as well. This Liberal paper states it never will be in the centre of the town, and great dissatisfaction has exised. I think some other influence than the benefit of the town and of the business interests has been at work in the selection of this site.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to ask the hon. member for Portage la Prairie if any public meetings were called in regard to the selection of this site for a post office, and did the people say where they would like it to be situated?

Mr. CRAWFORD. There was a public meeting called at which I was present myself, and one of our Tory friends said that if they had the control of the situation they would place it opposite the land titles office, away at the other end of the town and away from the business centre. I admit there was a division of opinion over the location of the post office, but the post office was placed as near the centre of the town as possible. Now, some of the largest business interests in the town are half a mile north of the site selected. The south side of the town, where the hon. gentleman says the business interests are largely located, is not right, as they are not more than a third of that distance from this site, not more than a quarter of a mile, if it is that. Now, one of the sites that some of our friends wanted to get was only 172 feet from this present site, but that was going to cost $6,000 instead of $3,000. I may say that I had a good deal to do in advising the selection of this site, and I thought it was not wise to pay $6,000 for a site when you could get one for $3,000, and when a large percentage of the people were in the opposite direction. I think I have one of the largest business concerns in the town and that is half a mile north of this location. We have three business places at the north end, half a mile north of this site, while the furthest place on the south is not more than a quarter of a mile away. But the main business firms have not more than five or six hundred feet to travel to reach this post office, while we on the north have to travel almost three quarters of a mile. To satisfy all interests and to save expense, I advised that the post office be placed as near as possible in the centre of the settled portion of the town, and that is where it is. The hon. gentleman, in talking of the business places, did not mention the business places on that side of the street at all. There is the Union Bank that cost $20,000 on that side of the street, within 500 feet of where this post office is to be located. We have one of the largest hardware stores in any country town in Manitoba on that side of the street, two harness shops and one of the largest and best hotels in Canada on that side of the street, within 300 feet of the post office site, and one of the best livery stables in the country very close to it. There is no question as to the location of the site being central. I thought it was wise to save $3,000 in the purchase of that site, as it was only 172 feet from the point where a great many thought it should be situated. I think that our hon. friends opposite will be liberal enough now to give us some credit for trying to save public money.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I hardly think it was economy that influenced the hon. member in recommending this site, especially as the board of trade in his own town protested strongly against the selection of the present site. Who compose the board of trade? The business men of the town. Are they not the better judges? I do not think the hon. member was influenced solely by a desire to save $2,000 or $3,000 in the purchase of a site, when the business men of the town who desired the location to be where it would suit business interests, protested strongly against the present site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did they want the $6,000 site purchased?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I do not know what the price was but they recommended a different site. The hon. gentleman is entirely astray when he says this location is in the business centre. I think his constituents will be surprised when they read his remarks in the 'Hansard,' unless he revises them considerably before the 'Hansard' comes out; they will be surprised to see the defence he has put up for the recommendation of this site.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to make a further statement. The only protest I have received in an official way in regard to this site was a largely signed petition from a large percentage of the people of the town, urging that if there was any protest filed in regard to this site no change should be made and that the site should remain where it is. I have that petition in my desk and it is largely signed

Mr. SCHAFFNER. From the people on the south side?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The south side and the north side. I would like to say in re-

gard to the board of trade in the town of Neepawa that one of the strongest Conservatives in that town said : We might as well be honest about it, if the Conservatives had their way we would have it down opposite the lands titles office, which is entirely away from the business centre of the town.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is that what is called Mitchell Corner ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Did the hon. gentleman favour that personally ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, personally I favoured that but the majority of the people thought it should go on the main street. The Mitchell corner is one row of lots off the main street. Personally I would have favoured that because it would have been just as central and as cheap.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The hon. gentleman speaks of the northern part of the town being three quarters of a mile from the post office. As a matter of fact, has not the business in the northern part of the town been decreasing and is it not becoming centred down south of the post office ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. All the elevators, the grain business, outside of some shipping in cars, and the milling business are at the north location.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that there were $12,000 voted last year. Part of that was spent. For what purpose ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 31st December last year there was an expenditure of $3,-437.56. That included $3.000 for the site, the remainder being expended for survey, legal and travelling expenses, advertising, &c.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it that you have only marked $2,000 here as being expended because the revote is $10,000 ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. There were a couple of thousand dollars voted for the site earlier.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is not well informed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to say that there were $2,000 voted before this.

Mr. SPROULE. Not last year ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not talking about last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The year before.

Mr. SPROULE. But there were $2,000 spent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were $2,000 voted the year before and $12,000 last year; that would make $14,000 altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. Well then $2,000 must have been spent. For what purpose ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That goes into the purchase of the land.

Mr. SPROULE. The land was not purchased in this year. It could not be because that would be a revote and it would lapse at the expiration of the financial year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The order in council authorizing the purchase of the land was passed on the 3rd of February, 1905. I think it probable that the land was purchased in the then current year; but at all events in 1905-6.

Mr. SPROULE. Then that money was spent in that year. There were $12,000 voted last year in addition. There has been $2,000 of that spent since. How was that spent ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Three thousand odd dollars in all that should have been spent.

Mr. SPROULE. But the estimates say that the first $2,000 was spent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman want that information ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes. I notice that a great many times, whether the minister understands it or not, he does not take the trouble to give the House the information. I think there is a principle involved that we should deal with at some time or other. We vote money from year to year which is either needed or not needed. If it is not needed it should not be voted because it is always on the estimates and is a standing bribe whenever an election is called up. We do not seem to be able to ascertain how much was spent. There has been a portion of the vote spent but when we ask how much was spent and what proportion was spent for the site we are unable to get that information. This is the same as some other items. With respect to the last item that we dealt with we were told that a site was purchased but we could not find out what the expenditure was. We ought to be able to get all this information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has not followed very closely what I said; otherwise, he would not venture to make the statement that there was any lack of informaion in respect to the previous item. In the case of Emerson I said that there was an assumed expenditure to the 31st of March of $1,000. That was the cost of the site. I said there were further expenses for survey, legal expenses, travelling expenses, &c., of $500 which made $1,500 altogether and we are asking for a revote of $3,000. That made a total of $5,000 which has been voted in the previous year. In this case I did decline to give the hon. gen-

tleman the information as to the cost but I want the hon. gentleman to understand that when he asks me and I do not know what should be the proper information I do not give it. I do not profess to tell what I do not know.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman ought to know because he should have the memorandum before him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In this case the site cost $3,000. The money has been actually paid. There is nothing to conceal. Any information that the hon. gentleman desires that I can give to him I will be only too happy to give. The first vote for this building was $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that spent ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be spent on the site. Then there was another vote of $12,000. That would make $14,000. But we are only asking a revote of $10,000. We have already paid for the site and other expenses $3,437.56. But there will be $563 of last year's vote which we are not asking for it.

Mr. SPROULE. But you are asking for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. You got last year $12,000, you have spent $2,000 and there is a revote of $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend see that out of the total votes we have had heretofore we have spent $3,437.56 ?

Mr. SPROULE. You have spent $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, $3,437.56.

Mr. SPROULE. You must have spent $4,000 if the wording of the item is correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the remainder of the $4,000 has lapsed.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister said that this $2,000 was spent on a site. Last year we voted $12,000 and we are asked to-day to give a revote of $10,000 thereby indicating that $2,000 has been spent. That, added to the $2,000 previously voted makes $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not necessarily. The total expenditure up to the 31st December is $3,437.56 and now we are asking for a revote of $10,000. The result, as a matter of book-keeping, is that $563 lapses.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no indication of it lapsing because you are asking for a revote of $10,000. What you have spent you do not ask for a revote of. That is spent and your estimates show it. We had $2,000 voted the year before, the minister admits that is spent, there was $12,000 voted last year, there is $10,000 of a revote and therefore the other $2,000 must have been spent and he has not given an account of the way in which it was spent. Therefore the other $2,000 must have been spent and the minister has not given us an account of where it was spent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These estimates are made up in November and this is an assumed expenditure of $2,000 up to March 31. The actual expenditure up to December 31 was $3,437, of which $3,000 was for the site and $437.56 for survey of the site, legal and travelling expenses, printing, &c. The revote which is to be applied for in the main estimates, 1908-9, is $10,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Who was the middleman ? It seems that the property increased in value $1,000 in a few months.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it follows that there was any middleman. I have not heard of any.

Mr. J. D. REID. How are the places in Manitoba in which buildings are to be erected, selected ? When I was in the west I saw some fine towns that are not mentioned here, like Hamiota, Carman, Manitou and others, some larger than these.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You would condemn us very much if we attempted to put public buildings in all the tows at once.

Mr. J. D. REID. But some of these towns are larger than those mentioned here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In which one would you say I should recommend the erecting of a public building ?

Mr. J. D. REID. Take Carman, for instance, a splendid town.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have said I am going to consider that.

Mr. J. D. REID. The trouble is the minister has been considering all of these. Will he give us a promise that he will include any one of these buildings we have suggested in the supplementary estimates ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not in a position to say what will be contained in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is only necessary to compare the cost of this lot in Neepawa, $3,000, with the cost of the lot in Dauphin, $6,000, to see that either the price of the Dauphin site is extravagant or that an inferior and unsuitable site has been chosen at Neepawa. I have the highest opinion of Neepawa, it is a smart, thriving town ; in fact I was sorry to part with that town when they took it away from old Marquette because it always gave me a good majority. When it was in Marquette no public building was granted to it. I have also a high opinion of Dauphin. They are much the

same in population and I am sure that no one will say that Neepawa is surpassed by Dauphin. I also think that town property is as high in Neepawa as in Dauphin.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What do you think a really good site in Neepawa should cost ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would not place value on it as I do not live there. But, the member has stated that for a site which I believe was where the townspeople desired it, $6,000 or $7,000 was asked.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How can you give such a close value for Neepawa and not for Dauphin ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I am drawing a comparison between the two towns. My own private opinion is that the Dauphin price was exorbitant.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend say that $6,000 which some gentleman wanted for the other site in Neepawa, which my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) declined to recommend, would be reasonable ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I do not know where the other lot is. The Board of Trade selected a certain site. That board is composed of business men and the site recommended by them was not selected, but another site was selected for which I claim the price paid was unfair because the member for Portage la Prairie says the ordinary value is from $3,000 to $6,000 for these lots.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The population of Neepawa in 1905 was 300 more than that of Dauphin, the figures being Dauphin 1,530, and Neepawa, 1,895.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The population of Dauphin now is represented to be 2,500 people.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We must take the census. Neepawa is more of a railway centre than Dauphin, as it has both the Canadian Northern and Canadian Pacific Railway. It all goes to show the exorbitant price we have to pay for the building of a post office on Burrows Avenue.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The site for which $6,000 was asked was only 66 by 90 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that $167 was paid for surveying the lot and making a plan. The minister gave us that information last year. Does not that seem to be a very extravagant figure for surveying and making a plan of a village lot ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would strike me as high unless there was some exceptional reason for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The surveyor may have had to come from Brandon, as there was no surveyor at Neepawa.

Mr. J. D. REID. How far is that ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. About a hundred miles.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me totally absurd when compared with transactions of that kind in this part of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is more than the usual cost, which runs from $25 to $50. It was paid in 1905. I will take occasion to have it looked into, and I will bring information as to the particular reasons for it.

Mr. SPROULE. A surveyor in our country will go ten or fifteen miles and survey a hundred acres, running the lines and making a plan, for from $5 to $7.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In addition to surveying the lot, the surveyor had to take the levels of the ground in order that the plans might be prepared at Ottawa, and to test the ground to see what the foundation would be like.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I may say that the surveyor was no friend of ours. He is one of the prominent surveyors of Canada. I can assure our friends that there was no graft in connection with it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the surveyor's name ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Moses McFadden.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the estimated cost of the building exclusive of the site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $41,000. The total estimated cost, including the site, is $44,437.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I see by 'Hansard' of last session that Mr. Bennett asked : 'What does the minister intend to spend on this Neepawa building ?' And Mr. Fisher, who was acting minister at the time, stated : 'I should think about $25,000, but the plans are not yet prepared.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract price was $28,000, and the additional expenditure is for the cost of the site, the heating, electric wiring, fittings, lock boxes, sidewalks, fencing, &c.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that an expenditure of $44,000 for a public building in a small village like that is extravagant. In the province of Ontario you will find dozens of small villages of that size and larger that have had no expenditure for that purpose and are not asking for it. It seems to me that these large expenditures in small villages, unless there is a strong probability of their growing to be large places, are not justifiable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should explain that this building is to be for a post office, examining warehouse and militia armouries as well.

Mr. SPROULE. What militia have you got there? In these votes for armouries we should have the Minister of Militia present to give us information as to the size of the force and why these expenditures are needed. In the towns and villages of Ontario we have no such expenditures. We only have them in a few of the large cities. But if it be right to put up these public buildings in these small towns in the new provinces, it is right that we should do so in the old provinces. And if it be not good policy in the old provinces, it is not in the new. There should be no discrimination. And whenever we are called to vote any expenditure for militia purposes we should have the Minister of Militia present.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are two rifle companies there with their equipment and a cadet corps as well. They require some place in which to store their arms.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the cadet corps?

Mr. CRAWFORD. They are boys from fourteen to sixteen years of age.

Mr. SPROULE. How many men?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Eighty men and thirty boys.

Selkirk public building Manitoba, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote of $10,000 and a new vote of $20,000. It is a two-story brick building with stone basement, 44 feet broad and 48 feet deep. The site cost $2,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The sites are coming down. Here is a place a good deal larger than Dauphin, yet the Dauphin site cost $6,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Is the contract let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is let to Brown & Garson at $24,000.

Mr. STAPLES. Does that include light and heat?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. The heating and boiler are estimated at $2,500, electric wiring, $1,000; fittings, $5,000; sidewalks and fencing, $1,000, besides contingencies. Total, including the site, $40,111.60.

Mr. STAPLES. Last year we were led to believe by the acting minister (Mr. Fisher) that the expenditure would be $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The cost of the building.

Mr. STAPLES. No, the total expenditure. Yet we are now up to $40,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. We should have fuller explanation. Last year the acting minister (Mr. Fisher), in reply to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), said:

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Tenders have just been received. The site cost $2,000. It is 58 x 150 feet at the south-east corner of Manitoba and Main streets. The building will cost about $20,000.

His reply would lead the House to believe that that was the total amount of expenditure. When we get an explanation we should have the whole thing in detail.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am giving it to the hon. gentleman. I have given the amount of the contract, the cost of heat and boilers, electric wiring, &c.

Mr. J. D. REID. When we come to an item such as this and the minister gives an estimate of the cost, we take it for granted that that will be the whole cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I draw a distinction between a contract for the erection of a building and the total cost, including fittings, &c.

Mr. J. D. REID. We have been deceived in every case. Up to the present every year the answer has been practically the same. Here is an instance where, instead of the estimates given by the minister, the property is to cost $50,000 to $100,000 more. Is it not a fact that when the total work is completed it will cost a great deal more than the estimate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is aware that when we ask for an amount in the estimates, we do not ask for the whole cost in one year, but ask what is intended to be spent during the current year.

Mr. J. D. REID. When it is stated that a building will cost so much, does that mean only the portion of the work to be done during that year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I take it that that would mean the estimate given by the chief architect to the minister of the cost of the building. But, if nothing else is stated, that would not be supposed to include the cost of the site, heating, wiring and so on.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the minister think it a good policy to begin a building such as this and only finish it in three years or so? Especially, in a little town like Selkirk? Ordinarily, a building begun in such a place is completed in three months.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are asking for enough money to finish the building.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The building was started last November—up to that time, not a stroke of work had been done. The foundation was put in and perhaps two or three feet above that. The work is now going on, and it is expected to be finished in July.

Mr. PUGSLEY.. The contract was let in October.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Yes, and I would point out to the hon. member for Grenville

(Mr. J. D. Reid) that two years ago the estimate given by Mr. Hyman was $25,000. The contract was let for $24,000. The owner of the lot asked $3,000 for it. It was a corner lot. At the other end of the same block, the Traders Bank has put up a pressed brick building to cost $30,000. The price asked for the lot was considered too high. Mr. Greenfield, who is in charge of the public works office in Manitoba was sent to Selkirk and inquired as to the value of property there. The owner afterwards offered to take $2,500 but ultimately accepted $2,000, which price was considered satisfactory and the lot was bought. So, there is nothing wrong with the site. There are to be rooms in this building for the Indian office, the inspector of fisheries for Manitoba and Keewatin, the customs office, the forest ranger for the county of Selkirk, and the examiners of masters and mates. Selkirk is the point where these things centre. There will probably be $200,000 or $250,000 worth of shipping there. The population in 1906 was 2,700. The postal revenue for nine months was $2,385, which would be about $3,200 for the year, in Stonewall also, we have a postal revenue nearly as large as that of Selkirk.

Mr. STAPLES. It is evident from what the hon. gentleman (Mr. S. J. Jackson) has stated that the Minister of Public Works of two years ago deceived us as to the cost of this building.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Why, the contract was let for $1,000 less than he estimated.

Mr. STAPLES. But we understand that this was to be the total cost, including the purchase of site and equipment of the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman, perhaps did not inquire particularly as to these other things.

Mr. STAPLES. It is not so very long since I read a speech of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. S. J. Jackson) in which he took credit for inducing the government to construct this building. And he did not stop at that, but went on to claim credit for every mile of railway constructed in his constituency. I began to wonder if he thought himself Sir Thomas Shaughnessy. He took credit for the snagboat that runs up and down the river. You would think he had more influence with this government —evidently he has considerable—than any other member.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I said that four years ago in one municipality there was not a single mile of railway, and that last November, nearly 100 miles of the Grand Trunk Pacific had been graded and would soon be ironed, and also that there were 40 miles of a new line of railway forced upon the Canadian Pacific Railway because the Grand Trunk was the shorter line. There was also the Canadian Northern, making a total of 150 miles of road that was not there when I was elected four years before. I certainly took credit for supporting the government that brought about these improvements.

Mr. STAPLES. I suppose the inference the hon. gentleman's hearers would draw was that, if he had not been elected, the Grand Trunk Pacific, when it came to the line of his constituency, would skip it, and not construct a line there at all.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The people appreciate the expenditure that the government have made in that section of the country in the last four years.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the hon. member for Selkirk had better move round all over the country, as he seems to take railways with him wherever he goes. In the matter of heating for these public buildings, will public tenders be asked ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister assures us that the tenders will be asked for the heating in every case ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should say in every case—yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will these be public tenders ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders will be asked from different people in the business.

Mr. BENNETT. That is, it will not be public competition, but restricted to party friends ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) can see that the advertising would be out of all proportion to the cost. I can assure the hon. gentleman and the committee that we will take care to get competitive prices.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say a word with reference to the controversy that has arisen here. As I understand the purpose of asking these questions, and the reason why we expect proper answers to be given, as near as they can be given by the Minister of Public Works, is this : When you propose an item for an expenditure in a particular place the first question we ask is : What is the country to be committed to, what is it going to cost ? We mean by that, What is the cost of the whole undertakings, what will it stand the country ? The minister gives an estimate of what he is going to ask parliament to vote, that is intended

to inform the House what the country is being committed to in toto, not the amount of the contract, not the cost of the land, not the price of the site only. We must take that into consideration, but that is not all. For instance, the minister might ask for an expenditure of $100,000. Now if he told us we were committing the country to the expenditure of $200,000, does he think that parliament would give it? Not at all. Therefore we naturally ask every time: What is going to be the cost of this in toto? When we look at the discussions last year, we find this year that the expenditures have crept up in almost every case beyond what we were told last year they would be, they do not accord with the facts that are given us this year as to the actual expenditure. In every case the expenditure has largely exceeded what we were told. Are we not justified then in saying that the House was misled, absolutely misled? Because we gave the vote last year on the understanding that the country was only committing itself to the expenditure of so much money, while we find this year that the expenditure has increased by thousands of dollars over what we were told it would be. Of course we understand that the minister only gives us an estimate and there will be some difference, but we ought to have a pretty close estimate, otherwise we would not be justified in commencing an expenditure of $25,000 if it afterwards turned out to reach $50,000 or $75,000. That is why we are particular to get this information at the commencement of the undertaking.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will see how that occurred. Last year the question was asked as to what the building would cost, and the minister said: Tenders are being received. Now when tenders are received for a building the architect always estimates what the building will cost, and when tenders come in they can be compared with the estimates. No doubt that is what the minister meant at that time.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I cannot admit that. In every instance we ask when the first estimate is placed before the House: What is this going to cost? That means what is the whole undertaking going to cost. We do not mean what the land is going to cost, what the cost will be according to the plans, or the contracts, but we want to know what will be the entire cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I certainly understood the hon member for Grenville to say that when the minister was asked as to the cost of this building he replied that tenders had been received, and the cost was estimated to be so and so. Now that would apply to the cost of the building for which the tenders were received.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

Mr. SPROULE.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

House in committee on Bill (No. 151) respecting the Grand Trunk Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Crawford.

Mr. SPROULE. I was requested by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) to say that it would be impossible for him to be here to-day and as there is an amendment which he intends to propose he requested me to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) to be good enough to allow the Bill to stand.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I have no objection, but, of course, it will not be said that the government is retarding the public business. I have been ready for six weeks to go on with this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. The last couple of times the government asked it to stand. We did not ask it to stand. The hon. member for South Simcoe was here upon the last occasion and he was ready to move his amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly, I know that the government asked that the Bill be allowed to stand a couple of times. But I want to be in the position of having it understood that I am not asking that it shall be allowed to stand to-night.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. G. H. McIntyre). Stands.

BELLEVILLE-PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 20) respecting the Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company.—Mr. Porter.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the hon. member who is in charge of this Bill (Mr. Porter) is not here. Still, if you consent to put a Bill through in the absence of the promoter in one case you ought to do it in all cases. He should be here to attend to the Bill.

Mr. ALCORN. Has the Bill been printed?

The CHAIRMAN. Apparently it has.

Mr. GRAHAM. There was some question with regard to this Bill as to the rates to be charged. We discussed it one evening at some length. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) was interested in it and we had quite a discussion as to the rates payable to and fro. That night

we got to a certain point when it was suggested that we leave it over until the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) was here.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and he is not here to-night.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no position to take on it, but I want it to be put in proper shape; that is all.

Mr. ALCORN. I have no position to take either. I would be willing that the bridge should be free. In the Private Bills Committee we agreed on a tariff. I have not the Bill as reprinted before me to know if it is correctly reprinted or not. The suggestion that was made when the Bill was up before was that the tariff should be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor in Council instead of the Governor in Council, and the hon. member for West Hastings expressed himself to me as being perfectly satisfied with that change. It was said that it was a provincial measure and should be dealt with by the provincial legislature, and it was suggested that the tariff should be made subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. The hon. member for West Hastings said that he was perfectly willing that should be done. So am I.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not going to make any objection to it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I took the exception to this legislation. It seems to me that we are certainly invading the jurisdiction of the local legislature. This was done a few years ago and this is merely an amendment. I thought then and I still think that this parliament should not come down to the discussion of the tariff or tolls over a highway bridge that is wholly and unquestionably within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature. I made the suggestion that instead of section 8 there should be substituted a section placing upon the company the onus of applying to the provincial government to have the tariff approved of. I do not think that this section should ever appear on the statute-book of the parliament of Canada. The only way to remedy the matter is to have a general clause to enable the company to have such a tariff as may be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the province of Ontario. I think that in justice to this parliament that amendment should be made and that we should pay some attention to the requirements of the British North America Act.

Mr. J. D. REID. The amendment suggested by my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) that the words 'Lieutenant-Governor' be inserted in the Bill, I suppose, would overcome the objection that has been mentioned by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). As I understand this amendment, as proposed by the hon. member for Prince Edward, it is that the tolls should be subject to the order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, which practically means that it gives absolute control to the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario instead of the Governor General in Council, as is now in the Bill; so that if the word 'Lieutenant' is inserted in the Bill it meets the objection that the hon. member for Westmoreland has stated, does it not?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, for the reason that this parliament, by this legislation, undertakes to fix the tolls. It is true that there is a clause which says that the Governor General has to approve of the tolls which are charged. If you were to say the 'Lieutenant Governor in Council,' that might in a measure remedy or obviate the difficulty, but it seems to me that we should not even attempt to fix the tolls, but that we should have a general clause stating:

Providing, however, that the rates and tolls collected and charged shall be subject from time to time to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province of Ontario.

Mr. J. D. REID. If these rates were established as they are in the Bill, but subject to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, would that not meet the case?

Mr. EMMERSON. This puts it into the hands of the company as to whether they shall apply or not, and they may never apply.

Mr. J. D. REID. But cannot the people apply to the Lieutenant Governor in Council?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I submit not; that is the point which I have in view.

Mr. J. D. REID. By adding the word 'Lieutenant' before Governor in Council we would bring this within the jurisdiction of the local government, which would meet the wishes of the hon. member and carry out what I am trying to state the Bill should be.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not wish to oppose the Bill, but I am objecting to this on principle. It seems to me the parliament of Canada should not undertake to fix rates and tolls on a provincial highway, and it should never be set out in the statutes of Canada that there shall be charged so much for a baby carriage, so much for a horse and carriage, so much for an adult, &c. I would expunge every word of this tariff and substitute a general clause empowering this bridge company to collect such tolls as from time to time may be approved of by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province of Ontario. My hon. friend's suggestion to insert the word 'Lieutenant' would not remedy it, because

you were here fixing the tolls, and if they are not satisfactory to the people and are satisfactory to the company there is no redress for the people unless, indeed, this company choose to apply from time to time to the provincial government.

Mr. SPROULE. But you may do as you have done in several cases, make the tolls subject to be revised from time to time by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. That has been done with several Bills. Wherever we have incorporated companies to build bridges across streams for highway as well as railway purposes we have set out the tolls.

Mr. EMMERSON. That came within our jurisdiction.

Mr. SPROULE. So does this.

Mr. EMMERSON. I submit not.

Mr. SPROULE. It does because we incorporate this company. Why? Because it is passing over a stream of water that is navigable and there is a draw in the bridge to allow boats to pass.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not within our jurisdiction although we may usurp those powers. A bridge across a navigable stream does not give jurisdiction to this parliament; it is within the jurisdiction of the provincial parliament. There are some four or five large bridges over the St. John river and every one that has been built by companies has been built by companies incorporated by the provincial legislature of New Brunswick. The companies obtained the privilege from the Public Works Department of Canada to construct their bridges over a navigable stream.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that in the cases of the bridges at Prince Albert and Edmonton we set out the tolls. We did the same with the Victoria bridge and again when the Victoria bridge was enlarged.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was a railway bridge at Edmonton.

Mr. SPROULE. There is provision for a passenger bridge as well. I have always understood, and I think I am correct, that this federal parliament is the only authority that controls the crossing of navigable waters. I think we provided for the tolls over the St. Maurice river when we gave 15 per cent of the cost of all bridges costing over $25,000. We have exercised this right, whether correctly or incorrectly, for many years.

Mr. ALCORN. This is not a bridge over a river, but a bridge over an arm of Lake Ontario, a mile wide. The bridge itself is three-quarters of a mile or more in length. There is a swing and vessels of the largest size pass through there. The Bill does not assume to fix arbitrarily a tariff, it simply fixes a tariff which the company is not to exceed, and I am instructed that this Bill was on two occasions brought before the provincial authorities who declined to have anything to do with it on the express ground that this parliament alone could deal with it as navigation was involved, and with all due deference to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) I think he will find that where navigation is involved, as in this case, over a body of water of this size, that this parliament is the only body with jurisdiction.

Mr. EMMERSON. I contend that this legislation is an interference with civil rights which is subject to the jurisdiction of the provincial parliament. I also contend that a company of this character asking these privileges or the original privileges should be incorporated by the provincial parliament, and if the bridge goes over a navigable river or even over an arm of the sea, the company has the right to build the bridge thereupon, subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works for Canada. There is a provision in the Public Works Act of this Dominion whereby in similar cases and with a similar condition companies can make their applications, and it is for the Public Works Department to determine whether or not the right shall be granted. The mere fact that it has been done in the past does not give us jurisdiction. We have the right where it is a public work for the general benefit of Canada; I am not going to discuss that point, but if this is proper legislation for the parliament of Canada, it necessarily follows that we have the right to fix the tolls, and the duty is upon us to do so and it should not be left to the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province of Ontario. But my contention is that we have not that right, and that this is a subject matter for the control of the provincial authorities.

Mr. SPROULE. I have given the reasons why the conclusion was reached that we had the right, and that this was the only parliament that had the right. Might I remind my hon. friend, who is a lawyer, of the long litigation over the Streams Bill of Ontario? What was the decision of the Privy Council in that case? It was that navigable streams were under federal control, and streams that were not navigable were under provincial control.

Mr. EMMERSON. That does not in any way affect my argument.

Mr. FIELDING. On the question of navigation I think there is no doubt that my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) is absolutely right. Any interference with the right of navigation would be subject to Dominion authority, and it would be necessary to get permission for that from the Department of Public Works,

It may not be the construction of a bridge; it may be the construction of a wharf or a pier. But that does not affect the legislative right of chartering a company for a work that is purely provincial in its character. The trouble here is that this work, though properly provincial in its character, has already been dealt with as a Dominion work. It is rather an anomaly that we should first treat it as a Dominion work, and then proceed to place it under the authority of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of a province. As my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works properly suggested, it might be that the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province of Ontario would not be willing to assume it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the proper authority to deal with it, if we assume the right at all, is the Railway Commission.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that it is not a railway bridge.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not a railway bridge, but a general passenger bridge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am disposed o agree entirely with my hon. friend from Westmoreland and the Minister of Finance. In the first instance this company should have been incorporated by the provincial legislature, as under the terms of the British North America Act the exclusive right of chartering companies with provincial rights is vested in the provincial legislature. What should have been done, I think, would have been for the provincial legislature to have incorporated the company, with power o erect this bridge, subject to the approval of the Minister of Public Works being first obtained. That is the course that has been pursued in the New Brunswick legislature, and there has never been any difficulty with regard to it; and I know that that was the view of the late Mr. Justice Burbidge when Deputy Minister of Justice. But the difficulty which confronts us in this case is that this parliament has already, whether rightly or wrongly, incorporated the company, that tha company has erected a bridge, that the public are using the bridge, and that it is desirable that by some authority these tolls should be regulated. I am inclined to agree that, if we are going to deal with the company at all, the better way would be to provide that the tolls shall not exceed the amounts named in the Bill, and then leave the fixing of the tolls within that limit to the Governor in Council. I doubt very much whether we ought to assume the right to impose on the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario the obligation to fix these tolls. I do not think the legislature of Ontario would properly impose that duty upon the Governor in Council, and, if so, what right would we have, by reason of our legislaive Act, to assume that we have jurisdiction to impose an obligation on the Lieutenant Governor of the province in respect to it?

Mr. ALCORN. I agree with the hon. gentleman, and I would direct his attention to the fact that subsection 4 of section 8 already makes the tolls subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. GRAHAM. It strikes me that whatever error was made, was made in the introduction of this legislation into this House. This bridge connecting the county of Prince Edward with the city of Belleville and the county surrounding it is a purely local affair. It does seem quite a small matter for the Governor in Council of the Dominion of Canada to be spending their time fixing the tolls to be charged on bridges of a purely local character. If, however, we are to retain the position that this is a matter for Dominion legislation, I am not in favour of delegating our powers to the Lieutenant Governor in Council of Ontario or to anybody else. If it is our legislation, on our statute-book, it is ours to enforce and regulate. Then, as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has said, though we may have the power to delegate any power that we possess to some other party, the other party may not wish to exercise that power.

Mr. SPROULE. Cannot we as a federal power impose duties on any citizen of the country?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a question if we can impose upon any one duties which are not his.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Lieutenant Governor of Ontario is a representative of His Majesty as well.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not aware that we could impose the duty upon the Lieutenant Governor in Council of regulating the bridge tolls, particularly when it is our bridge. There is a point involved in section 2 on which, not being a legal man, I would like to ask an opinion. Here is a new enactment put into this Bill, providing for the regulation of a public highway in a municipality. The Bill is going further than to ask us to deal with our old Act. It has a clause in it providing for an agreement between the city of Belleville and this company in regard to something which will become a public highway. I think we are going too far in asking the parliament of Canada to regulate public highways.

Mr. SPROULE. It strikes me that as the hon. member who has charge of this Bill is absent, we had better iet it stand until he is here.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have stated that this parliament has not jurisdiction, and I

want to give the special reason. It will be admitted that lands under these waters, or under any navigable stream, belong to the province, and this parliament usurps authority to control or deal with these lands, when it authorizes individuals in the name of a company to place piers or to do anything upon these lands. This parliament has no right to authorize any one to do that, and the provincial legislature of New Brunswick has acted properly in claiming jurisdiction for itself by incorporating such companies, giving them the right to deal with the land under the water and authorizing them to seek from the Public Works Department of the Dominion permission to do that in so far as it might in any way interfere with navigation. The point taken by the Minister of Railways in connection with section 2 is absolutely unanswerable and for the same reason. This Bill is an interference with the property and jurisdiction of the province of Ontario. Although this parliament has seemingly committed the error in the past, I do not think it should extend or perpetuate that error by interfering in any way with the tolls that may be charged because that would be an interference with civil rights.

Mr. SPROULE. In part the hon. gentleman is right and in part wrong. He is wrong in saying that as the land belongs absolutely to the province, we have not the right to give the authority asked. Go to Rainy river, that may be dividing this province from a foreign county, but we have given a charter to a company to cross there. The land there belongs to the province, but the federal parliament is the only one that can give authority to build across there, and we have given the right to build the abutments of the bridge on the land on the Ontario side. We do the same when it is a case of passing from one province to another. It is only the federal parliament that has the authority to give that right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is under the express terms of the British North America Act.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman's contention is that because the land in the bed of a stream belongs to a province, that deprives us of the right to give authority to build a bridge there, I have given instances where we have given that authority.

Mr. FIELDING. There is another feature of interest in this. My hon. frien from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) speaks of this as being distinctly a provincial work. It strikes me, on the surface that it is, but sometimes we endeavour, whether wisely or not, to withdraw a work from the exclusive jurisdiction of the province by declaring it to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. It does not appear that in this instance that was ever done. It does not appear that in the original charter of this company the work was declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, and the question might arise whether it really has become a work which comes under our Dominion authority at all. I think we would do well, under the circumstances, to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the Bill be allowed to stand, in the absence of the hon. gentleman who has it in charge.

Progress reported.

THE SASKATCHEWAN POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 153) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Mr. McCRANEY. When this Bill was before the committee on a former occasion, the question was raised whether it was not a subject more particularly for provincial legislation. I pointed out that under section 21 of the Saskatchewan Act, the Crown lands of that province are in the Dominion as representing the Crown. Consequently the river bed, the waters of rivers, the shores are vested in the Dominion, and complete jurisdiction over them is in the Dominion parliament and not in the provincial legislature. Since that time I have been handed a letter, written by the Deputy Attorney General of the province of Saskatchewan to Messrs. Smith & Johnston, of this city, who are representing the promoters:

Regina, April 28, 1908.

Sirs,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd instant in reference to the Saskatchewan Power Company Bill and have also heard from Messrs. Chrysler, Bethune & Larmonth in connection with the matter. Upon consideration of the matter and of the Bill as amended, this province is, I understand, offering no further opposition to the Bill.

Your obedient servant,
FRANK FORD,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have serious objection to this Bill because it looks to me as though it were simply got up by a lot of promoters for speculation. There is no proviso that they must commence work immediately. It simply states that if the powers granted shall expire by non-user during four consecutive years, or if the company does not come into actual operation within three years from the passing of the Act, the charter will lapse. Should we pass this Bill, the town of Saskatoon will be tied up for at least three years from any other possible chance of having any other water-power.

Mr. McCRANEY. This Bill gives no exclusive right of that sort, and there is no reason at all why any other company could not come here and get similar powers. The

vested rights only come in when the plans are approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. J. D. REID. How could you get any other power on the river if a dam is put across it? That will prevent any further power being obtained above, and a dam cannot be placed below because that would spoil the other. I was in Saskatoon last fall and I saw there a place where I believed power should be developed. Saskatoon is growing very quickly, and to be tied up for three or four years, as it will be if this Bill passes, would be very serious, not only for the town itself, but for other municipalities adjoining, interested in getting water-power. The people out there want this water-power developed. they want all the advantage they can get from it, and we ought to see that the promoters of the Bill undertake to proceed with the work at once. But if we pass the Bill as it is, we shall give these people at least three and probably four years—because all they would have to do would be a few hundred dollars worth of work to entitle them to claim they had begun operations—of absolute control. If there were anything in this Bill which would compel the company to go on with the work at once and spend so many hundred thousand dollars per annum, I would not hesitate to agree to its going through. But the capital is $1,000,000, and for the next four years not even $100 have to be expended. In my opinion this is a piece of legislation that ought not to go through this House, because it would give a body of men an opportunity of peddling the charter around the world and making a lot of money out of it, whereas it only cost them the charges of putting it through this House, while at the same time they are tieing up the water-power for years. Saskatoon will undoubtedly grow and in the next few years it will want this water-power. I protest against this Bill going through in its present shape, and unless a clause is added by which the expenditure shall be proceeded with at once, I would be justified in opposing the Bill.

Mr. McCRANEY. I do not know whether my hon. friend was in the House the other evening when I read a letter received by me from the city clerk of Saskatoon. The original Bill as introduced in the Senate was forwarded by me to the mayor for consideration of the council, because I knew that this matter had been discussed by them, and there had been some agitation in favour of the municipally developing power. Here is a letter which I have received respecting the Bill as it is now before the House :

I am in receipt of your letter, also your telegram of April 15, and in reply would say that I have been instructed by the city council to write you thanking you for the interest you have taken on the city's behalf in regard to the passing of the Saskatchewan Power Company's Bill. The council are of the opinion that it would not necessitate the sending of a delegate to Ottawa on Wednesday, the 29th instant, as clause 3 seems to be in keeping with the petition that we forwarded to you some time ago.

When we come to clause 3 the hon. gentleman will see that there has been an attempt to protect the interests of the city by providing that they shall have proper notice of the plans and an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have no doubt that these gentlemen have gone to the city council and told them that they intended to commence the work at once. I have no doubt that the people want this work to go on immediately. But the hon. gentleman knows that the damming of the river is not a very expensive matter, I suppose $100,000 will construct all the dam that is required for this water-power. If these men are sincere they should not hesitate to go to work and build that dam at once. The river is narrow where they intend doing it, and the banks are so high that the construction of a dam would require but a small expenditure, and they should not hesitate to go to work at once. The hon. gentleman knows very well that immediately this Bill is passed one of these gentlemen will take that charter in his pocket and start for England or some other place and sell it and get a rake-off, and that is all they intend to do with this charter. We should put a clause in this Bill that they shall commence work at once, this summer, and expend $100,000 developing it, otherwise this charter is null and void.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice a suspicious circumstance in the fact that among these names is that of the celebrated James R. Stratton who is a past master in this kind of device. They are trying to get hold of this thing as a speculation, and then peddle it around the country and make money out of it. I think the city council of Saskatoon are not paying proper attention to their own interest, otherwise they would not desire that any company should get possession of the only available water-power that is within reasonable distance of the city.

Mr. GRAHAM. I wish to correct my hon. friend. The gentleman named here is not the Hon. J. R. Stratton, he is another man altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood he was out there for some time last summer speculating ; and knowing his operations in Ontario, I naturally concluded that he was engaged in the same business out there.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works knows if this gentleman is a well known capitalist from New Brunswick.

Mr. DANIEL. This James Stratton I think is a lawyer, and was formerly a resident of New Brunswick.

Mr. J. D. REID. This Mr. Stratton I understand is the gentleman who used to conduct the elections for the Minister of Public Works in New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think Mr. James Stratton has always been a good Conservative.

Mr. J. D. REID. In the last local election in New Brunswick this Mr. Stratton came all the way from Saskatoon down to Ottawa, only a week or two before the elections, I understand, at the instance of the Minister of Public Works; and I understood that he was down in New Brunswick carrying on the campaign.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You must not believe all you hear.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister cannot deny it.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Stratton was in England at the time of the elections in New Brunswick.

Mr. FIELDING. I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the wording of subsection 2 of section 3, which appears to contemplate that the Governor in Council shall, at a particular time and at a particular place, put aside all other things and take up the hearing of this particular matter. It seems to me the procedure contemplated by clause 3 is somewhat unusual. It is not usual but very unusual, for the Governor in Council to grant hearings to any body. There are some exceptional circumstances under which hearings are granted, but all hearings take place before a minister or a committee of ministers. It seems to me that the proper procedure in this case would be that the application for hearing should be to the Minister of Public Works, then he should report to the council, and the Governor in Council could approve. I would like to make that suggestion to my hon. friend, because I think that is the proper procedure in any matter of this kind. It would seem that for parties to fix the date and say that they would appear here, and that the Governor in Council must hear this particular case, is a very unusual proceeding.

Mr. McCRANEY. I would be willing to adopt any reasonable suggestion of that sort.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would ask the hon. member (Mr. McCraney) who has charge of this Bill if he would accept an amendment compelling these people to go on with the work during the present year and to expend a certain amount? or does he intend to insist that the clause should be left as it is so that, practically, the charter may be carried about for sale and probably the work tied up for the next four years?

Mr. McCRANEY. The clause which my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) is discussing is the last clause in the Bill. I have not considered, nor have I discussed with the promoters, the question which he has raised. Even if we go on with the consideration of the Bill, I do not suppose we shall reach that clause. When we do reach that clause, I shall probably be able to give information on that subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the Bill in its present form been submitted to the civic authorities of Saskatoon?

Mr. McCRANEY. Yes. I will send the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) a letter which I received from the city council approving of the Bill in its present form.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did the promoters assure the council of Saskatoon that they would proceed with the work during the present year?

Mr. McCRANEY. I cannot inform my hon. friend as to what assurances were given by the promoters to the city of Saskatoon. But the city authorities had before them the Bill with the clause as it is now before the committee.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think it would be well for the hon. member (Mr. McCraney), in justice to the city of Saskatoon which he has the honour to represent, that he should write to the city authorities at once and bring their attention to this clause, so that we may know that they have been advised of the seriousness of the matter. I, for one, would like to be thoroughly assured that the inhabitants of Saskatoon realize what this may involve. I do not wish to oppose the passage of the Bill with the present incorporators, but, on behalf of the people of Saskatoon and of the towns that will be started in that locality, I think there ought to be some assurance that the work will be commenced within a reasonable time. Otherwise, this Bill means the tying up of that whole country in respect of one of its most important public services. I do not know the men who are concerned in this company, except Mr. Stratton. I do not say anything against him personally. I would be just as glad to see Mr. Stratton go through with it as any other man provided we are assured the work will go ahead. But, in view of the seriousness of the matter I hope the hon. member (Mr. McCraney) will to-morrow send a copy of 'Hansard' to the city authorities of Saskatoon that they may see the little discussion we have had. They can then say whether they are quite satisfied to let the Bill go through.

Mr. SPROULE. And what becomes of the argument of the Minister of Public

Works (Mr. Pugsley) and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) with regard to the proper authority to give these privileges? This seems to be a local affair; it does not go outside the province. It may cross a navigable stream——

Mr. J. D. REID. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, if it does not, what argument can be used in this case that will not apply with greater force to the Bill if just dealt with?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have been greatly bothered about this Bill. When it was before the committee on a previous occasion ,I raised this point of the jurisdiction of parliament to deal with the matter. My hon. friend (Mr. McCraney) who was promoting the Bill called my attention to the fact that by the terms of the Irrigation Act, all the waters of every river in the Northwest, and the bed and shores of every stream are vested in the Crown in right of the Dominion. He raised the question whether the provincial legislature could give authority to erect a dam upon property belonging to the Dominion of Canada. I suggested that he should confer with the Minister of Justice, who was the proper authority to advise on the subject. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCraney) has assured me that it is the opinion of the Minister of Justice that the Bill could properly be passed by this parliament. That being so, even though I had some doubt at first, I do not see that I should press my views, more particularly as the government of the province of Saskatoon has written, through its Deputy Attorney General, stating that the advisers of the province see no objection to the passing of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. With reference to that, I remember that there was a dispute about the fisheries in the province of Quebec on the Matane river, if I remember right, it was decided that the foreshores belong to the people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the Irrigation Act expressly reserves these rights.

Mr. SPROULE. But, once the land is sold, the Act cannot reserve it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, parliament can do anything.

Mr. FIELDING. I think there is always danger of error in amending a Bill like this at the table in a hurried way. I have an amendment here which I will not move, as the discussion on the Bill is not likely to be finished to-night, but I will hand it in and I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr McCraney) that he should look it over and consult the law clerk of the House about it. I propose that, instead of saying that the time and place for hearing shall be fixed by the Governor in Council, the following shall be embodied in the Bill, following the words 'time and place' in subsection 2 of section 3:—

At which application will be made to the Minister of Public Works for his approval of such plans; and the Minister of Public Works, after hearing such application, at such time or such other time as may be agreed upon by him, shall report to the Governor in Council, whether in his opinion such plans should be approved, and the Governor in Council may approve of such plans, &c.

SUPPLY.

The hour for private Bills having expired, House resumed in Committee of Supply.

St. Boniface public building, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site for this building cost $4,500, and it is estimated that the total cost of the building, including site, heating, electric wiring, fixtures, furniture, &c., will be $39,920.82, and this amount which we are now asking is expected to complete the work, including fitting and furniture.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is this lot in the centre of the town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not acquainted with the locality. It is on the corner of Provencher avenue and Aulneault street.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the size of the lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 66 feet on Provencher avenue and 120 feet on Aulneault street.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the cost of the fittings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Heating and boilers, $2,500; electric wiring and fixtures, $1,000; fittings and furniture, $5,000; sidewalks and fencing, $1,500.

Mr. J. D. REID. The building is erected now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building is pretty well along. There was expended to December 31 last, $19,920. That includes the site.

Mr. J. D. REID. When will it be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected to be completed on September 4 next.

Winnipeg—new examining warehouse, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote and it is asked to make provision for the erection of a new examining warehouse in the city of Winnipeg. This is to be a very large building four storeys in height, brick and steel, with stone facings, concrete and stone foundations. It is to be fire-proof throughout. In erecting these large buildings for the purposes of the customs examining warehouses, particularly, it has been thought that they should be as near fire-proof as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the full cost expected to be ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total probable cost, inclusive of the site and heating, electric wiring, fixtures, &c., is estimated at $417,744.59. The amount of the contract is $276,000. The site cost $88,125. The remainder covers the cost of heating, boilers, electric wiring, fixtures, fittings, furniture and sidewalks.

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

Mr. PUGSLEY. J. McDiarmid & Co., Limited, Winnipeg.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who drew the plans ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were drawn in the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is strange you have men here capable of drawing plans for a building like this in Winnipeg, while for a shed in Quebec there are no men capable of drawing the plans.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentlemen forgets what kind of a shed that is.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that this vote has been up once or twice before. I was in the examining warehouse at Winnipeg last summer, and this new building is certainly not coming any too soon because it is much needed. I think it is a disgrace to the government and the country, and it does not allow the people who have the work to do an opportunity for properly doing it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure my hon. friend will commend us most highly for endeavouring to wipe out that disgrace or stigma as quickly as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. I will, if proper foresight and economy are used in the expenditure of the money. I do not know about the cost of the site. Land, of course, is very high there. I presume that you purpose building alongside of the present building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have endeavoured to have the building erected at the lowest possibly cost consistently with securing a first-class building for the purpose. We asked for tenders in the usual way. There were three tenders received ranging from $276,000 to $319,000, and we accepted the lowest tender.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will there be any extras ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not that I am aware of. I think the steel alone will cost about $100,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are there any schedule prices ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, a lump sum contract.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is the site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Corner of Rorie street and McDermott avenue.

Mr. J. D. REID. From whom was the site purchased ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was purchased from Wm. Mackenzie, D. D. Mann and Roderick J. Mackenzie.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was there a commission paid to any one for purchasing it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. SPROULE. It was never purchased without a commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a hard thing to say.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, it is only in line with what we have found when we have got the information out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have been here for a good many months and I have never heard the suggestion made that there has been any secret commission paid to any person who has bought land as a site for a public building.

Mr. SPROULE. In nearly every case we have had this session, the minister has given us the amount of the commission ; I cannot remember the instances.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Paid to people for buying property for the department ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, real estate agents. Do you buy land on the Intercolonial Railway for nothing ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend does not suggest——

Mr. SPROULE. That you are as bad as they are with reference to the purchase of property on the Intercolonial Railway. You have a reputation that is a hundred per cent worse.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister has a nice way of putting it when he says there is no commission paid. Take the Transcontinental Railway. I will not refer to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask my hon. friend who has taken his seat (Mr. Sproule) to point out a single instance in which the Department of Public Works has been shown to have paid a commission upon the purchase of land.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Were not commissions paid for the purchase of this property on Mackenzie avenue ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A man was appointed specially to act for the government. I do not understand that the employment of a person to buy land, and the open payment of a commission, as was done then, is what was referred to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not what he says.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. We have the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) explaining it, but that is only paying commission in another form. Another way is that a friend of the government gets a hint, he purchases the property and makes a great big profit on it. The minister would say that there was no commission paid in that case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tell me of a single case in my department in which such a thing has been proved.

Mr. J. D. REID. We will probably before the end of the session, if we can reach the items in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You have the fullest opportunity of examining the Public Works accounts.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, we have examined some and the minister knows it has been rascally.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have made inquiry and I have never found anything that would justify the statement of the hon. gentleman. There may be some cases which would be open to some criticism, but there is nothing at all that I have seen that would justify the severe statement the hon. gentleman makes. It is all very well to take hearsay evidence, insinuations and suggestions, but in order to get the facts you must have proof and have some one who can speak from knowledge. As far as I can observe there has been no proof on which you can place reliance in regard to anything wrong in respect to the purchase of land for public buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. Last year information was given to the House that we paid $40,000 commission for buying lots of land down there for public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely my hon. friend must see he is wrong. Does he say that for the purchase of properties on Sussex street commissions of $40,000 were paid ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do say so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. To whom ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think one White. He paid $3,000 for elections in London and he said he was friendly to the government and therefore it was justifiable for him to give it. I am sure I am within the mark when I say he got $40,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information from my deputy is that Mr. White received $1,500. That is as near the mark as my hon. friend usually is.

Mr. SPROULE. I will remind my hon. friend ; my memory is not so bad as that and I went over the transaction with great care.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You say it was paid to White ?

Mr. SPROULE. I said my impression was the name was White.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You said positively——

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say positively, I said my impression was. I do not want the minister to pin me down to what I did not say. When I make a statement I stand by it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You say now it was $40,000 ?

Mr. SPROULE. No, I said, speaking from memory, the amount I believed was $40,000 and I think I can hunt it up and show him I am correct. I said my impression was the name was White but I was not sure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was not here last year but I venture to challenge my hon. friend to produce evidence of that. I do not believe anything of the kind ever took place, and I happen to know that the gentleman who has been appointed to purchase the properties is purchasing them upon a small commission. It is absurd to say that $40,000 was paid.

Mr. SPROULE. Not solely as commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said as commission and I challenge my hon. friend to look up the evidence and submit it to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not at all concerned about the hon. gentleman's belief if he was an atheist or anything else, but I am concerned about my own knowledge and I shall hunt this up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I venture to say you cannot find anything of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend need not be too positive. It is not the first time he has been positive, nor is it the first time he has been shown to be absolutely incorrect. I will take the trouble to look it up, I am not going to be beaten down in that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not trying to beat you down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What commission was paid ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was a small commission, I think 2 per cent.

Mr. J. D. REID. I remember the discussion on this last year. There was not only

Mr. White but, if I remember right, another gentleman in Ottawa and the amount was more than $1,500. The minister has taken the ground to-night that his department has not been in the habit of paying commissions for the purchase of land. We on this side are not in a position to disprove that statement as far as he is concerned, because we have not before us the Auditor General's Report for the expenditures since he assumed office, but we can prove that up to this last year amounts have been paid to certain individuals for purchasing properties.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend assume that the payment of a commission would be improper? I am not discussing whether commissions have been paid but I say that in many cases if one known to be an agent of the government goes to purchase land he will immediately find the price raised. That is human nature. It is the part of wisdom that persons shall be employed to get land who are not known to be agents of the government. And if a fair business commission is paid on a transaction of that kind it is a good transaction for the treasury as for one dollar spent in commission you probably save $10 in the price of the land. Of course I am assuming a fair and reasonable commission.

Mr. J. D. REID. As far as that is concerned I do not take issue with the minister; but when Dr. Sproule asked what the commission was the Minister of Public Works took it as an insult and as absurd.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not intend to say anything offensive. My remarks were induced by the suggestion or insinuation which we have had to-day that there was some secret commission, a middleman who had bought the property and had got a commission in some way out of it. That is very different from the appointment of men like Mr. Riopelle who was appointed openly to purchase the properties on Sussex street. What made me speak as I did was the unjustified statement that we had paid as high as $40,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the total amount paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that the commission was 2 per cent and as the property costs between $500,000 and $600,000 the commission would be $10,000 to $12,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not what invited the reply from the minister. My first question was what commission was paid and the minister answered that it was absurd to ask the question and that there was an insinuation of something wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did not the hon. gentleman say: It is always the case, always a commission? I took that as suggesting that secret commissions were paid to middlemen.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not until the hon. gentleman said it was absurd to ask such a question.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not think any hon. member of this House will agree with the minister that the payment of this commission is justifiable. There are in the department many men just as capable as any man in the city of Ottawa to make terms for the purchase of these lands. It was well known in the city of Ottawa that these gentlemen were the agents of the government. Every man on Sussex street knew that the government were purchasing these lands. Then why did the government throw away $12,000 on one of their friends when they had many men in the department quite as capable of doing the work.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman perhaps forgets the evidence that was given by Mr. Riopelle before the Public Accounts Committee, why this commission should be paid. It greatly exceeded $12,000, because in the first instance Mr. White and two or three other gentlemen took a preliminary canter around, announcing to the people that they were going to purchase for the government. I think they were paid pretty nearly $8,000. Mr. Riopelle frankly admitted before the Public Accounts Committee that when he went over the ground he told everybody what he was there for. He established a regular bureau at his office on Rideau street, and the department furnished him with a clerk and a messenger. I think the expense ran altogether to from $20,000 to $25,000. Mr. Riopelle assigned an excellent reason why his intervention was sought. It was that after a conference with Mr. Hyman, they came to the conclusion that there was no person in the department fit to conduct such negotiations. That was an awful reflection on the Department of Public Works. I would ask the minister if the services of Mr. Riopelle and the clerk and messenger are still continued?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that Mr. White and the other gentlemen to whom my hon. friend refers were not employed for the purpose of purchasing the properties, but were appointed as valuators. The department was desirous of getting these properties as cheaply as possible, and in cases where they could not be obtained at prices which the department thought reasonable, proceedings would be taken by way of expropriation, these two gentlemen were appointed for the purpose of valuing the properties. I think Mr. Riopelle was the only one employed for the purpose of making purchases. Mr. Riopelle and his clerk are still employed by the department, but the services of the messenger have been dispensed with. We intend to retain their

services until the expropriation proceedings are completed.

Mr. BENNETT. How much is it expected that there will be further coming to Mr. Riopelle?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able at the moment to tell my hon. friend.

Mr. CROCKET. What were the valuators paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has not told us yet from whom the land for this building in Winnipeg was purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was purchased from Messrs. William Mackenzie, D. D. Mann and K. Mackenzie.

Mr. SPROULE. Through whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no memorandum beyond the names of the vendors and the price.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister get the information and let us know through whom the purchase was made, and what was paid as commission and for the examination of titles?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the land acquired by expropriation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The order in council authorizes the purchase from Messrs. Mackenzie and his associates and therefore I assume that it was not acquired by expropriation.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the $417,000 complete the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and pay for the site, fittings, furniture and everything else.

Winnipeg—new immigration building, including additional land, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make payments in connection with the erection of the immigration building at Winnipeg. The building is 200 feet by 61 feet 4 inches. It is four storeys high from the basement. It is built of brick, the roof is covered with copper, the floors are fire-proof, the staircase is of iron, the partitions are covered with iron lath and cement plaster. It is made pretty nearly fire-proof. I may say that the expenditure up to the 31st of December last was $252,585.33.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Does that include the heating apparatus, the furniture and everything connected with the building, or is it only for the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That $252,885 covers everything, fittings and all.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. When was it finished?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are asking now for $2,000. There will be a further vote of $6,000 required for furnishings.

Mr. SPROULE. To come back to the question of commissions, I have found the reference in 'Hansard.' The acting Minister of Public Works at that time (Mr. Fisher) was asked what was the cost of the properties purchased by the government and he replied $400,000. He also stated that Mr. Riopelle of Ottawa had acted for the government in getting options on them. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) asked what about the commission and the acting minister replied: 'He is paid 5 per cent, I think.' Now, 5 per cent on $400,000 would amount to $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. colleague, Mr. Fisher, was either misreported or was in error.

Mr. SPROULE. I take this from 'Hansard.' I was not so very far out in my recollection. That $400,000 was only for part of the land.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Much more than the half—pretty nearly the whole.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The government had a vote last year for additional land. Would the minister inform us what is the total quantity of land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an exchange apparently with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think this is a description of the land:

It is composed of the southern fourteen feet of lots 61, 87, 96 and 118, and the northern 52 feet of lots 60 and 88, according to a plan of survey of lot 35, east of Main street, of the parish of St. John, registered in the Winnipeg land titles office, Winnipeg division, as plan 63; and also that portion of lots 95 and 117 of said lot and plan which may be described as follows: Commencing at the northwest corner of lot 95, thence south along the west boundary of said lot 52 feet; thence east parallel to the south boundary of said lot a distance of 98 feet; thence along a curve to the north of 521·6 feet, more or less radius to the northeast corner of lot 117; thence westerly along the north boundary of lots 117 and 95 to the place of beginning.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is this building to be used exclusively for immigration purposes? What length of time are the immigrants allowed to stay in it? Is any portion of the supplies to be furnished by the government other than beds?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to be used exclusively for immigration purposes. As regards the manner and the length of time, that is in the control of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is a very good reason why the Minister of the Interior should be here. It is not treating this House properly to have any minister absent when supplies are being voted concerning which only he can give the information. The Minister of Public Works cannot give the information I ask because the Minister of the Interior is not here. But these are things we ought to know before we allow the estimates to pass. When an item comes under two departments, both ministers should be present.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All we are asking for is $2,000 to complete the payment. The information my hon. friend desires can be had when the estimates of the Minister of the Interior come before the committee. What information is it he requires?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is the building to be used solely for immigration purposes? Does the government furnish any supplies to the immigrants? How long are the immigrants allowed to stay there? Is there any charge in connection with the supplies to immigrants who have the means to pay? The estimates of the Minister of the Interior are usually in block sums—four or five items in all, and we get very little information. If the member interested does not happen to be present, the information is not given. If this item goes through without our getting the information I ask, the chances are we will never get it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can give the practice at St. John and also at Quebec. The right to furnish meals to the immigrants is let by contract, and the meals are supplied at a very small sum above actual cost.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Are none paid for by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, unless perhaps in the case of a very poor immigrant.

Winnipeg—new post office, land and building, $100,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. It is for the erection of a new post office situated on Fourteenth avenue between Garry and Fort streets. It has a frontage of 134 feet and a depth of 166 feet. The rear line measures eighty feet in extent. The front portion of the building is to be six storeys high. It has a basement. The total cost, including site, heating, lighting, fittings and furnishing letter boxes will be $774,004.97. There was expended to the 31st December $656,159.97.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). When will it be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is practically completed now.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Two years ago the minister said it would be completed that year.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. LEFURGEY. When the building is completed, it will not be large enough to accommodate the work required to be carried on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Winnipeg is growing so marvellously, it is difficult to anticipate the requirements of the near future. This is a very large building. The lower stories will afford 17,000 superficial feet of space and the upper stories 15,000 feet. The post office alone has 10,000 superficial feet.

Mr. LEFURGEY. They will have to get additional space.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They thought years ago that the old post office was large enough.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We are here to think of the future, especially when we are spending millions.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. We have heard of the practice in other departments as to the opening of tenders. Would the minister (Mr. Pugsley) explain the practice in his department as it has been and as it is since he became minister?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the advertisement calling for tenders parties are notified to direct their tenders to the secretary of the department. When tenders reach the secretary in ordinary course, they are laid away in the safe. When the time comes for opening them, they are opened in the presence of the deputy minister and the minister.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Not the stenographer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the deputy minister and the minister.

Winnipeg—postal station 'B,' north of Canadian Pacific Railway track, $35,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would move that this vote be reduced by $10,000. There is in the vote as it appears a revote of $10,000, which amount was spent during the last fiscal year.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the total cost to be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total probable cost including site, heating, electric wiring, fittings and furniture is $76,629.33. The total expenditure to 31st December last is $51,629.33, leaving to complete $25,000.

Amendment agreed to.

Public Works—chargeable to income—Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories—Battleford public building, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. It is to make provision for a site and to begin the erection of a public building at Battleford for post office, &c. We are negotiating for the site and have sent a representative from the department to Battleford to look over the ground and make a recommendation.

Mr. BARR. What is the building to be used for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For a post office, and I understand that the Dominion lands office, telegraph office and immigration office will also be in the building.

Mr. LAKE. In which Battleford is the building to be erected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The old town of Battleford.

Mr. LAKE. And negotiations are going on for a site in old Battleford?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the site expected to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope to get a suitable site for $2,500 or $3,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Then why this vote for $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is hoped to proceed with the building and do something on it this year.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the total estimated cost, including heating, electric lighting, furniture, &c.?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that he estimates it at about $35,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Are the plans being prepared?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have not yet been prepared.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand the $35,000 estimated is exclusive of the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. How long has this item been in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was in last year, but whether it was in the year before or not I am not informed.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the population of old Battleford, as it is called?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the census of 1906 it is 933.

Mr. BENNETT. And what is the population of the new town of Battleford?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the figures before me.

Mr. BARR. Is not old Battleford going back?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The people are very hopeful of its future and it seems to be getting along very well. It has two churches, two hotels, flour mill, sawmill, newspaper and telegraph office. I am not prepared to say that it is going behind; in fact, I do not think that is the case.

Mr. BENNETT. The building is to cost $35,000 and the site $3,000—$38,000 in all. Does that include every contingency of expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is my information.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems a pretty large amount to spend in a town that has a rival within six or seven miles.

Mr. LAKE. The new town of Battleford is probably nearer than that—within two or three miles, if you could go direct across, and I believe there is to be a bridge. The new town has nearly reached the population of the old town. It seems a rather extraordinary proceeding, if the new town is likely to be the larger of the two, to put this building in the old town in preference.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Battleford seems to be quite an important place. As the hon. member (Mr. Lake) is aware it is perhaps the oldest town in Western Saskatchewan. It has a post of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, it has a land titles office, an Indian agency. And I have the statement here that the population is now 1,100, which differs a little from the figure according to the census.

Mr. BENNETT. The census was several years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I am informed that the population now is 1,100.

Mr. LAKE. What the minister has said rather gives point to the suggestion that North Battleford is the town in which this building should be placed. These government institutions of which he has spoken are placed in the old town. I find that in 1906 the old town had a population of 933. The new town was not in existence in 1901, but in 1906 it had grown to a population of 824. So the new town has equal claims with the old town to have this government building.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the post office revenue ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the nine months, $3,501. The money orders issued were $26,794, and the money orders paid $31,998. The building will cost about $35,000.

Calgary public building—enlargement for post office and examining warehouse purposes, changes, fittings, &c., $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The original building has been found too small, owing to the rapid growth of Calgary, and it has been found necessary to make an addition. The addition is larger than the original building. The contract has been let, and this grant will complete the payments. The amount of the contract was $77,000. There are other contracts for heating, wiring, passenger elevator, and some additional work, amounting to $2,596.

Edmonton public building, $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to continue the erection of a public building in the town of Edmonton upon a site which was purchased in 1906. The building, which is under contract, will be three stories high with a basement and attic. A portion of the building on the street corner is carried up five stories above the basement. The site cost $20,000. We have paid the contractors $98,720 up to the 31st of December, and there are other expenses in connection with the building, such as surveys, travelling, printing, advertisements, architects' fees and so forth, amounting altogether, including site, to $124,842.67. The contractors are the May-Sharp Construction Company. I believe they are giving good satisfaction. The total cost of the building including site, heating, wiring, furniture, will be $285,785.67. It is to be used for a post office, customs house, examining warehouse and weights and measures. The architects were the Ottawa Engineering and Architectural Construction Company.

Mr. BENNETT. Who comprise that company ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect informs me, Band, Burritt and Meredith. They were paid two per cent for the plans and specifications. We have a clerk of works on the spot.

Mr. CROCKET. Why were these plans and specifications not prepared by the architects of the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This firm was employed because at the time the department was pressed with other work. The clerk of works is Mr. Manson. The chief architect thinks he is getting $4 a day.

Mr. CROCKET. That seems a large amount to pay for a site. Who was it bought from ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Edmonton is becoming quite a metropolis. The site is a large one, 90 by 100 feet, and was bought from Gariepy and Lessard. The land was vacant at the time of the purchase. The property is a corner lot with a frontage of 90 feet on one street and 150 on another.

Mr. LAKE. Does this work take up all the time of the clerk of works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, he is supposed to be on the works all the time.

Mr. LAKE. Does the minister think it is good policy to employ a man at a very small salary like that to oversee a great public work of this nature ? There must be a great temptation to a man at a very low salary to pass over improper work if approached by the contractor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course we have to be guided by the wages that are paid to inspectors by the wages which are paid to masons and builders. In the east we pay $3 and sometimes $3.50 per day. When we get to Victoria we have to pay $5.50, and in some cases more. In one case on the mainland of British Columbia we have to pay as high as $7 because stone masons and bricklayers get as high as $7 per day. We have been thinking of fixing a scale of wages for the clerks of works in each province equal to the highest fair wage scale of the Department of Labour with respect to the particular work upon which the man employed may be engaged. This man has been doing work for the government for a long period and apparently he has not insisted upon his wages going up proportionately with the wages of other people.

Mr. BENNETT. Is he a practical man?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A thoroughly practical man.

Mr. BENNETT. What is his calling?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is a carpenter and builder.

Mr. LAKE. It seems to me that we are not proceeding on the right principle. I think that the class of man who is employed to do such responsible work as overlooking the work done by a contractor on a very big undertaking is open to temptation, if he receives the ordinary wages paid to the ordinary workmen on the building, to allow work to be scamped if he is improperly approached by the contractor. On some of these large works a very small amount of work scamped would mean a very large sum of money in the aggregate, and I think we ought to have the very highest class of men employed in overseeing these works. I think that is something that the minister might take into his consideration. Some of the works which have been built by the government of late have not been very satisfactory. We have heard of some of them coming to grief, and it is quite possible that it is attributable to employing men of that class who would consider as a sufficient compensation the ordinary workman's wages.

Mr. BENNETT. Who inspects the work outside of this clerk?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From time to time an architect is sent from the department to inspect.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to ask the minister if there are any particular qualifications required for a man to be overseer of a building at the present time. The minister must be aware of the fact that you cannot get to-day a competent foreman to oversee work of that kind for $4 a day. Ordinary carpenters were getting $4 a day all last year in the west. Every man who could handle a saw would get $3.50 and

$4, and a stonemason would get $6. You could not hire a man in any town in the west for less than that. How do you expect to get a competent man to oversee a $250,000 job at an ordinary workman's wages? I know that men have been employed to oversee public works who are not competent. Party service is about the only qualification that some have for their appointment. The overseer is on the job and paid every day although the workman is very often off work. That may be some compensation for him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course, we cannot always be sure that an employee is honest even if we pay him $5 or $6 a day, but we do find that we can get clerks of works who are willing to work for the same wages which those who are actually engaged in the work get. While the responsibility is greater the work is not of such an arduous character as the work of the stone masons, carpenters and bricklayers. This man who is clerk of works on the Edmonton public building has been acting in that capacity for the government for years. It must be borne in mind that he, having proved himself to be a capable and honest man, as the department thinks, has received steady employment and $4 per day right along, and that is not too bad.

Mr. LAKE. Winter and summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Winter and summer. We are fortunate in being able to retain the services of this man at that figure. I think he is just as honest and faithful as he would be if we paid him a dollar a day more.

Estevan land office, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We did away with the project of erecting a public building for a land office at Alameda, and we propose erecting a building of a more expensive character at Estevan, making it a post office and land office as well; so that, this building, it is supposed, will cost about $22,000 when completed.

Mr. CROCKET. How many of these land offices have been built in Saskatchewan?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell my hon. friend offhand, but we will get the information.

Mr. LAKE. Have you acquired the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. Where about, and what is the price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend. perhaps knows the locality. The site is composed of lots 1, 2 and 3, block 43, on the corner of Fourth street and Thirteenth ave., there being a frontage of 75 feet on Fourth street and a depth of 120 feet on Thirteenth avenue. The price is $2,000. It was purchased from Dr. D. R. Davis. He was acting on behalf of the owners, whose names I do not know.

Humboldt public buildings, $10,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Explain that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of this amount $2,000 is a revote. It is to make provision for the erection of a public building at Humboldt for post office purposes, &c. We have not yet obtained a site. We made an agreement to purchase one but the vendors have not so far been able or willing to give title and it is not unlikely we will have to get another site.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the population of Humboldt?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the population. The postal revenue for nine months of 1907 was, money orders, $15,087; money orders paid, $14,883. It is a growing town, a divisional point on the Canadian Northern half-way between Battleford and Dauphin. The cost of the building will probably not exceed $20,000.

Mr. LAKE. I would again ask the minister on what principle these buildings are distributed? I find that Humboldt has a population of 279, but there are other towns in the same district with larger populations such as Davidson, 520; Hanly, 568; and Melthorpe, 351. Why did the minister select Humboldt in this particular case for a public building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is difficult for me to answer that as the selection was made by my predecessor. Humboldt has been made the location of the Dominion Lands Office with five officers and employees, and it has also been made a customs port of entry so that a public building may reasonably be located in Humboldt.

Mr. LAKE. Humboldt is very fortunate indeed. and apparently is getting quite a lot of patronage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site consists of three lots having a frontage of 75 feet on Main street by 132 feet on Franklin street. It is a corner lot. We agreed to pay $3,000, but I regret that the vendors do not seem willing to complete the purchase.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is an absolutely ridiculous price.

Mr. BENNETT. They know they will get more.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they know they will not. In fact we have given them notice that as they have failed to complete the transfer, unless they complete it in ten days the agreement will be cancelled and we will purchase a lot elsewhere.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. To pay $3,000 for a lot 75 by 132 feet is ridiculous.

Mr. ADAMSON. Humboldt has a population of from 500 to 600.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not care if it has a thousand.

Mr. ADAMSON. It makes a difference.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. To pay $3,000 for a site in such a town, is as bad as the Dauphin purchase.

Mr. ADAMSON. The vendors will not make title.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. From whom was it bought ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. H. J. McDonald.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is a ridiculous price.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did the member recommend that price to the government ?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, I recommended the government to close at that price. The vendors asked $4,000, but I advised the government to pay $3,000 and if they could not get it for that to get a lot elsewhere.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Did they know it was to be bought for public purposes ?

Mr. ADAMSON. I presume they did, that the inspector went up there.

Mr. LAKE. When the hon. member said that the population was over 500 he was making a very generous estimate.

Mr. ADAMSON. I have a report from the overseer of the town, the mayor.

Mr. LAKE. There are other towns of larger populations in that district and in other districts that are not getting public buildings.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The question of the principle on which these buildings are erected is significantly answered by the buildings in the Northwest. Public buildings are being erected in the constituencies represented by our Liberal friends, Messrs. McCraney, Adamson, Turriff, Oliver, Knowles, Sifton, Burrows, Cyr, Jackson, Crawford and Dr. Cash; while my colleagues on this side, Messrs. Schaffner and Staples and myself from Manitoba have not a public building. We cannot induce the government to spend even $500 to build a shanty to protect the firearms in our town. I think that illustrates the discrimination made, and the fact that the only principle recognized in the erection of these buildings is the principle of patronage to those supporting the government. We have just as important towns to say the least in our constituencies, which are just as deserving of public buildings as other towns, except in the matter of sending a supporter of the government to this House. The hon. minister, who is so politic in some respects, might possible make more headway from a political point of view by pursuing a different course. The town in which I reside, Minnedosa, is of considerably more importance than Humboldt and several other towns which have been given public buildings. We have there a company of dragoons and a post office, and we at one time had a land office, but we have not been able to induce the government to erect a building.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the hon. gentleman give us an idea of what they paid for any other lot of the same size in Humboldt?

Mr. ADAMSON. I think a statement was sent in and is on file showing the prices of other lots. I am not prepared to admit that the town of Minnedosa is superior to Humboldt, though it is very much older. Humboldt is in the centre of a very fertile farming district, with a dense population about it and it is growing well.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It has not been pressing its claims so long as some of the other towns I have referred to.

Mr. ADAMSON. I am not prepared to speak on that point ; but there is a customs office and a land office there as well as a post office, and the officers employed in them should be properly housed.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the distinguishing feature of this lot ?

Mr. ADAMSON. It is high and dry and is well situated in the centre of the town, where a public building will be shown off remarkably well.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is a high and dry price, at any state. I would like to ask the minister if his inspector went to inspect that lot ?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Who is the inspector?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Mahler.

Mr. CROCKET. What did he report ?

Mr. ADAMSON. He reported favourably.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to call the attention of the public to the purchase of this lot for $3,000 in a town of 500 people, while a lot was bought in the centre of St. Boniface, quite a large city, for $4,000, and a lot in Neepawa for $3,000. This item should not be allowed to pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say, with regard to Mr. Mahler, who valued the land, that he is a gentleman who has a very high reputation indeed. He was selected as the expert to value the land and buildings of the Dominion government when they were taken over by the province of Saskatchewan, as one in whom both governments might have the utmost confidence. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that one would hardly be warranted in saying

that in a growing town like Humboldt, which has become a divisional point of the Canadian Northern Railway, which has a land office, and which is the centre of a splendid farming country, $3,000 would be an excessive price to pay for a corner lot equivalent to three 25-foot lots at $1,000 each. At all events, we have the fact that while the department has been urging the vendors to complete the sale, and has been ready to hand over the money, they have declined to do so, and we have been compelled to notify them that unless they complete the title in ten days, we will cancel the offer and look elsewhere.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the name of this place prior to the last general election?

Mr. ADAMSON. Humboldt.

Mr. BENNETT. I have the election returns, but I do not find a polling place of the name of Humboldt.

Mr. ADAMSON. There is no polling place, because the town was not commenced, or the railway built.

Mr. BENNETT. I find in the election returns that at the polling place of Bonne Madone there were 31 votes for the hon. gentleman and none for his opponent; at Schafer there were 41 votes for the hon. gentleman and none for his opponent; at Wakwa lake there were 17 votes for the hon. gentleman and none for his opponent; at Crooked lake there were thirty votes for the hon. gentleman and none for his opponent. Crooked lake, thirty for himself and none for his opponent. Trojca, forty-six for himself, none for his opponent. Halzxs, one hundred and nineteen for himself, none for his opponent. Kolonzia, one hundred and twenty-three for himself, three for his opponent. Fish creek, ninety-three for himself, none for his opponent. After the magnificent votes the hon. gentleman got at those different places,—and I may say too there seemed to be no spoiled ballots there, probably owing to the fact that the deputy marked them——

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not think there is any reason for such an insinuation.

Mr. BENNETT. The names are rather indicative of a foreign element.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes, and they are there still.

Mr. BENNETT. No doubt that is a comfort to the hon. gentleman. Why should these places, with only 500 or 600 people, be given public buildings, when these other places which poll 123 votes for the hon. gentleman to six against him, such as Kolonzia, has gone? What is the population of Kolonzia?

Mr. ADAMSON. Kolonzia is not a town but a township. There are a good many more than 100 votes at that place now.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have listened to some of the most reckless statements with regard to the expenditure of public money in that western country, coming from the Minister of Public Works. One would hardly expect a man in his position to make such statements. He is satisfied to give away the peoples' money to the constituencies only which support the government. When charged that only such constituencies may expect the expenditure of public money the hon. minister smiles and says that is practically where he intends to put it. We find the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) showing that there are a dozen other towns, with two or three times the population, urgently in need of public buildings, but not even a shed will be offered them because they are represented by opposition members. I feel compelled to make my protest against the use of public money in this way. The minister is using the money of the whole country and not of only one political party, and when I see how he is distributing that money to bribe the constituencies I cannot help entering my protest.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of the very rude challenge which I got from the Minister of Public Works after I had told him that $40,000 had been paid in commission on purchases of property in this city by the government, I felt compelled to look up the particulars. In the Auditor General's Report for 1896, I find that these properties cost $685,000. I find also in the 'Hansard' that the acting minister at that time, Mr. Fisher, said that 5 per cent commission was paid. That commission on $685,000 would amount to $34,250. But I find further in the Auditor General's Report that, in connection with the same property, there was paid to sundry parties, one of whom was Mr. James White, $7,314. True one or two of these items were for valuation and the other is for securing options, but they are all payments to secure the properties. Adding these items together, you have a total of $42,564. I now ask the minister if he does not think he was too hasty in the very imperative challenge he gave me and in the offensive way in which he referred to my statement when I said the commissions footed up to $40,000? If I was misled, I was misled by the Acting Minister of Public Works. In the 'Hansard' of 1906-7 the following question was asked by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Blain):

What properties in Ottawa have been purchased by the government since January? What amount of commissions have been paid on such purchases and to whom? What was paid for legal expenses, outside the Justice Department, on each property?

The acting minister (Mr. Fisher) asked the hon. member to make a motion and promised to facilitate his getting the re-

turn. It was too much, he said, to give in the form of an answer to a question. I find that afterwards a motion was made for this return but up to the present it has not been brought down. It is like some other returns moved for, with reference to which the order of the House has been entirely disregarded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the statement my hon. friend makes, no doubt he was quite right in saying what he did about commissions; but knowing, as I do, that 2 per cent was the amount paid Mr. Riopelle, the hon. gentleman will understand how astonished I was at his statement. The land agents would only make a commission of $12,000 if the properties cost $600,000 whereas at 5 per cent they would get $30,000. I wish to express regret if I said anything which hurt my hon. friend's feelings. I certainly had no intention of doing so and I think that the hon. gentleman in turn should withdraw the expression 'rude' which he applied to me. The whole thing is a mutual mistake, and that is owing to the fact that there is an error in the 'Hansard' as to the amount of the commission.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no objection in the world to make any amends due the hon. Minister of Public Works. I said what I thought as absolutely true and which I had good grounds for believing was true. In view of the explanation made by the hon. minister, I accept his withdrawl.

Mr. HERRON. It is astonishing how liberal the government are in spending money in those constituencies which return supporters of the government. Here we are spending in a town of 500 or 600 people some $20,000 to $25,000 on a public building. I have seven or eight towns in my riding, which never had a public building, and are just as prosperous as the one referred to, and a number of them have 3,000, 4,000 and some have 5,000 population. And I have no doubt that the post office and customs revenue are double the amount which they reach in those other small places. Yet no attempt has been made to supply these places with public buildings. It is evident that the government is liberal only in the case of towns which elect government supporters. Take the two southern constituencies in Alberta: The constituency of Calgary receives only the repairs of a few buildings that were constructed years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are spending a good deal of money in Calgary. We are putting an addition to the public building there larger than the original.

Mr. HERRON. And in my own constituency, the first settled in the whole province, one of the earliest settlements in the Northwest Territories, we are not getting a single dollar of public money spent. The fact is, that is merely a way of giving patronage to the people who 'vote right.' The government should surely have a better method of handing out public money.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the total cost of this building including site, lighting, heatings and fittings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between $22,000 and $25,000, apart from the site.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. For a place with 500 people?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the time the building is erected, it will be more.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have been looking over the reports concerning piers built by the Public Works Department at three places on lake Huron. If I had time to go into these matters, I could give the minister facts to show that his department is run in a most reckless manner. Apparently, the ministers in charge have allowed the affairs of the department to be run practically for party purposes. And the present minister appears to be going along in the same way, simply asking for money to spend in the ridings of members on his own side. But the money the minister is spending is the money of the people of the Dominion, not the money of one party.

Mr. BENNETT. Where is the thing going to stop? We are putting up this building in a little village of 500 people. In fact, there is no authority for the statement that there is even that many. The hon. member for the district (Mr. Adamson) has not said there are 500 people. Does the hon. gentleman reside in this village?

Mr. ADAMSON. No, but I have been there frequently, and can vouch for there being at least 500 people. It is the centre of a very large district. The constituency is over a hundred miles square and has a great number of settlers.

Mr. BENNETT. But they do not all go to this post office.

Mr. ADAMSON. No, this is for a land office and customs office. The land office, of course, has a great number of valuable documents, and these are not properly housed at the present time. This is for the use of the whole district and not for Humboldt alone. There is not a public building within 150 miles to the east of us or nearer than Prince Albert, nor is there one nearer Battleford on the west, which is 90 miles. It seems to me any person who considers the matter fairly will see that this affords accommodation for a large number of people and in an important district.

Mr. BENNETT. If we are to erect a public building in every village of 500 population, what will become of the credit of the country?

Mr. ADAMSON. This is for the accommodation of the 25,000 people in the district.

Mr. BENNETT. Of course, there must be people surrounding a village, or there would not be a village. I should think the Minister of Finance would sit up nights wondering what is to become of the credit of the country if this kind of things goes on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And yet hon. gentlemen on the other side are urging us to build more.

Mr. BENNETT. No, they are urging that some prudence and foresight should be displayed and that the public money should not be spent on the principle of party favouritism. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) was heralded by the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fowler) who told us that the minister would be the greatest spendthrift the Dominion had ever known. The hon. gentleman is certainly making good. And his reputation is in his own province seems to have been justified, because they are finding there that a province that was supposed to be on an even keel is millions behind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Absurd! There is no province that is in a better financial position than New Brunswick.

Mr. BENNETT. That is what the hon. gentleman says, but he cannot make the people of that province believe it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman says that in his own province they have confidence in him. He must be mesmerized; he is suffering under a hallucination.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We shall see when the time comes.

Mr. BENNETT. The time has passed. The hon. gentleman certainly came back from the general elections in New Brunswick in a very dazed condition, and he has not recovered from his daze yet. And let the hon. gentleman remember that he is carrying out this policy himself. He is the one who goes to council and recommends that these expenditures should be made. Of course, he has his colleagues in the same boat with him, but he is primarily responsible. While it is true that we cannot prevent them going on, we can enter our protest against this disgraceful expenditure—that is the right word I believe—of $25,000 in a village like this.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is the minister willing to take responsibility before this House and country of paying $3,000 for this site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have to. The agreement was made, and I propose carrying it out unless they fail to make good. I have given notice that unless they make good within ten days, we will buy elsewhere.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. There ought to be some way to prevent an expenditure that is so absolutely ridiculous and extravagant as this. The state of affairs indicated by the hon. member for Marquette is bad enough. It is bad enough to have this large expenditure on public buildings in different towns to go on without any principle to guide it. But it is still worse that this country should be called upon to pay $3,000 for a corner lot and two other lots in a town of 500 people. I cannot understand how men would ever have the cheek to ask that amount of money. A fair value for that corner lot, I would say, is about $500 and the other two are worth $200 each, and that is more than would be asked in any town in southern Manitoba. Southern Manitoba is a much better district and much more thickly populated, and you can buy a lot in any town in southern Manitoba from Winnipeg to the border of the province for less than half that money. If there are any means I can use, or any words I can say, to prevent such a reckless and extravagant transaction being put through by this government I want to be considered as having used it and as having said it. This is a parallel case to Dauphin.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has the hon. gentleman ever been in Humboldt and does he know what lots have been selling for recently in Humboldt?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I have never been in Humboldt. and I have never been to the north pole either, but I know pretty well what land is worth in any town in Manitoba. I would like to know if the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Adamson) can give to this House any reason why lots in the town of Humboldt should be worth more than town lots in southern Manitoba?

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not know anything about the value of town lots in Manitoba, but I do know their value in Humboldt?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If the hon. gentleman says that a lot 75 by 132 feet in the town of Humboldt, with a population of 500, is worth $3,000, I take it upon myself to say that he does not know anything about the value of land. It is not worth that money, and he cannot find any valuators in Manitoba or any other country to say it is. I can ask for no better instance to explain to the people on a public platform how it is that public expenditure has been increasing so rapidly in this country. We have the same thing over again as occurred in Dauphin. In connection with all these public buildings we find this graft going on and it is high time to stop it. Perhaps the minister is not in a position to know the value of this land, nevertheless I hold him responsible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentlemen think it is right to make assertions of graft without the slightest evidence?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not suppose graft is a parliamentary word, and I withdraw it.

Mr. ADAMSON. There is no ground for the hon. gentleman's statement whatever, there is not a tittle of evidence for any thing he has said. I can tell the committee that there have been town lots, to my personal knowledge, sold for $1,000 in Humboldt before there was a building erected in the place.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How long ago?

Mr. ADAMSON. Within four years.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What makes this land so valuable?

Mr. ADAMSON. Because it is a growing town.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Five hundred people; talk about being a growing town! I say again that the hon. gentleman can give this committee no satisfactory reason why town lots in Humboldt are worth any more or nearly as much as town lots in Manitoba towns. If the minister wants to protect the financial interests of this country he ought not to sanction a vote like this.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. A few moments ago I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Simcoe and the reply of the minister in regard to his own province. I would like to read for the minister's benefit what I find in to-day's evening 'Journal':

Fredericton, New Brunswick, May 15.—Hon. J. X. Flemming began his first budget speech in the legislature yesterday. He made some interesting statements. The old government had estimated $8,000 surplus for the year ending October 31 last. He took exception to the way this was arrived at, and said that juggling with the accounts was practiced throughout to make it possible, in the words of an hon. gentleman not now present, for the government to come out each year with a 'tidy surplus.'

To figure out the fallacious surplus of last year, the government not only had to leave their overdraft unpaid, but they had to swell the income by holding open the books for the receipt of money for over a month after the close of the year.

A statement by Mr. Flemming which aroused much comment, was that that very afternoon a bill had come from the Intercolonial Railway for $47,496.34 for rails said to have been supplied the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company in the year 1902. Here was an account out of sight for six years, though an order in council authorizes its payment. To-day it stands unpaid, with interest on it to the amount of over $8,000. What kind of miserable system had they to admit of such a condition of affairs?

Mr. Flemming figured the total of actual and contingent liabilities of the province at $10,253,193.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is an absolutely false and misleading statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What I fear is that when we come to investigate the expenditures in the Public Works Department we will find them carried along in the same old slipshod, careless manner as they have been for the last few years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not suppose it is proper to bring into the discussion of an item like this things that have occurred in the New Brunswick legislature and questions of provincial politics. But as the hon. gentleman has done so, I simply wish to say that the article which he has quoted is absolutely misleading. It refers to a claim from the government railway for rails said to have been supplied to the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company, and the paper says the accounts have been hidden. Nothing of the kind. The accounts have been rendered by the Railway Department each year and there has been a standing claim against the Dominion government for double subsidy which would pay the contra account of the Dominion government for rails. The statement contained in the newspaper which my hon. friend has read from is absolutely misleading and is on a par with statements which are being made in the New Brunswick legislature in regard to myself and others who have left that legislature, who are not there to answer, and which are absolutely false and misleading.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the people ever send them back to answer them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The people have sent me here, they have sent me notwithstanding the objections made on the other side, and they have sent me by acclamation.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the hon. member for Humboldt if he has any property there?

Mr. ADAMSON. Not one foot of property, and never had.

Mr. J. D. REID. The government, in favouring these small places, are practically injuring real estate along the line, cause the erection of a public building creates the idea that these are to be the central points. The government are going a little too fast in making an expenditure of this kind in a small place like this. I certainly do not believe that land values in a place like Humboldt are as great as the minister states they paid for this lot.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not paid but agreed to pay, providing they complete the title.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am taking it for granted that the purchase will be carried out if they complete the title. I have not heard of prices such as those which have been paid at Humboldt. A third of the amount paid would be a very large price in a place like that and that is dis-

counting the future to a very great extent.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If hon. members on this side of the House do not bring the claims of their respective constituencies before the Minister of Public Works, and if they subsequently bring them to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, they are at once confronted with the declaration: This is the first time that I have heard of it. The hon. minister has been Minister of Public Works for some time and he says: This is the first time that the hon. member has brought this to my attention. He tries to leave the impression upon the country that we are derelict in our duty, that we have not been looking after the interests of our constituencies, whereas if we, session after session, impress upon the minister the desirability of putting up certain public buildings in our towns he accuses us of desiring to increase the expenditure of the country. It seems almost impossible to please the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Rather it is the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman to which I direct the attention of the House.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is not inconsistency but the position we take is that it is unjust discrimination. If towns with a population of from 2,000 to 4,000 and upwards are not treated just the same as towns in constituencies represented by supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite we say that it is unjust discrimination. It is not right that there should be expenditures only in constituencies represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. The system of purchasing land for the purposes of the department is entirely wrong. Why is it necessary to advertise broadcast through a town that the government want a certain piece of land for a certain purpose? The hon. member for Humboldt has admitted that he acted as the intermediary in the purchasing of this lot and he says that they asked $4,000 and that he got them to reduce the price.

Mr. ADAMSON. I was not the intermediary. It was referred to me by the department and an offer was made of $4,000. I do not know the owner of the property, never saw him, never met him and I never wrote to him or he to me. I thought that the price was too high and eventually the department got the land for $1,000 less.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The parties knew that it was required for government purposes.

Mr. ADAMSON. They could not help knowing. A government inspector was sent from the department.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The Minister of Finance has stated that it is a well known fact that if parties know that property is desired by the government they raise the prices. No doubt that is true and I think the system of purchasing land should be changed. In the town where I reside with nearly four times the population of Humboldt I guarantee that on the main street you could get a lot with a 60 feet frontage for $1,500. To say that in a town of 500 population it is necessary to pay $3,000 is ridiculous.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to ask that this item be allowed to stand till the minister takes a little pains to find out the facts. I never expected to run up against anything like this. It is beyond any decency and I am going to ask that the item stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see any advantage in allowing it to stand. I told the hon. gentleman that before I became minister this was carefully inquired into. The department sent one of the most reliable experts in land value in the west, a man of the highest character, Mr. Mahler, a gentleman who was employed by both governments, and who valued some of the buildings which were taken over by the Saskatchewan government, to value this land. An agreement has been entered into to pay $3,000. The lot is 75 by 132, it is a corner lot, centrally situated, and I see no reason why the item should stand. I will get any information in the department with reference to the matter and I will submit it and it will be open to the hon. gentleman to discuss it at another time.

Mr. ALCORN. Did this commissioner make inquiries on the spot or look for any other lots and get prices on them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what I understand he did; I understand he compared prices with other lots.

Mr. ALCORN. What were the prices of other lots?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say to-night; it is three years ago.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. I have a word to say in reference to this kind of public improvement. It is pretty hard to build a harbour except where there is navigation. But in erecting a post office or public building it seems to be the kind of public improvement that you can pass around any place. I do not think that the members on the government side should try to make the people believe that the money that is expended on these public buildings all comes from the Liberal party. It comes out of the funds of the Dominion of Canada. I know of a constituency in which there is no public building although it is one of the oldest constituencies in the Dominion of Canada one of the most fertile and one which has a very lively town in

the centre of it. Unfortunately for that town and county—or rather fortunately—the sitting member is a gentleman on this side of the House. At a meeting held there not long ago this question came up and one of the speakers I believe, the ex-president of the Liberal association, said: The present member for this riding has asked for a post office but cannot get one. What you want to do is to send a Liberal to Ottawa and you will get your post office. Graft or intimidation of this kind is used to the utmost extent in the erection of public buildings. It is a bid to get a few parliamentary votes, but I have to tell you that the people of that constituency have had that gauntlet thrown down to them for the last twenty years that if they elected a Liberal they would get a post office. I say they are entitled to that building and they resent that base attempt to bribe them in their franchise by telling them to vote for this government or they will never get a post office. I have heard that statement from a Liberal. The people of Ontario and of that constituency denounce that kind of thing. We will not stand for it, we will do without our post office rather than sacrifice our franchise.

Mr. TURRIFF. If they were entitled to it for twenty years why did not your friends give it the last eight years they were in power?

Mr. WM. JACKSON. What I said was absolutely true.

Mr. TURRIFF. Why did not your friends build it?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They were spending $40,000,000 and you are spending $130,000,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. You will find that post offices were not being erected in such small towns as they are now erected in.

Mr. TURRIFF. In many western towns, even where the population is not very large, the post office revenue is much larger in proportion to the population than in the east. This building will be a post office, land office and customs house.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does that make any difference in the value of the site?

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentleman is aware that in many small towns in the west of from 500 to 1,000 people if you go outside the main portion of the town you can buy lots for $100 or $200, but in the centre of the town the lots sell for a very high price. I understand there was discussion with reference to the town of Dauphin and I was told by a gentleman who has lived there a great deal and knows it very well that a lot had been bought for $11,000 by a private individual for his own purposes, not for the government.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How big was the lot?

Mr. TURRIFF. 44 feet wide. The government site was purchased for $6,000 for a 75-foot lot, and the $11,000 lot was within 300 feet of it. I venture to say that in Humboldt there may be a dozen lots right in the centre of the town that you could not buy for less than $1,000 apiece, the price being paid here. I do not think it is an out of the way price. It may be a little high but in many towns of from 500 to 1,000 people, $3,000 for three lots, one of them a corner lot, would not be considered high.

Mr. BENNETT. Would that be a fair criterion for the prices of lots in Blairmore?

Mr. TURRIFF. Perhaps the hon. member knows more than I do about that.

Mr. BENNETT. I was not as deep under the surface in that transaction as the hon. member.

Mr. TURRIFF. If the hon. member insinuates that I was interested in the Blairmore townsite he is altogether mistaken, and it is a cowardly thing for him to do, but it is what you might expect from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The hon. member knows towns in his own constituency and in mine better entitled to buildings than this, and can he give reasons for the erection of a public building in this town and not in the others?

Mr. ADAMSON. I have given reasons. I have said that lots were sold at $1,000 apiece before there was a building there. Before there was a town, lots sold at $1,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why are they sold so high?

Mr. ADAMSON. Because the people wanted them, it is a case of demand and supply.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does the hon. member mean to say that anywhere in the western country in a town of 500, land is worth $250 a foot. That is what your lot cost in Dauphin.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. member heard the same statement as I did in the corridors made by a gentleman from Dauphin that a lot within 350 feet of the lot sold to the government had been bought by a private company there for $11,000 and the lot was only 44 feet wide.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I heard it but I did not believe it, but Sir, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) has said that right in the centre of the town which is a good town, one of the best in the Northwest, lots can be bought for $1,500.

Mr. KNOWLES. Is there any reason why the hon. gentleman should believe one statement rather than the other?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I accept the statement of the hon. member for Marquette.

Mr. ADAMSON. Knowing nothing whatever about the subject.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that. I say there is not a member from the west on the other side of the House who will say that these three lots, one of them a corner lot, in the small town of Humboldt, are worth $3,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The best way to test the accuracy of my statement is for the hon. minister to put in the supplementary estimates $1,500 for the lot, and I will produce it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Without attempting to cast any reflections upon the town the hon. gentleman represents, I might say that it is on a side line, it is an old town, and it is not a divisional point.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. It is a divisional point.

Mr. ADAMSON. It is not on the main line of a railway.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It will be on the main line of a railway to Edmonton.

Mr. ADAMSON. Humboldt is a divisional point on the main line of the railway. The price of land there is governed by demand and supply, like any other commodity, and I can assure the committee that town lots of 25 feet frontage were changing hands at $1,000 each before there was a building in the town. We cannot account for these things, but such is the case.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you pay such a price when you can get the accommodation for the post office to-day for a rent of $75 a year?

Mr. ADAMSON. They are paying as much more for the land office and possibly as much more for the custom house for buildings entirely unsuitable for the purposes for which they are used.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, admit that you pay three times as much, it would amount to only $225 a year. There are many places yielding a revenue of over $2,000 a year which have no post office at all.

Mr. ADAMSON. I admit that there are places that should have post office buildings which have not. This is not only for a post office, but for a land office, and it is particularly important that we should have a place for the safe keeping of the records of the land office.

Mr. SPROULE. You could build a fireproof registry office for $3,000. In Ontario and other provinces you will find villages yielding a revenue of twice or three or four times as much as Humboldt, and yet they are not getting a post office or applying for one. It does not seem to me to be defensible to spend such large amounts for public buildings in small new places and to neglect places which are two or three times as large.

Mr. ADAMSON. In the land office there are six people employed, in the custom house two, and in the post office two, making ten public servants who have to be accommodated.

Mr. LAKE. One point that should not be overlooked is that after you buy a site at a very high price in a new town in a new district and put up an expensive building, you may find in a short time that the town may sink to nothing, and you may have to move the land office and other buildings somewhere else. I remember very well, on the line where my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) used to live, the land office was moved successively from Cannington to Alameda, Oxbow and Estevan. There were four moves, and there would have been a corresponding waste of so many public buildings if this policy had been carried out in those early days. I think it is a mistake to jump into a new town when it is just on the boom and put up a public building. The people may flock out as quickly as they flocked in, and you may find in the end that the buildings may be all waste.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentleman has given one very good reason why a land office should be built. He has instanced the land office at Cotran district. It was first established at Carlyle, where I lived somewhere about 1882 or 1883. It was moved from Carlyle from lack of accommodation and because there was better accommodation up at Cannington. A few years later it was moved from Cannington on account of lack of accommodation. It was moved to Oxbow temporarily. From there it was moved to Alameda. From Alameda it was moved, because of lack of accommodation, to Estevan on account of the latter being so much nearer to the great bulk of land available for homestead entry and because it was the junction of two railways and much more convenient for the immigrants to make entries. But the main reason why the land office has been moved around so often has been lack of accommodation. If there had been proper accommodation at Carlyle in the first place, the chances are it would never have been moved.

Mr. LAKE. The very fact that it has been moved shows that the new places were very much more convenient for the purposes of a land office. The hon. gentleman himself admitted that it was moved to Estevan because it was nearer the centre of operation.

Mr. TURRIFF. And because there was no accommodation at the other places.

Mr. LAKE. And because the people to be served in this new district would have to go so much further to do their land business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If the minister has a conscience, and I think he has, this discussion should result in a great deal of good to this country. In my judgment the prices paid for these lots are absurd. I am quite willing to sanction the erection of public buildings throughout the whole Dominion, so far as they can be built by the Public Works Department, so long as the money is properly spent, but I will not approve of the purchase of lots at such high prices as those shown to have been paid. It seems absurd to pay $6,000 for a lot where there is not a town but only the site of a town. That is simply paying an inflated price. There is no reason why the government should pay such exorbitant prices. Rather than pay such prices, the minister should refuse to supply the building. I can take you into many flourishing towns in Ontario where you can get the building lots very much cheaper. I want to refer to the town of Sandwich, where a gentleman purchased 208 feet on the main street for $2,000. Sandwich is one of the oldest towns in Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was it bought at ordinary sale ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would you not say that was very cheap ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is about the price you can get lots for in any town of that size throughout the Dominion except in places in the west where the prices are inflated and exorbitant. The man who purchased that lot for $2,000 sold the half of it to the government for $1,700.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lot sold the government was 104 feet for $1,700. That was not out of the way.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That would look fairly reasonable compared with $3,000 for a lot in the western country.

Mr. TURRIFF. Three lots.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Judge them by the feet. You get 108 feet for $1,700. There is not a town in this Dominion which would not give the lot in order to have a public building. I think myself that the government should buy their lots but only pay reasonable prices. The minister ought to lay down some policy with regard to the erection of public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was in hopes the other side would lay down the basis.

Mr. LAKE.

Mr. SPROULE. We are not charged with the responsibiliy.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Posmaster General lays down a policy so far as free delivery of the mails is concerned. There must be so much revenue and so much population. I would not have the nerve to ask for a $30,000 public building for a place with 500 of a population. There should be some policy laid down. Make the population 1,500 or 1,000 or 2,000 and take the revenue into consideration. Then you will have something substantial to go on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would you give a public building to every town having that population ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Always taking into consideration the revenue and the customs. I put in a claim the other day for a public building. I advocated a public building for the town of Tilbury and the minister kindly said he would take my application into his consideration.

Maple Creek public building, $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Have you bought the site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The property is situated on the corner of Gaspard street. It is 150 feet by 130. The building will be a two story brick building with stone foundation. Dimensions 59 feet by 54.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the price of the lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a government site

Mr. BENNETT. What is the population of the place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. According to the last census, 687.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost, everything included?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including everything, $32,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What railway is this town on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I saw Maple Creek ten years ago and admired the town site at that time. I had the pleasure of seeing it again last season. It looks to me as if it ought to be an important town, but it seemed to me that it was about the same size when I saw it last season as it was on the occasion of my first visit. This would indicate that some of the western towns do not go ahead as some of their enthusiastic admirers seem to think.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The postal revenue is $2,424. Apparently Maple Creek does more

business than many towns of larger population.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the centre of an important ranching district.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Medicine Hat public building, $22,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of this $15,000 is a revote. This is to complete the building.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including everything, $47,108.06.

Mr. BENNETT. When will it be finished?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It should have been finished on December 4 last. It is now about ready for the roof; there has been delay.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the contract let by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Five tenders were received and the tenders of Messrs Oakes & Everard was accepted.

Prince Albert penitentiary—site, &c., $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe the site that is being bought at Prince Albert for a penitentiary is admirably well suited for that purpose. We have purchased from different parties lots of 183 acres, 165 acres, 125 acres and 174 acres. The total cost is $30,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Where is it located?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is within the boundaries of Prince Albert. I am told that it is a very desirable property.

Mr. SPROULE. Better cut it up and sell it for post office sites. If you get prices such as you paid in Humboldt you will make money.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the contract let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. The plans have not been prepared yet.

Mr. BENNETT. And no steps will be taken under this vote to construct the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should suppose not. We might prepare plans and something might be done, but I am not really prepared to say.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What will be done in the meantime with the land that has been bought?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be left. I understand that the Minister of Justice is of the opinion that this will be needed for the purposes of a penitentiary within a short time. I am told that the site is exceedingly well adapted for the purpose.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the population of Prince Albert?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that information before me, but I should think it would be about 5,000.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It seems to me that this 640 acres of land at $30,000 within the town site of Prince Albert is not out of the way. It figures out at about $47 an acre. There is a lesson here for some of the hon. gentlemen who have been claiming $1,000 a lot in small towns.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it necessary to have 640 acres for a penitentiary? Is there any other place in Canada where the penitentiary has half that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are urged to make a further purchase.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. In my constituency we have the Stony Mountain penitentiary with 640 acres.

Mr. SPROULE. It is all rock.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. There are 40 acres of rock where the building is. And, if I mistake not, besides what I have stated, they have 240 acres of hay land.

Mr. BENNETT. No contract will be entered into under this vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not for a building.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see what you need so much land for unless you are going to speculate in it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At the penitentiary in Dorchester, N.B., they have, I think, 700 acres.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. With a couple of hundred convicts, you can work a lot of land.

Regina post office, custom house, &c., $88,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the public building. It is on the corner of 11th avenue and Scarth street.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the total estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including every thing, $212,565.87. It is to be used for post office and customs house. Regina is a rapidly growing town.

Mr. LAKE. Could the minister give us any information about the site and the price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The purchase was made from the Knox Presbyterian Church of Regina, at a cost of $10,000.

Saskatoon public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract. The total cost including site, heating, electric wiring, is $90,614. We paid $9,000 for the site, which is situated on the corner of Second avenue and Twenty-first street. The building is to have a frontage of 64 feet by

72. It is to be used for a land office, customs, inland revenue, post office and weights and measures.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. gentleman's predecessor claimed that this building would cost in the neighbourhood of $42,000 or $43,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was an under estimate. Mr. Stewart is the clerk of works; he gets $4 per day. The contract was let on the 27th of June, 1907, and calls for completion on the 1st of April, 1909. The amount of the contract is $64,500.

Mr. BENNETT. Where do the other $26,000 come in ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is made up by the boilers for heating, the site, survey, legal expenses, printing, advertisements, heating, electric wiring, fixtures, fittings, furniture, sidewalks, fences, superintendence and contingencies.

Yorkton public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site cost $4,000, and is 100 feet by 120. The population of Yorkton by the last census was 1,363. The contract has not yet been let. The chief architect has not made the plans yet, but I presume it will be a building like at Dauphin, running from $30,000 to $35,000, exclusive of the land, probably.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yorkton is a thriving town. I think this price is about $40 a foot, which is exactly the price paid for the lot in Humboldt. But Yorkton has a population three times that of Humboldt, and lots in Yorkton should be much more valuable than Humboldt.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will we take up on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it was understood that the debate on the Election Bill was to be resumed. I did not ask the Prime Minister before he left, but I think that is the understanding. If we resume Supply, it will be with the estimates for Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, May 18, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 167) respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—Mr. E. M. Macdonald.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Bill (No. 166) to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act, in so far as the same affects the province of Nova Scotia.—Mr. Aylesworth.

YUKON ACT AMENDENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 169) to amend the Yukon Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. member be good enough to give an explanation ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill is very short. It contains three principal provisions. One is to provide for an entirely elective council for the Yukon Territory. Another is to provide for an audit of the public accounts of the Yukon Territory by the Auditor General's office. The third is in regard to the office of public administrator of the estates of deceased persons in the Yukon Territory, to provide for security and duties and an audit of his accounts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. BERGERON.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I rise to a question of privilege. In the Regina 'Leader,' which has been placed in my hands, I find an article concerning myself to which I desire to draw the attention of the House. I shall not read the whole article, as it contains matters which are a subject of discussion which I do not want to take up with that paper, but I shall read the portion of the article which I wish to contradict, and which deals with a matter of fact. The part to which I object is as follows :—

All Canada knew, moreover, that in the Prince Albert by-election, Mr. Haultain and Mr. Bradshaw were doing their utmost to stir up anew all the anti-Catholic prejudices on the autonomy school clause, and were making every possible use and abuse of the text of Mr. Turgeon's nationality and religion. Knowing all this, Mr. Bergeron deliberately went to Prince Albert on the eve of that by-election, stood deliberately on the same platform with Mr. Haultain and Mr. Bradshaw in a campaign meeting and did deliberately all he could to procure Mr. Turgeon's defeat and Mr. Bradshaw's election on a platform conceived in anti-Catholic prejudice and nothing else. So entirely did Mr. Bergeron identify himself with the anti-Catholic candidate in Prince Albert and wish for Mr. Turgeon's defeat, that on the following evening at Rosthern he publicly referred to Mr. Bradshaw as 'our condidate' and gloated over his possible election. Mr. Bergeron's championship of the minority is indelibly besmirched with shameless insincerity.

I desire to say that there is not one word of truth in the whole of the part of the article which I have read. I was not on the platform with any of the gentlemen mentioned. I never said one word, directly or indirectly about the local elections and I never called Mr. Bradshaw or anybody else 'my candidate.' I may say that both of us, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and myself, kept scrupulously out of the legal fight. We spoke of nothing but federal issues.

ALLEGED IMMIGRATION FRAUDS AT HALIFAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) whether it is correct, as stated in the press that a Mr. Joseph Bernstein, who, I think, was an interpreter at Halifax, has been dismissed as the result of an investigation held recently. I would also ask whether or not the same commissioner investigated any other matter—whether there has been any investigation into the circumstances which were commented on in the press with regard to certain facts disclosed in the police court in London some two or three months ago.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior?. The complaints against Mr. Bernstein have been fully investigated and the result has been the production of a great deal of conflicting evidence. If the House desires, I shall lay a report of the investigation on the table. The conclusion arrived at by the investigating officer was that although the charges against Mr. Bernstein were not fully substantiated, it was a question whether the amount of suspicion which had been engendered against him had not done away with his usefulness. I do not know what my hon. friend would do if he had such a report presented to him, but I must say it left me in a somewhat undecided frame of mind. With regard to the Dickey matter, we have had several inquiries concerning it which I am not in a position to place before the House, but so far as I have beee able to ascertain yet, there has been nothing disclosed beyond what has already been published. That is to say, we have not been able to substantiate the more extreme charges which were made against Dr. Dickey. He has offered an explanation of his conduct, and I have not been able to overthrow that explanation although I have examined it as carefully as possible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood the hon. minister said that the same commissioner was investigating both matters.

Mr. OLIVER. No. Perhaps I did say that the same commissioner would investigate both, but what I wish to say now is that I had a separate investigation made apart from that altogether.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That has not been concluded ?

Mr. OLIVER. It has, but it is of a character which I would not feel warranted in placing before the House. It was an entirely confidential investigation. The investigation which was made by the officer who inquired into the case of Bernstein was on the surface. He took what information he could which was open to the public.

THE ALGOMA STEEL COMPANY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals been directed to the fact that he Algoma Steel Company has stopped operations for the present and that the stoppage is said to be due to some extent to the lack of orders. I would also ask whether the minister has under consideration the possibility of placing further orders with the company in order that work might be resumed whether these orders might come from the Intercolonial or the Transcontinental Railway Commission.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals. Of course the consideration of any large work such as that would have to depend on our getting the cash to carry it on. The difficulty in the Soo works has been brought to the attention of the Railway Department. As far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, I have not been considering the purchase of any rails from the Soo industry, but the question is under consideration with the Transcontinental Railway Commission to see whether anything can be done to relieve the situation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am sorry to hear that the country is in so bad a condition financially as the minister seems to suggest.

STRIKE AT OWEN SOUND.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) what steps have been taken in connection with the strike at Owen Sound ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). I have not yet received any report from the officers as regards this riot—I do not know that I should call it a strike—which has taken place at Owen Sound. My information is that there was no strike in the proper sense of the word. I am informed that there was no engagement by the company and therefore no employer and no employee, and the law could not be applied. That is my own private information. I have no official information. I have asked the Deputy Minister of Labour to prepare a report. If my hon. friend will call my attention to this riot a little later, I may be able to impart more information to the House.

DAMAGE BY WATER TO THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the attention of the Minister of Railways been directed to a statement in the public press that a portion of the National Transcontinental is partially flooded, and I notice the suggestion that there seems to have been some mistake in the estimate of what high water levels might be expected. I would ask whether or not there is anything in the report that a portion of the railway in the vicinity of La Tuque will have to be reconstructed and that a portion of the track will require to be rebuilt at a distance from the place where it has already been partially constructed.

Mr. GRAHAM. That matter has not been brought to my attention but I shall make some inquiries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let me just read the despatch in the Montreal 'Gazette' of 16th inst. :

La Tuque, Que., May 15—(Special).—The unusual height of the St. Maurice river this spring has apparently shown up a bad engineering mistake in the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway in this district, which may necessitate a complete redrafting of the plans. At the present moment several miles of the roadbed of the new railroad are several feet under water; in fact, one of the contractors came into La Tuque this afternoon and reported that he had paddled in a canoe for two miles over the tracks of the railway, there being two feet and more of water over the tracks during the entire distance.

The floods will undoubtedly cause havoc on the work, the swiftly rushing water undermining the roadbed. It is also stated by the engineers that the piers on the new bridges have been greatly damaged, and many of them will have to be rebuilt during the summer, and the bridges probably elevated.

There is every indication that in planning the road the engineers miscalculated the high water levels, and have laid the road in such a way that it will be flooded whenever the St. Maurice rises unusually high. The river this spring has risen higher than it has done for many years past, and the whole country in this district is flooded. This is, perhaps, fortunate, as it has shown the mistake by the engineers before the road was completed. Whether the plans are changed or not the present floods will cause great expense to the contractors, as the roadbed will be practically ruined by washouts.

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall make inquiries.

IMMIGRATION ACT.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a matter concerning which I asked a question the other day. At what date may we definitely expect to have the order in council in reference to immigration which we were informed had been passed pursuant to the recent amendment of the Immigration Act. The minister has promised it on one or two occasions but it has not yet come down.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I expect to be able to give the hon. gentleman a definite answer tomorrow.

QUEBEC BRIDGE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. MONK. I ask the Minister of Railways when we may expect that the report of the Royal Commission on the Quebec Bridge will be printed. As there is a committee named to inquire into certain matters connected with the bridge it is important we should have that report printed in full as soon as possible.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I understand that the copy is all in. It seems to be a question whether there is to be an index and table of contents. The printer makes this explanation :

The report consists of technical matter and a number of technical signs were required which had to be ordered and we expect to receive these every day. They were ordered some weeks ago. The above remark applies to volume 1; there will be a second colume consisting of evidence, &c.

Mr. MONK. I would suggest that we might have the report without the index as soon as possible and the index might be added afterwards.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE BUILDING—STRIKE.

Mr. VERVILLE. Is the Minister of Labour aware that there is a strike going on at the Montreal post office ? Is he aware that Mr. Peter Lyall, the contractor, refuses to pay the men under the fair wage clause of this contract? Is it the intention of the government to take any action to compel him to pay the wages he has contracted to pay?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). There is, of course, no strike in the Montreal post office, if the hon. gentleman refers to the employees. There is, I understand, a difficulty between Peter Lyall & Sons, the contractors, and the bricklayers and stonecutters who are engaged in constructing the addition to the post office. The contract between Peter Lyall & Sons and the government contains the fair wage clause. The contract was let on October 12, 1907, and the fair wage schedule was prepared by the Department of Labour in accordance with the fair wage resolution of 1900. I am not officially informed that there is a strike among the bricklayers, but my hon. friend (Mr. Verville) has told me that the bricklayers are

protesting against a reduction in their wages. There has been a complaint lodged against the contractors by the stonecutters who allege that Peter Lyall & Sons have sublet the contract for stone cutting contrary to the provisions of the fair wage clause of 1900. As soon as I received the complaint from the stonecutters I immediately sent Mr. Dubreuil, the fair wage officer to investigate and he reported that the complaint was well founded and that report has been forwarded by my department of the Department of Public Works. Although I am not officially informed as to a strike among the bricklayers, I intend, at the request of my hon. friend (Mr. Verville) to send the fair wage officer to Montreal to investigate the matter.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

House in committee on Bill (No. 151) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company—Mr. Crawford.

Mr. GRAHAM. Stand.

Mr. LENNOX. I don't want to pick a quarrel with the Minister of Railways because he is usually very fair, but the other night in my absence he seemed to think that the opposition were the cause of this Bill standing. During the four weeks it has been before the House it has been called about a dozen times and except on two occasions the government asked that it should stand. I am ready to go on now. I am quite prepared to bow to what the government say in reference to it, but I want to say that should I not be here on an occasion when it is called I expect the Bill to stand. I have been here ten times when it was called with a number of books ready to proceed, and only twice did I ask that it should stand on my account.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have asked it to stand several times and my hon. friend has asked it to stand several times, and I suppose we really ought to be ready to go on with it whenever it is called.

Mr. LENNOX. Then let it go on now.

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask it to stand to-day as a matter of convenience. I agreed to postpone it the other day because my hon. friend was not here, but if we both attend to business we ought to get rid of it some time this week.

Progress reported.

BELLEVILLE PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 20) respecting the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company—Mr. Porter.

Mr. FIELDING. It was understood the other night that this Bill should stand in the absence of the hon. gentleman in charge of it, and I suppose the same rule will prevail to-day.

Progress reported.

SASKATCHEWAN POWER COMPANY

House in committee on Bill (No. 153) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company—Mr. McCraney.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill is not present and I would ask it to stand. The last clause of this Bill gives the promoters the right to delay this work for four years. I have communicated with some gentlemen in Saskatoon, and if they are satisfied with the Bill I have no objection to its going through. In the meantime it had better stand.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member (Mr. McCraney) in charge of the Bill is not present. Unless he has asked somebody to act for him, I would ask that the suggestion be accepted and would move that progress be reported on the Bill.

Progress reported.

PACIFIC AND ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 138) respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Mr. BERGERON. The promoter of this Bill is not present either.

Mr. FIELDING. I move that progress be reported.

Progress reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 164) for the relief of Edith May Gilmore.—Mr. J. D. Reid.

QUESTIONS.

THE RAMA INDIANS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What sums are at the credit of the Rama Indians with the government?
2. What interest or sums are annually paid these Indians?
3. Under what conditions is it possible to draw from the fund to the credit of the Indians?
4. Have moneys been at any time drawn from the funds of the Rama Indians?
5. Have all legal procedures been taken in the removal from the Indian fund of these sums?
6. Will the government lay upon the table of the House a copy of all correspondence in the matter of withdrawing such sums?
7. Was the consent of Indian council obtained for withdrawal of these moneys?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. On the 31st of March, 1908, the funds at the credit of the Rama Indians were as follows :

Capital	$49,024 82
Interest	722 54
	$49,747 36

2. In 1907, $1,200 was paid to these Indians.

3. The conditions under which it is possible to draw from the capital funds at the credit of the Indians are regulated by sections 87-90 of the Indian Act ; that is, the consent of the band and the authority of His Excellency have to be obtained for any capital expenditure—except for surveys, compensation to Indians for improvements or for any interests they have in lands taken from them ; or by way of contribution to schools attended by Indians : in these three cases the authority of His Excellency in council is sufficient without the consent of the Indians. Expenditure from interest is undertaken at the request of the Indians from time to time with the concurrence of the department.

4. Money is constantly being drawn from the funds of the Rama Indians. The expenditure from interest is for general purposes, including interest distribution in equal per capita amounts semi-annually ; for the payment of medical attendance ; and for other miscellaneous purposes. Expenditure frequently takes place from capital. The expenditure from the latter fund for the five years ending the 31st of March, 1908, has been :

For surveys	$1,176 91
For sidewalks	387 20

5. Yes.

6. If necessary the government will lay upon the table of the House copies of correspondence dealing with the withdrawals from capital for the five years period mentioned in answer to question 4.

7. The expenditure for sidewalks was agreed upon by the Indians. The expenditure for surveys was taken from capital without the consent of the Indians, under section 89 of the Indian Act.

ANGLO-FRENCH EXHIBITION—REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Who are the persons appointed by the government to represent Canada at the Anglo-French exhibition being held in London?

2. What are the salaries and travelling allowances established for each such person?

3. How much has been paid on account to each?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The permanent Canadian Exhibition commissioner, Mr. William Hutchison, is so far the only person appointed to represent Canada.

2. His salary is $3,000 per annum and he is given a living allowance of $20 a day for nine months of the year and $10 a day for three months.

3. Up to the 18th instant he has been given on account, $3,605.15.

CAMPBELLTON WHARF—PILING.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What amount of piling was used in connection with the public wharf at Campbellton this year?

2. Who supplied the piling, and at what price per foot?

3. Were tenders asked for in connection with the supplying of piling in this wharf?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. No piling was supplied this year (1908); the accountant's books show the following was supplied in 1907, 5,632 lineal feet. This piling was required to be from 45 to 50 feet in length.

2. Messrs. Mann & Baxter, of Campbellton ; 12 per lineal foot.

3. No.

CAMPBELLTON HARBOUR—GAS BUOYS.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. How many gas buoys are in use in the harbour of Campbellton, New Brunswick, and for how long have they been in use there?

2. Who has the job of placing and taking up said buoys each season?

3. Were tenders asked for before the job was let?

4. If so, who were the tenderers and what were the several amounts?

5. What sum is paid for placing and taking up said buoys each season?

6. Are tenders asked for each season for this work?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine) :

1. Six gas buoys are maintained on the Restigouche river between Campbellton and Dalhousie, N.B. Gas buoys were placed in this district for the first time in 1906.

2. The Shives Lumber Company of Campbellton, N.B.

3 and 4. No. The Shives Lumber Company appeared to have the best equipment for handling the gas buoys and the work was placed in their hands.

5. In 1906, $885.88 for five buoys. After that year $150 per annum for each buoy.

6. No. As the work was very well performed by the Shives Lumber Company and the price is reasonable, an arrangement was made with them to maintain the buoys at $150 per annum for each buoy.

THE MINT—MANUFACTURE OF SILVER COINS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. How many dollars worth of silver has been coined in the mint since it opened, and

what amount of said coin has been disposed of outside of souvenir coins?

2. Is it the intention of the government to continue the manufacture and storing of silver coins?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. $313,338.35—of this amount $28,025 has been received from the mint and issued to the several assistant receivers general.

2. The amount of silver coins manufactured will be regulated from time to time by the demand for that class of currency.

PAYMENTS TO MR. EUGENE FORTIER, CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. MORIN asked:

1. What amounts have been paid Mr. Eugene Fortier, painter and decorator of the town of Chicoutimi, by the Department of Public Works, since May 1, 1905, to date?

2. What was the nature of the services rendered?

3. Wherein are they mentioned in the Auditor General's Report for 1905-6, and 1906-7?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1, 2 and 3. March 30, 1906 (Auditor General's Report, 1905-6, page V—228), painting, papering and repairing windows, $153.60; March 16, 1907 (Auditor General's Report, not published), sundry painting on tugs and dredges, $13; September 2, 1907, (Auditor's Report, not published), painting tug 'Monitor,' $39.50; September 23, 1907, (Auditor's Report, not published), painting tug 'Storm King,' $60.25; total, $266.35.

RIDEAU CANAL—BUOYS BETWEEN MERRICKVILLE AND EDMOND RAPIDS.

Mr. J. D. REID asked:

1. Had B. McGrath the contract for lighting buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids on Rideau canal during season, 1907? If so, at what price?

2. Were tenders publicly called for? If so, how many tenders were received?

3. Has B. McGrath the contract for the same work for season 1908? If so, were public tenders called for? If not, why not?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. No. Byron McCaw is the contractor. $450 for the balance of the season from 1st June.

2. Yes. Five.

3. No. The present contractor is working under this contract which the department had the option of continuing in operation for three years and has continued as the service given last year was satisfactory.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILROADS.

Mr. AMES asked:

What area of land was granted by way of subsidy to railroads during each of the following years: 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). 1892, none; 1893, none; 1894, 793,600 acres; 1895, none; 1896, none.

THE FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. BRISTOL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

When is it expected that the French treaty will go into effect?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). It is difficult to forecast the time for coming into effect of the treaty. My hon. friend is aware that the Canadian parliament has approved the treaty. But, so far, the treaty has received the approval of only one branch of the French Chambers, and until it has received the approval of the second branch of the French Chambers we cannot anticipate when it will be brought into effect.

IMPORTATION OF OPIUM.

Mr. ELSON asked:

1. What amount of money has been received by the government as duty upon the importation of crude opium in the years 1906 and 1907, respectively?

2. What amount has been received on powdered opium in 1906 and 1907, respectively, and what amount on opium prepaid for smoking?

3. Has the government received any petition or petitions from British Columbia asking for the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of opium?

4. Is it the intention of the government to introduce a Bill this session, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of opium other than for medicinal purposes?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The amount of duty collected by the government on crude opium during the fiscal year 1906, was $47,281.34, and during the fiscal year 1907, $75,028.34.

2. The amount of duty collected by the government on powdered opium during the fiscal year 1906, was $218.25, and during the fiscal year 1907, $423. There was no duty collected during these years on opium prepared for smoking.

3. None by the Department of Customs so far as the officers are aware. I spoke to the First Minister about it, and he thought that he might have had communication or representations in reference to the question from some quarter, but he thought not from British Columbia. I suggest that the hon. gentleman ask the Prime Minister when he is in his place.

4. I have not an answer.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—DELAYS OF MARITIME EXPRESS.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville) asked:

1. How many locomotives belonging to the Intercolonial Railway are lying idle at Moncton awaiting repairs?

2. How many are at Halifax, Rivière du Loup and other points, awaiting repairs?

3. How many times during the month of January was the maritime express from Montreal late when arriving at Halifax, and how many hours? Also how many times was it late during February, March and April?

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

1. Twenty-one at Moncton.

2. None at Halifax, Rivière du Loup 2, Campbellton, 1.

3. Month of January, 1908.—Five occasions 4 to 16 minutes late; Three occasions 1 hour to 1 hour and 15 minutes late; seven occasions 1 hour and 50 minutes to 2 hours and 30 minutes late; five occasions 3 hours to 6 hours and 40 minutes late; five occasions 5 hours to 6 hours late; one occasion 9 hours and 17 minutes late.

Month of February, 1908.—Seven occasions 11 minutes to 55 minutes late; six occasions 1 hour to 1 hour and 55 minutes late; four occasions 2 hours and 13 minutes to 2 hours and 30 minutes late; 2 occasions 3 hours and 11 minutes to 3 hours and 15 minutes late; five occasions 4 hours to 5 hours late; three occasions 6 hours and 5 minutes to 6 hours and 45 minutes late; one occasion 7 hours and 12 minutes late; one occasion 9 hours and 35 minutes late.

Month of March, 1908.—Nine occasions 3 minutes to 33 minutes late; one occasion 51 minutes late; one occasion 57 minutes late; nine occasions 1 hour and 10 minutes to 1 hour and 55 minutes late; four occasions 2 hours and 23 minutes to 2 hours and 29 minutes late; one occasion 3 hours and 41 minutes; one occasion 4 hours and 33 minutes late; one occasion 5 hours and 8 minutes late; one occasion 9 hours late.

Month of April, 1908.—Fourteen occasions 8 minutes to 55 minutes late; five occasions 1 hour and 20 minutes to 2 hours late; five occasions 2 hours and 5 minutes to 2 hours and 55 minutes late; 1 occasion 4 hours and 29 minutes late; one occasion 6 hours and 16 minutes late.

PURCHASE OF GOODS FROM THE T. LINDSAY COMPANY.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. What is the amount of goods purchased from the T. Lindsay Company, Limited, of this city, for the purposes of the Anglo-French Exhibition in London?

2. What kind of goods and at what price?

3. Are the goods so acquired to be exhibited marked at their cost price?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. $18.36.

2. 102 yards Hessian at 18 cents per yard.

3. The goods purchased are not to be exhibited. They were used for packing.

Mr. J. D. REID.

DUTY ON UNLEAVENED BREAD.

Mr. BRISTOL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

Has any petition been received at any time by the government or any member of it, or any department of the government for placing a duty on unleavened bread? If so, what is the date of such petition or request, and by whom was the same signed?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I will say a few words prefacing my answers, so that they may be better understood. There has been a duty on unleavened bread, as the department understands it, for years and years, dating away back to the 1894 tariff, and before that, I believe. My colleague the Minister of Finance as well as myself cannot recollect any representations having been made to us on that question during the tariff commission. I think my answers will be satisfactory to the hon. gentleman, because he probably refers to something that has happened lately.

Unleavened bread has been dutiable under the present tariff and under previous customs tariffs, but remission of such duty has been made at times by order in council.

The Customs Department has no information as to petitions for placing duty on unleavened bread. Representations, however, have been made to the Department of Customs by solicitors on behalf of the National Matzo and Biscuit Company, Limited, asking that the provisions of the customs tariff in respect of the duty on unleavened bread be observed.

SUBSIDIES TO THE PROVINCES.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. What was the amount of the provincial subsidy paid to the different provinces of Canada by the Dominion government before the adjustment of such subsidies?

2. What is the subsidy now?

3. How much was paid to each province before such adjustment, and how much since?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. The annual subsidies paid to the different provinces before the passing of the British North America Act, 1907, were as follows:

Ontario	$1,339,287.28
Quebec	1,086,713.48
Nova Scotia	432,805.56
New Brunswick	491,360.96
Manitoba, including allowances for lands, &c.	621,497.46
British Columbia	307,076.66
Prince Edward Island	251,051.98
Alberta, including allowances for lands, &c.	1,124,125.00
Saskatchewan, including allowances for lands, &c.	1,130,335.40
	$6,784,253.78

2. The annual subsidies paid to the different provinces since the passing of the British North America Act, 1907, are as follows:

Ontario	$2,128,772,08
Quebec	1,686,579.08
Nova Scotia	610,464.76
New Brunswick	621,360.96
Manitoba, including allowances for lands, &c.	751,497.46
British Columbia	522,076.66
Prince Edward Island	321,051.98
Alberta, including allowances for lands, &c.	1,254,125.00
Saskatchewan, including allowances for lands, &c.	1,260,335.40
	$9,156,263.38

3. Answered by 1 and 2.

ALBERT G. McDONALD—COMMISSION ON IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. ALCORN asked:

1. What sum has been claimed by Albert G. McDonald, of Pictou, Ontario, as payable by the government for commission on immigrants placed with farmers or other employers, between March 28, 1907, and May 10, 1908?

2. Has said McDonald claimed payment of any other, and what, sum, or any, and what account other than for commission in respect of such immigrants so placed?

3. What sum has been paid said McDonald for commission, and on any other account connected with placing immigrants during the period aforesaid?

4. Did or does the government dispute any and what part of any such claims, and upon what grounds?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. $294.

2. Claimed $12.25 expended in housing and feeding immigrants.

3. $270 paid in commissions.

4. Government refused to pay account for board, &c., as instructions stated 'The department will not be responsible for any other expense than the $2 per capita commission.'

There is a dispute as to the claims of commission to the amount of $30.

DREDGING AT PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. What amount has been paid for dredging at Port Arthur and Fort William or Mission river during the season of 1907?

2. To whom were any amounts paid therefor?

3. What quantity of material was removed at each of said points, and what was the nature of the material or materials?

4. What were the prices paid at each of said points for different kinds of material removed?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. Port Arthur, $29,523.71; Fort William, $309,705.64; Kaministiquia and Mission Rivers.

2. R. Weddell and Great Lakes Dredging Company.

3. Port Arthur, 306,933 cubic yards of clay and sand; Fort William, 2,859,238 cubic yards of rock, sand and clay.

4. Port Arthur: Rock, $3; all other materials, 9½ cents per cubic yard, scow measurement, with an additional charge for haulage of 1 cent a yard for each extra mile.

Fort William and Mission River: $2 for rock and 9 cents for all other materials, scow measurement, with an additional charge for haulage of 1 cent for each extra mile.

LIGHT-KEEPER, INGONISH ISLAND.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Who is employed by the government as light-keeper on Ingonish island, in the province of Nova Scotia, what salary does he receive, and where is his place of residence?

2. Is it true that the said light-keeper has not resided upon the island during the past winter months and up to the present time, and that he has employed another man to attend to his duties?

3. Has the government sanctioned this subappointment?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. (a) Robie V. Warren. (b) $360 per annum. (c) Ingonish, N.S.

2 and 3. The department has no such information.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MEDICAL SERVICE.

Mr. MORIN asked:

1. Who is the medical officer employed by the construction commission upon the eastern portion of the Transcontinental Railway?

2. Is it a Mr. Parent? If so, what is his salary per annum?

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

1. The medical service and attendance on men employed on construction are furnished by the contractors, and this service is carried on under the supervision of the inspectors of the Department of Agriculture. The only medical officers employed by the commission, are as follows:

J. B. Piegay, District 'C,' salary $80 a month; D. Handfield, District 'C,' salary $75 a month; Geo. R. Johnson, District 'D,' salary $80 a month; W. J. Taugher, District 'D,' salary $75 a month.

2. No.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Aylesworth for the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act and the proposed amendment of Mr. W. J. Roche thereto

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Kootenay). Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to detain the House at any great length discussing this matter as it has already been referred to and considered pretty thoroughly by members on both sides of the House. However, there are a few features of the case that I would like to draw the attention of the House to and to emphasize. The question of the preparation of the voters' list for a federal election in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia, which is involved in the first section of the Bill introduced into this House by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), is one of the principal features that has been discussed so far. Between 1885 and 1898 the Dominion government kept control of the lists to be used in elections for federal purposes. In 1898 the government of that day saw fit to delegate to the different provinces of Canada, under certain restrictions, the power to make up and revise the lists that should be used in Dominion elections. I have no doubt that the government of that day felt that they had good reasons for bringing about that change. I did not have the advantage of being a member of the House at that time, nor of having been in the position to look thoroughly into the matter or to participate in the debates that took place, but I notice, from the extracts which have been read in the House, that there was a distinct line of cleavage as between the Liberal party, then the government of the day, and the Conservative party, or the party in opposition, as to whether or not it was advisable to make that change in the franchise law. It is equally apparent to me from those extracts that have been read here that while the government of the day delegated this power to the provinces they did not divest themselves of the right or power at any time, for certain reasons and under certain conditions, to take back unto themselves that power to have control over their own lists. Speaking generally, in so far as I see the matter now, I believe to a very great extent in the principle of the federal government controlling the preparation of their own lists for federal elections, but whether that was or was not a wise move in 1898 is a matetr that I am not going to discuss. I am not going to quarrel with the position taken by the government or the position taken by the opposition. It was an experiment and the question is: Has it worked out satisfactory in all cases? If there are cases in which it has not worked out satisfactorily, the government have reserved to themselves the right to take control of these lists in cases where the privilege has been abused. I will deal first with the question as it seems to me to affect the province of Manitoba, and secondly with the question as it affects the province of British Columbia. In so far as the question affects the province of Manitoba, I have sat in this House and listened to members who have spoken on both sides; I have, as it were, taken the part, if I may say so, of an outsider in order that I might come to a fair and reasonable conclusion as to whether or not our hon. friends opposite from the province of Manitoba have any grievance with regard to the provisions of this Bill as it would affect them. I am sure my hon. friends opposite will not expect me to give more credence to the statement made by themselves than to the statements made by hon. members from Manitoba on this side of the House. I think I will be taken as having acted fairly towards them if I say that in coming to the conclusion at which I have arrived I have given to them the same degree of credence that I have given to my hon. friends on this side of the House. It has been borne in upon my mind, in listening to this discussion, from that standpoint that whatever reason may have been present in the mind of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice when he introduced this Bill or in the minds of members of the government who agreed with him in introducing it, as to the necessity of applying its provisions to the province of Manitoba, there are the greatest reasons for retaining this provision in the Bill. It strikes me that there are only three arguable grounds upon which our friends opposite can base their objections to this Bill as it was originally brought into the House. The first ground is the taking away of the right of the province of Manitoba; the second ground is the fear that has been stated to exist in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Manitoba that the preparation of the lists will partly be done under government officials, under the Bill as it was originally introduced, and that they will not receive fair treatment at the hands of officials appointed by the government, and the third reason, if these two are disposed of, is the fact that they are singling out or separating Manitoba from the other provinces of Canada and applying this legislation to it. To my mind these three reasons are all the real reasons that can be urged against this legislation. Let us proceed to take these reasons one by one and to discuss them briefly. Take the first reason, namely, the taking away of a right. I think my hon. friends will not dispute the point when I say that there is no inherent right in the province of Manitoba or any other province of Canada to prepare, for federal elections, federal lists. That is not a right given to them the same as many other rights were

given to the provinces by the British North America Act. What they have is not an inherent right. It is simply a power delegated to them by the Franchise Act passed by the Dominion parliament in 1898. Now you can delegate a power for a time and you can take back that power. Having delegated that power, not only can you take it back from the province of Manitoba but you can take it back from every other province in the Dominion. In 1898 this parliament delegated to the different provinces a power which was inherent in itself and so the taking back of that power is not robbing a province of its inherent right nor is it seizing the franchise of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not discrediting the honesty and fairness and the sincerity of Manitoba in making up the voters' lists when you take back the power from that province and not from the other provinces?

Mr. GALLIHER. I will deal with that phase of the question in a moment.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. Are you delegating powers to the provinces in any proper sense of the term when you merely accept their work in the preparation of the voters' list?

Mr. GALLIHER. When you accept their work?

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. Is it delegating powers to a province when you merely accept the work of the province for your own purpose?

Mr. GALLIHER. My statement is that certain powers are delegated to the provinces with regard to the preparation and revision of these lists.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that this parliament delegated the powers to the provinces.

Mr. GALLIHER. This parliament did delegate power. It said: We will take the lists of the province of Manitoba as they are prepared and revised by provincial authority.

An hon. MEMBER. You adopt their work merely.

Mr. GALLIHER. You adopt their work, but you must have delegated certain powers or otherwise the Dominion itself would have to prepare the lists. I stand by my first statement in the matter. If I am correct in my premises that disposes of the first objection, because, as I pointed out, there is no inherent power vested in the province of Manitoba to hold control over federal voters' lists any longer than the federal parliament permits it to hold that control. Now, as to the fear expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite from Manitoba that the officials appointed by the Dominion government will not be fair in the making up of the lists, surely that fear is dissipated by the suggestion of the Prime Minister with regard to the preparation of these lists.

Mr. FOSTER. What does my hon. friend understand that suggestion to be?

Mr. GALLIHER. I will state what I understand it to be. I have read a good many of the newspapers on that point and no two of them seem to have grasped the same idea.

Mr. FOSTER. What does my hon. friend think to be the reason for that—stupidity in the newspapers?

Mr. GALLIHER. Sometimes, perhaps.

Mr. FOSTER. Or a lack of definiteness of the part of the Prime Minister?

Mr. GALLIHER. Sometimes the newspapers have been stupid and purposely so, and while I do not mean to say that I am less stupid than the newspaper editors, there is no doubt in my mind as to what the Prime Minister meant. The proposition of the right hon. the Prime Minister is that the county court judges of Manitoba be appointed to revise the present existing lists or the lists as they may exist after the latest revision by the provincial authorities; that, taking those lists as a basis the registration clerks and other officials shall be appointed not by this government, but by the county court judges. That would take the whole modus operandi of the preparation and revision of these lists for the federal elections absolutely out of politics.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the judges having revised the lists under the provincial law are to immediately begin to revise them again under a Dominion law?

Mr. GALLIHER. The judges may have revised them under the provincial law, but before that revision many names are put upon these lists by the registrars who are appointed by the provincial government, and the proposition is that these registrars, or those who shall place before the revising judges the lists, shall not be appointed by the government of Manitoba or by the Dominion government either, but shall be appointed by the judges and responsible to the judges for their work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under what provision of the Manitoba Franchise Act do the registrars put names on the lists?

Mr. GALLIHER. I notice in to-day's 'Citizen' that the Hon. Mr. Rogers, Minister of Public Works for Manitoba—a gentleman whom I know very well—states that no name can be put upon the lists or taken off the lists except by the judges of the province under the present law.

Mr. STAPLES. That's right.

Mr. GALLIHER. The Hon. Mr. Rogers does not state that quite fairly because he

knows that the registration clerks receive applications at stated times and stated places and many of these applications are written in on a list handed to the registrar, and if these lists are submitted regularly the judges cannot strike these names off unless they are objected to and the objections sustained.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Is there not a provision in the Provincial Act to enable representatives of both parties to be present when these sworn applications are received?

Mr. GALLIHER. I have no doubt.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). And is there not a provision that immediately the representative of either party may hand in an appeal to the registration clerk?

Mr. GALLIHER. That may all be, and for the present I am not quarrelling with the Manitoba Act.

Mr. ALCORN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not object to being asked a question now and then during my address nor does it bother me much, but I do object to standing up here to be cross-examined by hon. gentlemen opposite with question after question. I do not interrupt very often when hon. gentlemen opposite are speaking, and I only wish the same courtesy to be extended to me. My hon. friend from Prince Edward county (Mr. Alcorn) will have his opportunity to speak. However, I have no objection to answering his question.

Mr. ALCORN. The hon. gentleman says the Premier announced that he intended to have lists made wholly under judicial authority.

Mr. GALLIHER. Hear, hear.

Mr. ALCORN. And that a certain modus operandi was suggested by the Premier for that purpose. Where in the right hon. gentleman's speech does the hon. gentleman find that modus operandi laid down? I might call his attention to this fact, that at the close of the right hon. gentleman's speech I asked this question:

> Has the right hon. gentleman mapped out or has he in his mind any modus operandi by which his new lists will be made altogether under judicial authority?
>
> Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think so. I think we will be prepared to do so at the proper time, when we are in committee.

Where else in the speech of the right hon. gentleman does the hon. gentleman find any modus operandi laid down?

Mr. GALLIHER. If my understanding of the right hon. the Prime Minister's suggestion is correct, and if I am stating what is correct, would my hon. friend (Mr. Alcorn) be prepared to accept an Act on lines such as I have suggested?

Mr. ALCORN. The lines are so very faint I do not think any one could accept or reject it.

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friend says the lines are very faint. At the risk of repetition I would say that my understanding of the proposition of the Prime Minister is that every official, including the revising judges, who shall take part in the preparation of these lists in Manitoba for federal purposes, shall be an official absolutely beyond the control of politics. Can you suggest any fairer method of preparing lists? Can any politician, either on the Conservative or on the Liberal side, say that this is not the fairest way in which a list can be prepared, to take it absolutely out of politics and place it in the hands of county court judges? My hon. friends cannot complain of the county court judges in Manitoba for in running over the names I find that five of the seven are appointments of their own, and I think I know them all, all honourable gentlemen in every sense of the word. I make that comment to show that no fault can be found with the majority of the judges on the ground that they will be Liberals.

Mr. ALCORN. Where in the speech will the hon. gentleman find that?

Mr. GALLIHER. The hon. gentleman will get his chance to speak and I shall be pleased to listen to him. As I say, my understanding of the proposition of the Prime Minister is that the lists of Manitoba, taking as a basis the lists as they will exist after the last provincial revision before a Dominion election, shall be revised by county court judges, that they shall be taken absolutely out of politics, so that every man, Grit or Tory, will have a fair opportunity of being on the list and a fair opportunity will be given to each party to have the names of any who should not be on the list struck off. I do not believe it is possible to suggest a fairer method.

Mr. CROCKET. Why apply that only to Manitoba?

Mr. GALLIHER. I am going to that. I think it is clear that any fear hon. gentlemen may have felt that the lists to be prepared under this Bill as it originally stood would be unfair, is met and completely obliterated by the proposition of the Prime Minister. Thus reason No. 2 disappears.

Reason No. 3, the singling out of Manitoba. I shall refer in this connection to some quotations of the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I will be fair enough to admit at the start that if no good reasons are shown for singling out the province of Manitoba, that province

should not be singled out. I make that as a flat proposition to start with. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has asked: Why do you select Manitoba and not Ontario or Nova Scotia or any other province? If you have a school of nine children, to use a homely expression, and one of those children for some cause or other deserves punishment, if you like to call it so——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh, hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friends laugh, but I said I was using a homely illustration; probably punishment is not the word, let us say deserves correction. My hon. friend would not say it was fair to the other eight provinces of the Dominion that you should correct them all for the fault that was committed by one.

Mr. FOSTER. How about the little boy, British Columbia.

Mr. GALLIHER. I shall come to the little boy 'British Columbia' later on. I do not intend to forget British Columbia. If no reasons can or will be given in the discussion why Manitoba should receive different treatment from the rest of the provinces, which is probably a better way to put it, I agree with my hon. friend that this Bill should not go through; but if it can be and has been shown and the very arguments of my hon. friends opposite as well as those of my friends on this side, have forced me to this conclusion—that in Manitoba, without reflecting on the government of that province, a state of affairs exists and has existed for some time by which justice is not done to all concerned, I would go almost as far as the Prime Minister himself did when he stated that it was the bounden duty of this government to interfere.

The hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), at page 8688 of 'Hansard', referring to the words of the Prime Minister in the debate of 1898; on the Franchise Act, quoted as follows:

> But if the day comes when a fraud is committed against this parliament, when legislation of a hostile character is brought forward in the legislature, then it will be always open to this parliament to resume its own powers and to enact a franchise law of its own.

The leader of the opposition himself during that debate said he quite understood the principle that the Dominion government was not depriving itself of its rights for all time to come but could take back to itself again its right if necessity arose. The Prime Minister said:

> But if the day comes when a fraud is committed against this parliament——

I think the leader of the opposition said that it was not clear whether this fraud was a fraud against the Liberal party or not. It need not necessarily be a fraud committed against the Liberal party, in fact I think the fraud is much broader and would be, if it is a fraud at all, a fraud against all the electors of the province, whether Liberal or Tory.

Again the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) at page 8690 of 'Hansard', in speaking of the perfection of the Manitoba Act says:

> And this law, enacted by the legislature of Manitoba, under a Conservative administeration, has been subject to so little criticism that I say here I do not believe there is in the Dominion of Canada a single province which can show legislation more satisfactory, more fair and effective than that which we have been discussing.

But my hon. friend must know that while we may have an excellent Act on the statute-book, if, in the carrying out of that Act, abuses occur, if the Act is not administered fairly, the results are just as vicious as if the Act itself were vicious.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is then the administration and not the terms of the Act itself to which the hon. gentleman objects.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is what I am objecting to at present. My hon friend also at page 8694 quotes the following words used by the right hon. the First Minister:

> But, sir, I ask my hon. friends if they will not admit that, although the legislation which to-day exists in Manitoba and the manner in which it is administered may be satisfactory to the Tories, it is not satisfactory to the Grits, and that is the reason why we have introduced this legislation.

And my hon. friend the leader of the opposition very astutely rather played on those words and asked: What if we came into power and we should find a provincial Liberal government in office in Nova Scotia and should want to change the Act as regards Nova Scotia, because, although it may be satisfactory to the Grits, it is not satisfactory to the Tories? My hon. friend sought to leave the impression that the First Minister was merely making this change in the law in Manitoba because the lists did not please the Grits and do please the Tories. But he knows well that outside that little quotation I have read, there have been grounds brought before the right hon. gentleman, and afterwards proved in discussion here, which show unfairness in the administration of this law. Nay, it has been shown that the grossest kinds of frauds have been committed in some parts of Manitoba in the preparation of those lists. These frauds I do not lay at the door of the government of Manitoba, but they must be laid at the door of the officials appointed by that government and of the men who acted as the agents of those

officials, and I suppose that the government of Manitoba is the responsible party in the end.

With regard to the reasons why Manitoba is singled out from the other provinces, I intend making some quotations from the speeches of hon. members on this amendment. I have already pointed out that in 1898, the right hon. the First Minister stated that while the government of Canada would be justified, on the ground of fraud or of hostile legislation, in taking back control of the federal lists, there were other grounds on which it would be justified in doing so. Let me refer to the speech of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford). Discussing the very point mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Rogers in his interview with the 'Citizen,' the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) brought out some interesting facts to show what the officials appointed by the provincial government had to do with the preparation of the lists in Manitoba. On page 8344 of 'Hansard' the hon. gentleman said:

> Who limits the time for registration? The executive council of Manitoba. Who decides that there should be but one registration clerk and one booth in each constituency? The executive council of Manitoba. Who fixes the places of registration booths and the hours during which they are to be open? The executive council of Manitoba, the political machine. Who appoints the registration clerks who have very considerable discretionary powers? The executive council of Manitoba. Who fixes the courts of revision, allowing but for a single day, for a part of a day or a number of days? Who fixes the time for the sittings of the court of revision and the duration of those sittings? Who limits the hours during which the court of revision can sit? The government of the province of Manitoba has full control over the courts of revision and everything else, in so far as registration and the revision of the voters' lists in the province of Manitoba are concerned.

The judges, of course, sit where they are authorized to sit, and, during the time they are authorized, decide as to who should or should not be on the lists.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Will the hon. gentleman be surprised to learn that the judges name the places, the dates and the hours?

Mr. GALLIHER. Since when?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). In practice ever since this Act has been on the statute.

Mr. GREENWAY. Did the hon. gentleman read the proclamation the other day?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). And they are confirmed by order in Council, but it is they who fix the dates.

Mr. GALLIHER. What does the hon. gentleman say to the last proclamation?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Will the hon. gentleman deny that the judges name the places, the times and the dates for the holding of the courts of revision?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And have them confirmed by order in council.

Mr. GALLIHER. If my hon. friend will take the last proclamation issued in the Manitoba 'Gazette' of April 25, he will see that what is complained of is still being done in Manitoba even yet, in the face of the Bill being brought down to supply a remedy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can assure my hon. friend—and my statement can be verified by the judges themselves if necessary—that the judges fix the dates, the places and the hours during which they shall sit. The government of Manitoba interferes in nowise with those. Upon the report of the judges being brought to council, an order in council is passed and the proclamation issued.

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friend admits that the judges make their recommendations to council, and the council may or may not put them in form of an order in council.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the council do?

Mr. GALLIHER. It will probably be hard to answer what, in all cases, it does. But that is only one point of the many I have here. I have here half a dozen different ones that are not challenged.

Mr. STAPLES. They were all challenged and answered long ago.

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has challenged them all holus bolus. He pleads the general issue, in other words, but that after all is not a very good answer to a direct statement. Now, let me quote from the hon. member for Portage la Prairie at page 8300 of 'Hansard' with regard to the distances people have to go to get on the list. Holding up the proclamation, the hon. member said:

> Well, here is the proclamation, and you can read it for yourself. For a man to get on the list in Gladstone he will have to travel two hundred miles coming and going. To be registered in Russell, he will have to travel 156 miles; in Emerson, 216 miles; in Selkirk, 200 miles; in La Verandrye, 240 miles.

Now, let me point out to my hon. friends opposite that there are different degrees of fraud. Where, in the administration of a franchise Act, it is rendered practically impossible for persons duly qualified to be placed on the voters' list to reach the place appointed for them in order to have their

names placed on that list within the time allowed, you are committing, in a degree, fraud against those citizens. Now, there is a state of affairs, which, if it existed in British Columbia, would bring down the condemnation of every man, Liberal or Conservative.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is not correct.

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friends opposite had their opportunity of cross-examining the hon. member for Portage la Prairie who made this statement and who knows the facts. These hon. gentlemen know that I cannot know these facts personally. But I am quite sure they will do me the justice to say that I have just as much reason to accept the statement of my hon. friends on this side as I have to credit the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the name of the man who has to do this?

Mr. GALLIHER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) cannot be serious in that question. Certainly, I cannot give him the information. But the hon. gentleman would have quite a walk if he went afoot to ask this man his name. Now, the hon. member for Portage la Prairie——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) permit me a question? What is the length of Manitoba from north to south and its breadth from east to west?

Mr. GALLIHER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that. But I travelled Manitoba in the old days and I know a little about its physical features. I know that, very often, you have to go around a long way by reason of natural physical impediments. Two places may not be far apart as the crow flies but you cannot always travel that way, as muskegs and swamps intervene that you cannot cross. Now, it has been said that registration clerks have no powers in connection with the preparation of these lists. Let me give an instance, given by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) at page 8365 of 'Hansard':

> In connection with those voters in the particular case I was going to refer to at Lansdowne last year, here is where an abuse crept in to the extent of 40 voters, owing to the fact that the registration clerk failed to do his duty. Applications were made to strike 40 names off the lists, but when the case came before the judge, owing to the fact that the registration clerk had failed to notify the electors whose names were protested the judge would not deal with it at all, and those men were allowed to remain on the lists.

That shows you that this matter is not all in the hands of the revising judge, for others—and these appointed by the executive council of Manitoba—have duties to perform. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) proposes that these men shall not be political appointees, but shall be appointed by the judge who is chosen to prepare and revise these lists.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What year is that?

Mr. GALLIHER. I am informed that that was in 1907. Now, let me quote from the speech of the hon. member from Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) with regard to the action of the registration clerks. I quote from page 8617 of 'Hansard',

> The hon. leader of the opposition and other gentlemen opposite have challenged us to show where any person was left off the list of electors by any official of the Manitoba government, or where any complaints had been made against the lists that had been prepared. My hon. friend from Selkirk gave last night a good many instances of this kind, but I might refer in addition to the incident at Balsam bay where 28 voters applied to the registration clerk to put their names on the list, but they could not get the registration clerk to receive their applications and they were disfranchised. The registration clerk, in making the return wrote to his friend, who was the candidate for the constituency, and said: 'Nobody had applied but the few Grits, and you bet I did not put them on.'

Mr. STAPLES. Have you that letter?

Mr. GALLIHER. I took the trouble to ask the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) if that letter was in existence and how the letter had come out. He told me that the case came up in court and this is how it was brought to the attention of the public. Will my hon. friends opposite say that that was not a fraud committed on these electors? If these citizens were justly entitled to be placed upon this list in order that they may exercise their franchise, was not this refusal of this registration clerk, because they were Grits forsooth, a direct, a gross fraud practised against these citizens?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. member (Mr. Galliher) knows that the reply has been given to that statement. I do not wish to repeat the facts. But there was not a man of these disfranchised—they were all put on the list.

Mr. GALLIHER. They were, for the time being. Hon. gentlemen opposite can reply to what I am saying in good time. The hon. member (Mr. Burrows) who makes the statement I have quoted is responsible and I give the statement on his authority. But I will quote some statements later that my hon. friends cannot take this objection to. Now, let me quote from the hon. member for Dauphin—page 8261 of 'Hansard'—with regard to the disfranchisement of the Lac du Bonnet electors. I would like to quote another statement made by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) in that regard.

Another case which has been cited before, a very glaring case—a case which shows we had grievances under this Act—was the deliberate disfranchisement of 38 electors at Lac du Bonnet. In this case the revising officer, Mr. Heap, in order to enable the people who were living at Lac du Bonnet to be placed on the list, and at the request of representatives from that district, adjourned his court and agreed to go to the lake and take the applications of the residents there.

Now Mr. Heap saw himself that it was not possible to deal out fair play to these men if he did not appoint another place which could be reached by them, where they could have their names put on the list. He did so, and what was the result ?

The train goes to Lac du Bonnet once a week, remains about two hours and returns. The clerk sent word that he would be there on a special train, the residents met him, and he took all their applications. They were bona fide electors. Nobody raised a claim that they were not entitled to vote. But as soon as the government found out that he had adjourned his court, they notified him that his action was illegal; and notwithstanding the fact that the registration board certified to the list, when the election took place, the sheets containing these names were torn off, and these men were disfranchised.

I have a copy of his certificate here.

Mr. STAPLES. Better read the two certificates.

Mr. GALLIHER. I will read the one I come to first. When their own officer was trying to do what was fair and to give these men an opportunity of being placed on the list, what did the government do ? The government, or those delegated for the purpose, did not draw any thin red line through these lists, as the hon. member for Selkirk has said, but they tore them off holus bolus ; and I am informed by an hon. member who took the trouble to look it up, that notwithstanding they had torn these thirty-eight names off the list, when the list came down here certified by the clerk to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, fourteen of those names that had been torn off were interlined on that return, and that was returned as the proper list to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. It is quite reasonable for Liberals to assume that these fourteen names were not friends of the Liberal party. Now in regard to the resolution of the Trades and Labour Council of Winnipeg, the hon. member for Dauphin quoted that also. This resolution was published in their organ, and I draw attention to it in order to show that it is not only the Liberals who are complaining of the manner in which the local Act is being carried out, but those belonging to the great labour party as well. On page 8625 we find this in the speech of the hon. member for Dauphin.

The resolution which the Trades and Labour Council passed unanimously and which the boards printed in large type on its front page was as follows:

Whereas the facilities for registration of voters have proved altogether inadequate for the purpose, therefore be it resolved:

That this trades council demand of the government that registration be re-opened and be kept open for at least five days.

And my hon. friend went on to say that the Roblin government did not reopen the registration proceedings. Again, on page 8631, the hon. member for Dauphin alludes to what took place when the returning officer, in the last Dominion election, urged that an additional poll should be opened in one of the ridings of Selkirk, at Lac du Bonnet, so that the people might have an opportunity of exercising their franchise. My hon. friend said :

If the provincial polling division had been followed in the Dominion elections of 1904, the people of Lac du Bonnet, in Selkirk, would have been obliged to go to Cromwell to vote. This would have involved a railway journey from Lac du Bonnet to Molson, and another railway journey to Beausejour, and a drive from Beausejour to Cromwell, in all a drive of forty miles. It is very difficult, in fact impossible, for the electors to go from one place to the other, as there is only one train a week. If the train happened to go on election day it would be all right, but trains do not, as a rule, run on election day any more than on any other day if it does not suit their convenience. The Dominion returning officer put a poll at Cromwell and another at Lac du Bonnet, and they had to divide the list to agree with the polls. That was one of the cases in which action was taken against the returning officer for using the thin red line, as stated by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

So that wherever it was sought to give the electors an opportunity to record their votes we find that even the returning officer was arrested for attempting to do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word with regard to the affidavits that were placed on 'Hansard' by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole), in his speech on this Bill. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) seemed rather to reflect upon the hon. member for Winnipeg because he had read those affidavits in the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that rule were to obtain in this House, I think we would find among our hon. friends opposite very many offenders in that regard. If it is wrong to read an affidavit in the House which discloses improper acts on the part of any person, our hon. friends opposite, who have heretofore read such affidavits in this House, would be to blame fully as much as my hon. friend from Winnipeg. The whole question is as to the truth or falsity of these affidavits. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in his speech a few days ago, paid me the compliment of saying that if I would rise in the House and, in my fair and manly way, as he put it, would give my

opinion of this matter, I might speak in a manner differing somewhat from my hon. friends. Now I do not want to destroy the opinion the hon. member for North Toronto had of me; still I must say that if I had in my possession affidavits which I knew to be true, or had every reason to believe were true, and which disclosed wrong-doing in the preparation of the lists in the province of British Columbia, I would rise in my place in this House and read those affidavits, if occasion called for it. I think that the hon. member for Winnipeg only exercised his privilege in reading those affidavits, nay more, it was his duty, not only to his party but to the country at large, to read them as he did. Therefore I think that the reflection cast upon my hon. friend from Winnipeg by the hon. member for Macdonald for reading those affidavits, was not at all warranted. And how did the hon. member for Macdonald treat those affidavits? Did he venture for a moment to say that the contents of those affidavits were not true? No, he met them by flourishing a cheque and saying, there is the cheque that paid for them.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, and I intend to say, hear, hear. The question is not whether those men who made these affidavits were paid for the time that they lost in leaving their work and going to make them; the question is as to the truth or untruth of those affidavits. What is the use of saying whether these were paid for or not if the cheque which my hon. friend there held was paid for by his friend's friends too? But, be that as it may, so long as the statements in this affidavit are true it matters not to me whether the men were paid for their time or not. If they are true the gist of the whole thing and the application of the cheque has nothing to do with it whatever. If they are untrue, of course, it is a different thing. But, there must be either one or two conditions with regard to these affidavits. If these affidavits are not true then what should be the result? These affidavits were made in the city of Winnipeg right under the nose of the Attorney General's department of the province of Manitoba by residents then and now, as I understand, of Winnipeg. I heard that one of them has taken a trip away, but the majority are there yet, and if there is anything untrue in these affidavits the Criminal Code of Canada provides a means of dealing with men who make false statements under oath. It is the bounden duty of the Attorney General's department of Manitoba to prosecute all these men if they have made false statements in these affidavits. I am not going to say that the Attorney General's department was derelict in its duty in not doing that. I am rather inclined to take the charitable view of the case and to say that the reason that these men were not prosecuted is that the contents of these affidavits are absolutely true. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), when the four or eight affidavits were quoted and the circumstances stated, remarked that that was the herd that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) and the right hon. Prime Minister were travelling with. How he came to that conclusion I do not know. Not only were his friend's friends—if I am wrong I wish to be corrected—travelling with these four or eight men, but they were travelling with a herd of 450 men, a herd bigger than the herd of buffalo which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has imported into this country. It is not unreasonable to suppose that hon. members on this side of the House, knowing the contents of these affidavits, would not wish to have men of that description on the list and would wish to have men who were placed on the lists under these circumstances removed in order that they might have a fair election. I will read some extracts from these affidavits. My hon. friend from Winnipeg read these affidavits, but made very little comment upon them. I propose to take a short time in making some comments on these affidavits. We will take first the affidavit of Theodore Rudneski:

Province of Manitoba, to wit:

I, Theodore Rudneski, agent, make oath and say as follows:—

I am personally, intimately acquainted with W. H. Hastings, the organizer in the province of Manitoba for the Conservative party, and I have been acquainted with the said Hastings for upwards of two years.

About the middle of the month of January 1907. I pointed out to the said Hastings that a large number of foreigners, particularly of the class usually known as Galicians, were residing in various parts of the city of Winnipeg who were at that time entitled to take out naturalization papers in Canada, but who had not at that time done so and who were otherwise qualified to become electors in the elections then in contemplation in the province of Manitoba.

This is how it started:

Shortly after the middle of January, 1907, the said W H. Hastings, in my presence, made arrangements with a committee of six composed of Joseph Makarski, Thomas Snezek, Frank Szablewski, George Czornij, Michael Humiłowicz, Thomas Jestremski, to proceed at once to make up a list of Conservative Galicians eligible for naturalization.

I noticed that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asked my hon. friend from Winnipeg if this were not in connection with naturalization and not in connection with the preparation of the lists. My hon. friend does not imagine for a moment that we are so guileless as to believe that the Conservative party in Manitoba are going to pay for the naturalization of 450 Galicians unless with the object of having them placed on the list as good

Conservative voters. The first step in placing a foreigner on the list who is not a British subject is to get him naturalized and it is with the naturalization of these people that these affidavits have to do. I will not read all the affidavits but I will read some parts of them that strike me very forcibly:

Prior to the third day of February, 1907, the committee aforesaid and other friends of the Conservative party made up a list of some 450, more or less, Galicians, Polanders, Germans, and other foreigners said to be at that time eligible for naturalization.

Prior to the said third day of February, 1907, the signatures of a few of the men on the list of 450 as aforesaid, were obtained——

The signatures of a few of these men were obtained.

—by different parties to blank oaths of residence——

Blank oaths of residence:

—and oaths of allegiance on the forms in common use in connection with the naturalization of aliens, but the greater number on the list aforesaid had, prior to the third day of February, 1907, signed no papers whatever, or taken no oaths or affidavit whatever with a view of complying with the requirements of the Naturalization Act.

The great majority had signed no papers. A number of them had signed what? Were they aware of the papers they were signing? Was it filled in? Not at all, but it was a blank form of naturalization paper.

On Sunday the third day of February, A.D. 1907, I, this deponent, and Thomas Snezek, Frank Szablewski, Thomas Jestremski, Billey Chicocki, Vladmir Rudko and Julian Nowacki went, at the request of the said W. H. Hastings, in the Maw block on Market square, in the city of Winnipeg, and set to work about two o'clock in the afternoon to prepare the naturalization papers for the parties on the list of 450, thereabouts, above referred to.

And they continued that work until two o'clock on Sunday, just these men there present, nobody else, none of the applicants.

I was personally present at the time and place aforesaid, and I saw the said Thomas Jestremski sign as commissioner, the various naturalization papers aforesaid and certify that the contents of the said papers were sworn to or affirmed by the respective parties mentioned therein, without any of such parties swearing or affirming or being present on the occasion in question.

Actually the commissioner, the man employed, the man paid by the Conservative party to get these men naturalized so that they might be put on the lists as good Conservative voters in North Winnipeg actually purported to swear men who were not present at all, and he actually affixed their signatures as having sworn when they had in reality made no deposition at all.

Mr. GALLIHER.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow a question?

Mr. GALLIHER. Surely.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend read the affidavits of Mr. Hasting's and the other gentleman concerned in which they absolutely deny this? Why not give as much credence to these affidavits as to the others?

Mr. GALLIHER. I have not read the affidavit of Mr. Hasting's. I am not taking second-hand proof. I am taking the sworn statement of the very men that Mr. Hastings employed to do this work. This is direct evidence. Talk about the thin red line, but when it comes down to swearing in 450 invisible men you are drawing a very much finer and more evanescent line. This affidavit goes on to say:

12. The only commissioner present at the time and place referred to in paragraph 7 hereof, was Thomas Jestremski, and it was necessary in order to complete the naturalization papers for the 450 applicants, more or less, above referred to, for the said Thomas Jestremski to sign his name some twelve or fifteen hundred times, more or less, and the said Thomas Jestremski complained from time to time towards the latter part of the session in question of fatigue and complained that he was too tired of writing to complete all the papers. To overcome this the said Jestremski told others of the parties referred to in paragraph 7 hereof to sign the names of the said Jestremski to a number of the papers which were being made out as aforesaid, and the same were signed accordingly.

Thomas got tired of his job before it was all complete. I believe there is something known as writers' cramp, and Thomas appears to have got the writer's cramp, although I can find nothing in these affidavits that discloses the fact that he had any cramp in his conscience. And what did our friend Thomas do under these conditions? It was a mere matter of form to Thomas to declare that people were present before him when they were not present, but greater things were required of Thomas and when Thomas had worked to the point of exhaustion for his employers, Thomas very calmly turned over to his co-workers, who were also paid by the Conservative party, the right of signing his name as a commissioner for taking affidavits. There might be some powers that Thomas could delegate, but the taking of affidavits is not one of them. However, Thomas was equal to the occasion, and this affidavit goes on to say that these men signed the affidavits with Thomas' name until they completed the lists. We can imagine how closely the signatures of Thomas Jestremski was copied by his four or five co-workers when we know that the person whose duty it was to see that these affidavits were in regular order could not distinguish between the genuine and the bogus signature of Thomas. Is it reasonable to suppose that these affi-

davits were not only not scrutinized, but deliberately allowed to go in knowing they were improper. Then I would take the affidavit of Mr. Rudneski (page 8192 of 'Hansard'), and it follows closely on the lines of the affidavit of Thomas Jestremski. He also knows Mr. Hastings and he also says that these other men were employed to do this work by Mr. Hastings for the Conservative party, first at a stipend of $2 a day and as they improved in the manner of doing their work they got it increased to $2.50. This gentleman also says among other things that Jestremski was the only commissioner there and that he was troubled with writer's cramp and delegated his powers as I have mentioned. Further we find that a Mr. Irving connected with the Attorney General's Department has said that some of these affidavits ought to be dated back to January so that it would make them appear as being at a certain time before the holding of the court in February in order that the naturalization papers might be issued. He says distinctly that Mr. Hastings was present and knew the nature of the work being done on the said Sunday, February 3, and that they were dated back to January 2, 5, 8, 10 and 11, 1907. Now, as to how these people got naturalized: First, the great majority of them never signed the papers at all; secondly, a few of them signed in blank; thirdly, none of them were present when the commissioner took the oath which it was necessary to administer to them; fourthly, the commissioner delegated his authority to somebody else to sign these affidavits for him, and, fifthly, the dates of these that were taken on the 3rd of February were put back to certain days in January in order that they might meet the conditions that would arise. Now, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness I ask if in that case an unmitigated and indefensible fraud was not perpetrated upon the electors of North Winnipeg? These affidavits are taken from the mouths of the very people who were employed and paid to do the work. Hon. gentlemen may say that these affidavits were not made by very high-class people, but if that be the case the fault lies with the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite who employed and paid that class of men to do that class of work. But something else occurred in connection with these naturalization certificates. I shall refer to an affidavit put in by the hon. member for Dauphin at page 8622 of 'Hansard,' the affidavit of John Hyzy, who says:

To wit: I, John Hyzy, of 627 Lorette avenue, in the city of Winnipeg, do solemnly declare I am at the present time vice-president of the Polish Conservative club. I have seen in the 'Free Press' of this morning certain affidavits from Theodore Rudneski and others as to the way in which naturalization papers were made out just previous to the last election, in March, 1907. I have also seen in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of this evening affidavits denying such charges, and, with a full knowledge of the facts and the seriousness of such charges, I do say and solemnly declare:

After having read the affidavits and contradictions, I would like to know how Hyzy or any one else who was not present would know in what way this was done.

1. During the month of February, 1907, I went to the headquarters of the Conservative club, in the Maw block, and met Mr. Rudneski and Mr. Sablewski, and asked them about the naturalization papers for Mr. Desput and Mr. Jaworski and others, and they told me that they were not ready, but Rudneski said it was easy to make them out.

Yes, there is no doubt that their methods of making them out were free and easy.

2. Mr. Rudneski then sat down and filled in one of the papers and several others afterwards. I had to spell the name of Desput for him. He then went into an inner room on the right hand side of the large room where I was. I followed him to the door of the inner room, but he told me not to come in. There were other persons there whom I did not know.

3. I saw him go to the table, then the door was closed. He came out a few minutes later with the papers. Before he took them in I noticed they had no stamp on them, but I could not say whether the signature of the clerk of the court was on them or not. When he came back and gave me the papers they had the stamp or seal of the court on them down in the left hand corner.

Now what a state of affairs. A man swears positively that this naturalization board, went in to the back room of the committee of the Conservative committee room in the Maw Block in the city of Winnipeg, that the papers when they went in did not bear the seal of the court, and when they came out from that room a few minutes afterwards did bear the seal of the court. In my opinion, and I think this will be agreed to, there is one proper place of custody for the seal of the county court of the county of Selkirk, or the city of Winnipeg, whichever it may be called now, and that is within the precincts of the court, and neither the clerk of the court nor any body else has any right to take the seal of that court either into the Conservative committee rooms or into any other rooms outside the court. It is there for a special purpose and when we find the seal of the court brought into the back room of the Conservative committee rooms in the Maw block in Winnipeg, in February, 1907, and have these naturalization papers stamped with that seal in that room, will any one say that there is not another case of fraud? These affidavits disclose absolutely cases of fraud probably unparalleled in the history of the preparation of voters' lists, and when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the

House ask why Manitoba is singled out from the rest of the provinces of Canada, I refer them to not only the conditions in Manitoba which have been set out in concrete form by my hon. friends the Liberals from Manitoba but also the scandalous actions in naturalizing these men and placing them on the list, for Rudneski swears that most of these names were placed on the lists afterwards——

Mr. STAPLES. Would my hon. friend like to see the original cheque with which he was paid for the affidavits?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes. Might I ask my hon. friend how much his friends paid Rudneski for that cheque ?

Mr. STAPLES. Not one cent more than its face value and I will prove it to the hon. gentleman if he wants it.

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) need not get warm at all ; I am speaking in all kindness and we are old friends, when he played short-stop I played long-off.

Mr. STAPLES. And you are a good sport too. Play the game fair.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think I will be accused of playing it unfair. I have not made statements and called them my own——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. I have taken affidavits right from the root of the thing, right from the very men who did the work and I have taken statements of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who, I believe know what they are talking about and I have given them as their statements.

I shall now proceed to British Columbia which, as my hon. friends know, is also included under the provisions of this Act. In British Columbia we have in many respects an excellent franchise Act but in some respects it is weak. One of the good features of the British Columbia Act is that the list is revised twice a year in May and November. One of its weaknesses, to my mind, although this is possibly owing to the conditions physical and otherwise of British Columbia, is that it permits registration without personal application. The provincial government can give authority to any one to take affidavits in connection with the placing of names on the list. such a person can then go about among the people, as they do on both sides of politics, and in three or four days hand in a list of names of men who have taken affidavits without those men having to come personally before the registration clerk. I think myself that the only actually safe way to register is to have personal application for registration, but that would be difficult in the case of many miners who work in mines removed from a town where a commissioner is appointed. Probably that is why the commissioners are appointed in this way, although that practice gives rise to frauds, as I have no doubt there are many cases where men are placed on the list who cannot read or understand the English language. No doubt in many instances men are on that list who cannot read or understand English, yet I suppose who have taken the affidavit with regard to residence and naturalization required by that Act, without understanding it.

Mr. BERGERON. That works on both sides.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not making any distinction but merely pointing out what is probably a weakness in the Act, which, in many other respects, is an excellent one. I notice that one of the provisions to entitle a man to be placed on the voters' list is that he shall be able to read the Act or any portion thereof, if so required, to the satisfaction of the registrar. But as a rule that provision is never exercised. My hon. friend will see that in the schedule that there is no provision regarding that in the affidavit, and the test can only be administered by the registration clerk or the registrar. Another and probably a more serious defect in the Franchise Act of British Columbia is this. Take the present list which is now five years' old. There is no question that in every riding in British Columbia to-day there are hundreds of names on that voters' list which ought not to be there as they represent either dead men or absentees. I consider that a serious weakness, and while owing to British Columbia being a new country and owing to its conditions, I would not go so far as my friend Mr. John Houston, the editor of the 'Empire' of Prince Rupert, who asks that the list should be revised every year, still I think the suggestion is one it would be well for the government of British Columbia to consider. It would, I think, be only fair to have a complete new list made up at least every two years.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman say that the lists are only revised once in five years?

Mr. GALLIHER. I say that the list now in existence is five years old. During that time we have had two courts of revision every year, the first Monday of May and the first Monday of November, and our Act provides that the registrar may, on giving notice or on the application of any one strike off the names of dead people or absentees; but in the practical working of the Act, it is very difficult to strike off names unless very special attention for a very special purpose is paid.

Mr. SPROULE. Have not the other provinces to do the same thing?

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not arguing that there is any distinction. I am merely endeavouring to point the excellencies and the defects of our lists. There is the power to strike off names but a lot are allowed to remain on from one election to another, and moreover you have to deposit one dollar for every name you object to. If you wish to have 200 names struck off, you must deposit with the registrar of votes $200. In every case in which you succeed, your dollar is returned. Otherwise it is forfeited. But while you may be morally certain that John Smith went away from the district of Kootenay a year ago and is not entitled to be on that list, yet you will hesitate before making an affidavit to the registrar that he is not in the district. The provisional divisions are very big, and it is barely possible that John Smith may be in some out of the way place, up in some mine, and never comes to town for six months in the year. Add to that the circumstance that you forfeit a dollar if the name is not struck off, and you can see that a great many names are left on the list which ought not to be there.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be interesting to know how many dollars the hon. gentleman squandered in trying to get names struck off.

Mr. GALLIHER. If it would be interesting to the House, I have no objection to telling my hon. friend that in the district of Kootenay I have gone before the people taking my chances on the will of the majority, and that I neither squandered dollars that way nor in buying any man's vote. In fact I did not have to. While we have a good Act in many respects in British Columbia, it has some defects, and if the Bill submitted to the House does not become law, we shall in British Columbia have to face an election with lists loaded up with a lot of driftwood and absentees. But I may say candidly to my hon. friend that if we were alone in this matter, while the revision of the lists, as provided in the Bill submitted to the House would certainly work no injustice to the province of British Columbia, yet I am disposed to say that had it not been felt desirable to introduce a Bill of this kind because of the conditions in the province of Manitoba there is no very grave necessity for applying it to my province. I candildy admit that I have not received from my district any expressed wish on the part of those who support me that this legislation should apply to British Columbia. On the other hand I have received from Conservative associations—and as I represent all the people there, I think it but fair that I should state this—objecting to the application of this Act, some from misunderstanding, some on the ground that the lists are all right as they stand, and others on the ground of disapproval of the principle. Now, I have stated the matter fairly, and I state just as fairly, that I believe that, had there not been, as there is, in my opinion, every necessity for applying this Act in the fair manner in which the Prime Minister proposes to the province of Manitoba, it would not have been asked as applying to British Columbia.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) know whether the Liberal members sitting in the legislature of British Columbia have ever made a move to have the Act amended in the way my hon. friend suggested a moment ago?

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not know of any instance in which they have done so. But I will frankly say to my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) that I do not really think that makes any difference ; I think that is beside the question ; because, whether I happen to be a member of the federal House or a member of the local legislature, I certainly am entitled to my view as to what should be a proper franchise Act and what amendments I think should be passed in the interests of the people.

Mr. BERGERON. But, in 1898, we adopted the principle of leaving all this to the local legislature.

Mr. GALLIHER. I understand that that is the position, but I presume that my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) will admit that if you have the power to give you have the power to take away, for reason. I think we have scriptural authority which might possibly be applied to that. If I might make the quotation, Scripture says : 'The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away.' So, we might say, the government gave and the government takes away. And, perhaps my hon. friends opposite would not object to my applying the latter part of the quotation also and saying 'Blessed be the name of the government.'

Mr. SPROULE. You are not well up in that.

Mr. GALLIHER. I quote that subject to correction by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) who is an authority. Before leaving British Columbia, I would say that the Liberal members of British Columbia have been considering some features of this Bill and may ask for some change later on when certain sections come up for consideration separately. In other words, we wish to be understood as having in view certain matters that will be in the interests of British Columbia.

Now, I will only refer to one other section of the Act and then will leave the matter of discussion on any other section to the time when the Bill is being discussed clause by clause in committee. I refer to section 17. I quite agree with the view expressed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) when he says that it is very

desirable to preserve the secrecy of the ballot. I think that is something that will be admitted by members on both sides of the House. Probably, the wording of section 17 as it is may be a little wide; it may give cause of the apprehension expressed by the leader of the opposition. However, this Bill, like others, must be taken up for consideration clause by clause, and it should be the endeavour of every hon. member to make the Bill as good a measure as possible. Merely expressing my own opinion hurriedly, I would say that it seems to me that the wording of the clause leaves it open to the serious objection that my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) sees in it. What, as I fancy, is intended is that, if the returning officer places a mark upon the ballot of a voter through inadvertence, his doing so is not to have the effect of disfranchising the voter, but the ballot should be counted. Left in its present form, this section might possibly give rise to the abuse suggested by the leader of the opposition. But if the section be so framed as to allow only for cases of omission or inadvertence, then it will not be open to the same objection. For, after all, we have to consider the right of every elector to exercise his franchise; and, when he casts his vote, that vote should not be cancelled because of an error of the deputy returning officer. We all know what took place in the Wentworth election two or three years ago. I had in mind, in this connection, a case decided in the Supreme Court of the state of Washington. It is the case of Moyer and Van de Vanter, and is reported in 12 Washington, page 377. I have not gone into the case itself but have merely taken the syllabus. It says:

> The provisions of the general statutes, section 391, directing that in the canvass of the votes any ballot which is not endorsed by the initials of some one of the election officers shall not be counted——

That is, as in our case, if the returning officer, being required by the statute to initial the ballot, through error or inadvertence, fails to initial it, the principle announced by the Supreme Court of Washington would validate that vote. For it says that not to count such a ballot would be:

> —in conflict with the constitutional provision entitling all male persons having certain qualifications to the right to vote at all elections, since the effect of such statutory provision would be to debar voters of their constitutional right to vote, without fault on their part.

In other words, declaring that it was unconstitutional to say that a vote should be void and bad and could not be counted through an error or omission on the part of the returning officer. That is the extent to which they have gone in the state of Washington, and I understand that the same ground has been taken in the courts in Michigan. So it does appear to me that if, through inadvertence, a returning officer happens to place an initial on a ballot where it should not be, a man who has an inherent right to be on the list should not on that account be deprived of his franchise. It is an easy matter to distinguish between an error or inadvertence and a deliberate act; I do not think the court would have any difficulty in deciding that. So I say that if, through inadvertence or omission of the returning officer to do a thing which the law called upon him to do, and through no fault of the elector, who had marked that ballot in accordance with the law, it seems to me that it is due in fairness to that elector that his ballot should be counted. I think probably this section 17 could be so redrafted as to do away to a certain extent with the reasonable and proper objection that was raised by the leader of the opposition, namely, that it would be absolutely wrong to leave it in the hands of a dishonest returning officer so to mark a ballot that John Smith could be identified.

Mr. ALCORN. Where does the hon. gentleman find anything about inadvertence in this section?

Mr. GALLIHER. I am saying that I think the section can be redrafted so as to include only such cases as I am suggesting. As I say, the court can easily distinguish between what is an error and what is deliberate. For instance, no returning officer has a right to write the name of John Smith on a ballot, or to mark the initials of a voter. The only difference between this Bill and the present Act is that, under the present Act, the returning officer, if he is dishonest, can put these marks on the ballot, and the result is that the ballot would not be counted, and the voter is deprived of his vote by the wrongful act, not of himself, but of the returning officer. This Bill would in effect say: Notwithstanding that the returning officer wrongfully puts a mark on the ballot the voter shall not be deprived of his franchise. But if this provision is going to open the door too wide, surely we can come to some conclusion with regard to drafting, so that at all events the error or omission of a returning officer will not deprive a qualified elector of his vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on this Bill much longer than I intended, and I ask pardon of the House for having taken up so much time. I thought I would be able to condense my remarks into half an hour, or an hour at the most. Although this question has been discussed at great length on both sides of the House, I felt it my duty as a member of this House to place my views on record. I trust that there is no misunderstanding with regard to the proposition of the Prime Minister, because, if I understand aright, it appears

to me that no reasonable man in Manitoba can say that in so far as the preparation of the lists is concerned, the proposition of the Prime Minister would not provide an absolute guarantee that every qualified elector in Manitoba shall have the right and the opportunity of registering his vote.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, before the House rose at six o'clock we heard from the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) several statements with regard to the proposed Bill which is now before us and, knowing that hon. member as I do, I cannot help but feel that he was labouring very hard to-day in the effort to make out a case on behalf of hon. members on the government side of the House. I believe that the hon. gentleman sings a song called 'Play the game; play the game fair.' I only wish that he would take the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) aside for a few moments and sing that song to him. I believe that if he did we would have better results than we are likely to have from the arguments which have been advanced by government members. However, his whole speech goes to show that the government is not playing the game fair. Statement after statement that the hon. member made, in attempting to defend the government's action on this Bill, certainly proved to me conclusively that the government are trying to force on the House and the country, and upon the province of British Columbia and Manitoba in particular, an unfair and unreasonable measure. He said that the statements he made were not his own but that he took them from the speeches of the hon. members who are supporting this measure, but, if you investigate these speeches you cannot help but feel, as hon. members on this side of the House feel, that they contain statements which are not founded on reasonable grounds. He did not tell us about the short space of time that the government would give the people of Manitoba to register their votes under the operation of this Bill. He did not tell us that practically the people of Manitoba would only have four weeks in which to register and have the lists revised as well. The one great cry of hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House is that the Manitoba Election Act does not give them sufficient time in which to register the names of voters in the different polling divisions or to revise the lists, but when you inquire as to the time they are likely to grant for the courts of revision and for the placing of names on the voters' lists you cannot help but feel that the Act which the legislature of Manitoba has given to the people of that province is much better than the one which is proposed by this government. He did not tell us that the government were likely to introduce the Ross ballot clause in this Bill. Clause 17 is a clause that the people of Ontario fought for many years to eliminate from the statute-book of that province and we are proud and glad to know that we have in the province of Ontario a body of men who have been able to carry out the promises that were made to the electorate previously to their coming into power and one of the promises that they have carried out since coming into office has been the elimination from the statute-book of the numbered ballot. We are surprised that an effort should be made to introduce this into the Dominion Election Act and we can only think that the Hon. Mr. Ross, in coming to Ottawa, has had something to do with placing that clause in the Bill which is now before the House because it was through having that clause on the statute-book of Ontario that he was able to carry practically the last two elections that he did carry and was able to retain office for a longer period than he otherwise would have been. The hon. member who took his seat before six o'clock did not quarrel with the Manitoba Act. He had practically nothing to say in opposition to that Act. He was trying to explain, for one thing in particular, the Prime Minister's speech but the press of this country and members of the opposition have been unable to understand what the Prime Minister's meaning was in making the statements which he did make to this House in defence of the Bill. The hon. member for Kootenay also stated that Manitoba must be punished. That is a pretty strong statement for a member of this House to make in regard to the Bill which is now before us and which deals with the province of Manitoba. Why should Manitoba be punished, may I ask that hon. gentleman? Why should Manitoba and British Columbia be singled out for special legislation in connection with the Election Act of the Dominion? I cannot help but feel that if the hon. gentleman would investigate this matter thoroughly he would be satisfied that the Election Act of Manitoba is not only a reasonable and fair measure, but that the province of Manitoba, should not be singled out as a province to be dealt with in the manner in which this government are attempting to deal with it. Manitoba must be punished. He said that it was practically for her own good that she should be punished.

Then he spent an hour dealing with affidavits which have been presented to this House by some hon. gentlemen opposite and which have been dealt with by hon. members on this side of the House, particularly the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J.

Roche) and the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) in the most able manner. They were able to show that these affidavits were not founded on fact and they had affidavits from prominent men and officials in the west distinctly stating that the affidavits quoted by hon. gentlemen opposite were false. Take the affidavits for instance of Mr. Hastings, barrister, of Winnipeg, and of Mr. R. C. Irving, inspector of legal offices for the provincial government. I will read the affidavit of Mr. L. N. Betourney :

Dominion of Canada, province of Manitoba; to wit:

In the matter of naturalization of aliens in the Winnipeg county court, in the year, 1907.

I, L. N. Betourney, of the city of St. Boniface, in the province of Manitoba, do solemnly declare

(1)—Since the amendment to the Naturalization Act requiring three weeks' notice to be given to the court by aliens applying for naturalization, no applications have been read in open court and no certificates of naturalization have been issued by me, without such notice having been given by such aliens as required by law.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Sgd.) L. N. BETOURNEY.

Declared before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 7th day of May, A.D. 1908.

AUGUSTUS MILLS,
A Commissioner in B.R., &c.

As you are aware, Mr. Betourney is clerk of the court of that province, he is a reliable person and he says distinctly that these affidavits are not authentic and that they have not been presented to him for record. The hon. gentleman depended on the speeches of the government members for his information which he placed before the House to-day. If the hon. gentleman had investigated these speeches and looked into the statements which have been made by a number of hon. members coming from the province of Manitoba and others who have addressed the House on this question he would come to the conclusion that the government were prepared to take an unfair advantage of the Conservatives of Manitoba. Year after year the Manitoba government have been courting inquiry into their Franchise Act and year after year the Liberal opposition in the legislature have been unable to point to one serious irregularity under the election law. And yet we find the Dominion government selecting Manitoba for invidious distinction and attempting to belittle it in the eyes of the Dominion. Some of these gentlemen opposite told us that voters had to go as far as 212 miles to vote, but the province of Manitoba is only 264 miles long by 284 miles wide, a fact which goes to show how reckless have been the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman from Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) was fair enough to tell us that the election Act of British Columbia was just and reasonable and he told us that so far as he was concerned he was willing that British Columbia should not be included in this Bill. No doubt a great many constituents of the hon. gentleman have been pleading with him to give fair play to his own province as well as to Manitoba. In the province of Manitoba there are 41 constituencies and there are on an average practically 12 registration booths in every one of these constituencies. I have here a proclamation referring to the electoral division of Turtle Mountain, and had I time I would read the whole of it in order to show how fairly registration booths are conducted in that province but the following paragraph which is printed in large type will suffice :

Only such persons whose names are not on the last revised list of electors but possess the qualification to be registered as electors under the provisions of the Manitoba Election Act need attend the registration sittings or court of revision for the purpose of being so registered. Electors can make application for registry at any of the places mentioned above.

As I understand it this means that if a man who resides in the lower part of a constituency happens to be at the extreme other end when a court of revision is being held there he would be justified in going before the court and getting his name on the list, and the application would afterwards be investigated before the judge and his name would appear on the list in its proper location. The hon. member for Kootenay in effect admitted in his speech that the Prime Minister had practically goldbricked not only the opposition but the press of the country. He told us that the Prime Minister was anxious to give a square deal to the Conservatives, but let us see what the right hon. gentleman said and I quote from page 8296 of 'Hansard.' Here are the right hon. gentleman's words :

I have no hesitation in saying that I am a partisan but in all fairness to myself I do not believe that I would willingly and conscientiously strike below the belt in order to take unfair advantage of an opponent.

I have been a member of this House for a number of years and I must say that I do not believe the right hon. gentleman is responsible for the clauses in this Bill which have no other object in the world than to strike below the belt.

The right hon. gentleman continued :

I am a partisan and I have sufficient experience of political life in this country to know that very often the judgment of a partisan may be blinded and warped.

I cannot help but think that the right hon. gentleman's position on this Bill is blinded and warped, and that he is attempting to force down the throats of His Ma-

jesty's loyal opposition a measure that is unfair, unreasonable, and invidious and a measure as to which the opposition of this House are justified in straining every nerve to oppose. The right hon. gentleman continued :

I understand fully, I think, the motive of the opposition which has come to this Bill from gentlemen on the other side of the House and especially from the members from the province of Manitoba. They dread the effect of the law of their own province if it is to be administered not by officers appointed by themselves, but by officers appointed by this government.

The hon. member for Kootenay tried to defend the position of this government in seeking to let their officers take charge of the lists in Manitoba, but he was unable to say a word against the Manitoba Franchise Act. He was willing—no I could not say he was willing for the hon. gentleman plays ball, as he reminded one of the members on this side that he played ball with him, and the hon. gentleman knows how to play the game fair, and his laboured remarks this afternoon plainly proved to me that he would like to play the game fair, but he could not do so and defend this Bill. The hon. gentleman was defending this Bill with one hand while he was taking back the words he uttered with the other hand, and instead of taking a manly stand against the measure he was compelled to make a weak and vacillating defence of it. I am sure when he reads his speech to-morrow he will feel humiliated because knowing the hon. gentleman as I do I know that the task imposed upon him as a western member to defend this Bill was most distasteful to him. The right hon. Prime Minister further said ('Hansard' page 8298) :

Sir, is it not a fact that in 1885 the Conservative party crammed down our throats a system whereby the lists were taken from independent officers and placed in the hands of officers appointed by themselves.

And yet the right hon. gentleman is today trying to cram down the throats of the opposition a measure which, were he in our place he would use his most strenuous efforts to prevent becoming law. Sir, I admire the men on this side of the House who are coming out boldly and manfully in defence of Manitoba, of British Columbia, and of the unorganized districts of Ontario and Quebec which are attacked by this Bill. When you see these men fighting for their existence in this House and for the rights of the people, you cannot but admire the position they are taking. The right hon. gentleman says that in years gone by the Conservatives attempted to cram down the throats of the then opposition a nefarious measure. Why then should he bring in such a measure as this and attempt to cram it down the throats of the opposition ?

At page 8557 the Prime Minister says :

We held to the opinion that the preparation of the lists should be left in the hands of the provincial authorities.

That is referring to the conditions previous to 1885.

—still, we had, in the language of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, to keep watch over the provinces and if we found that conditions arose which would not be fair to this House, then it would be our duty to resume our powers and to have the list prepared by ourselves.

What are the sections in the Provincial Act of the province of Manitoba to which the right hon. the Prime Minister alludes when he says:

If we found that conditions arose which would not be fair to this House then it would become our duty to resume our powers and to have the list prepared by ourselves.

The right hon. gentleman was unable in the whole of his speech to refer to any section in the Act of the province of Manitoba that was unfair or unreasonable. He was unable to show this House or the people of the Dominion that the Provincial Act of Manitoba was unfair or unreasonable in any way, and was not for the general benefit of the people of that province.

The right hon. gentleman referred to the overlapping of constituencies in the western provinces, but he could find similar overlapping in every eastern province. In almost any province in Canada he will find overlapping more serious and very much greater in proportion than he will find in the western provinces. For instance in my own riding there is overlapping and there are irregularities in regard to voters' lists and the same thing prevails in many Ontario constituencies. The hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was able to state that for the one irregularity that could be pointed out in Manitoba he could show two in the province of Nova Scotia. I feel sure that on investigation the Prime Minister and his cabinet would find that the Manitoba Provincial Act is reasonable, that it does justice to the people of that province irrespective of party and that the proper course for this government would be to adopt that Act. Pages of the Prime Minister's speech on Thursday last were devoted to the defence of Leach, but after the statements made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), I am sure that those who were attempting to defend Leach will feel that his position in the eyes of this country is not a good one The Prime Minister said :

If the polling divisions are not divided by the boundaries of the Dominion constituencies, I do not see any necessity for intervention; it is only where they are divided, so far as I can see, that the necessity for intervention arises.

But when you come to look into the results of the forcing of such a Bill as this upon the province of Manitoba before the last Dominion election, it is found that many irregularities resulted.

Let me read from the Prime Minister's words at page 8311:

On this side of the House there is an intimate conviction that the lists in the province of Manitoba are very unfair to the political party to which I belong. The members from Manitoba who sit on this side have given what seem to me conclusive evidence on that point. I have looked into the Manitoba Act. In many respects, it is a commendable Act.

In the whole of his speech he was unable to point out one section of that Act which was not for the general advancement of the franchise in that province and when he refers to the members who are supporting him in this matter, I cannot but feel that by this time he is surely cognizant of the fact that they have not been furnishing him with the proper kind of information in regard to the western provinces

Then at page 8315 he says:

I ask my hon. friends if they will not admit that although the legislation which today exists in Manitoba and the manner in which it is administered may be satisfactory to the Tories, it is not satisfactory to the Grits—and that is the reason we have introduced this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is practically the crux of the whole question. The First Minister admits frankly and fairly that as far as he is concerned he must have partisan administration in the province of Manitoba and the unorganized districts or he cannot carry the next election; and I believe it is our duty to see that this province and these unorganized districts are protected and that he shall not secure that advantage.

At page 8317 the Prime Minister says:

That is the proposition I have to make. The judge who is empowered to adjust the lists will be entrusted with the work of correcting all errors which may have been committed in the preparation of the lists in Manitoba.

If that is the only proposition he has to make to the members of the opposition, the Provincial Act provides for that in the province of Manitoba and there is no need of discussing this question any further. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) asked him the question:

Will the right hon. gentleman point out some of the abuses committed by the registration clerks?

Although that question was asked twice the right hon. gentleman was unable to point to one abuse by the registration clerks.

Having read carefully the speeches of the Prime Minister and his prominent supporters in defence of this measure, I can only say that I do not find any argument that will substantiate their statements in regard to the forcing of such a clause upon the people of Manitoba. The opposition are called obstructionists. I think that on Friday last we were able to give to the House and the country proof that we are not obstructionists. But, Sir, we are patriots, we are ready and willing to stand by this province, and by the unorganized districts and to see that justice is done to them.

The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) laughs at my statements. Does he think it is right that this measure should be crammed down our throats. I cannot believe that he is supporting this Bill with his splendid energy and voice, nor can I believe that he will stand by and see this little province saddled with an obnoxious measure such as is now proposed. Coming from the province of Ontario, he will not wish to see the province of Manitoba saddled with the marked ballot which for years kept the Ross government in power Is that the object of the hon. the Minister of Customs ? Does he want to force upon the people a numbered ballot ? Does he think it is in the interest of the country that a man should be able to go into a poll and write his name practically on a ballot ? Clause 17 is one of the most unfair clauses we could possibly place in an Election Act. Let me read it:

Provided, however, that no ballot papers shall be rejected on account of any writing, number or mark placed thereon by any deputy returning officer.

That practically means that the door is flung wide open to acts of corruption. It means that what was practised upon the province of Ontario up to the advent of the present Ontario government is to be perpetrated upon the whole Dominion. I cannot believe that the Minister of Customs has given his sanction to this Bill. I cannot help believing that when he comes to speak, as no doubt he will shortly, in defence of this measure, he will not attempt to defend that clause. On his own side man after man has pronounced that clause a most unfair and invidious piece of legislation which should never have been proposed by the Minister of Justice. If they have not done this on the floor of the House they have done it in the intimacy of friendly conversation. The Minister of Justice knows that it is unfair. The First Minister is well aware that it is most unjust and unreasonable. Yet we are called obstructionists because we are trying to have it eliminated, and the right hon. gentleman is threatening us with dissolution. Well, all I can say is that we welcome dissolution. It is high time that the people were given an opportunity to drive this government out of power. It would be the best thing that could happen this country if we should have a dissolution and have these

barnacles cleaned off the ship of state. Let this government go into the dry dock of public opinion and get the barnacles scraped off, they will soon met their fate in the next election however. According to the Montreal 'Star' of to-day, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) declared in Montreal that provincial politics must go hand in hand with federal politics for both are destined to work for the good of the country. I can hear the Minister of Agriculture down in that province telling the people of the wonderful advantages this Bill is going to give them. He went on to say:

While provincial issues must be more particularly discussed on such occasions, he wished to warn the electors of the county of Brome that they must be ready for another campaign in a very short time. The opposition at Ottawa are trying to usurp the powers of government.

Just fancy the Minister of Agriculture, with his sixty majority, going to the province of Quebec and telling the people there that the opposition at Ottawa are trying to usurp the powers of the government. Did he tell them it was high time the opposition were on the treasury benches? Did he tell them about the corrupt acts of this government, about the corruption carried on in every department of the government, not excluding his own? No, but he went down and said:

The opposition are trying to usurp the powers of government. The latter have been entrusted with that duty, however, and if we cannot carry it out with the present parliament, we will appeal to the country in three or four weeks and have another parliament to do the work of the country.

I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he cannot go to the country any too soon, and when he does he will find that this moribund government, with one foot in the grave, will be compelled to give up the offices they now so unworthily hold. The hon. minister was trying to buoy up his own courage.

An hon. MEMBER. He was feeding the chickens.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Perhaps. Or talking about his cold storage scheme and other measures which he has not yet been able to make any practical use of. The government appear to be very unhappy over the Manitoba list. But we do not find any complaint from the Liberal members in the legislature of that province. We do not find any complaint from the men who are living in that province and who represent the people on the opposition side in the provincial legislature. They have not been making any outcry against the present voters' lists there. They have been unable to see that any unfair advantage is taken of them. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, have recourse to all kinds of means to force this measure on that province.

When we consider the unhappy position in which this government is, we cannot help but conclude that the country is ripe for dissolution. The government to-day are practically in the hands of the money lenders. Look at the position in which the Grand Trunk Pacific stands to-day financially. Look at the position in which our bonds are in the old country market. Consider the tens of millions of dollars which we shall have to borrow in the old country in the near future. To-day we are obliged to pay four, five, six and as high as seven per cent for our money. Is it not time, therefore, that the present government should be ousted and a business government be given control? This government are in the hands of the middlemen and the grafters. When we compare the way our finances are managed at Ottawa with the way the provincial finances of Ontario are administered, we cannot congratulate the present administration. I need hardly point to the Quebec bridge and the corruption in the different departments. With regard to this measure, the opposition have been contending all along that clauses 1 and 17 should be eliminated. In this matter each province to-day is a little kingdom unto itself, but the central authority is trying to change that condition. What they ought to do is deal out justice to Manitoba. They are trying, however, to ignore provincial rights and, further, to take the ballot from the people in the unorganized districts.

Reference has been made to the position taken by the Prime Minister in 1904 with regard to the measure which was then contemplated. I can only say that the Bill must have been drafted in the Justice Department and that some one in the government must have been responsible for it, for we find that it is was 'printed by the King's Printer' some one must have directed this. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that he is ignorant of it. Then, who is the dominating force in regard to this measure? Was it the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). And is that hon. gentleman dominating the government in regard to this matter and forcing it upon the provinces of the west? I cannot but believe that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) is largely responsible for the present Bill. We have the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell throwing slurs upon the laymen of this House and parading his greatness as a lawyer and a legal luminary before the country. As I understand it, law is based on common sense. But when you read clause 1 and clause 17 of this Bill, you cannot but see that, instead of being based on common sense and fair play, they are based upon the very opposite. That hon. gentleman asked why it was that more days were allowed for registration in Manitoba

in 1903 than in 1905. But, though he asked the question, he would not give the opposition an opportunity to explain. The obvious reason is that, in 1903, every man had to be registered, but in 1905 only those who had not been registered before needed to have their names put upon the list, and so it would have been folly to have allowed an equal number of days for registration.

Our duty in regard to this measure is plain. The Liberal-Conservative party are fighting for a square deal and we should be weaklings not to fight for our position. The Liberals of Manitoba are not asking that the present measure should be forced upon that province. The Prime Minister appealed to the sense of honour and fair play of hon. members on this side. Why, we have been fighting for nothing else than honour and fair play. Hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us of obstructing the business of the country in this House; but when these hon. gentlemen look back upon their own record, they can hardly find fault with us for the position we take. The Prime Minister tells us that Leach is a respectable man. Well, so is Preston a 'respectable' man; so is Vance a 'respectable' man; and the O'Gorman's, and the Lewises and the Pritchetts and all who have been doing the dirty work of this government—so are they all 'respectable' men.

If this Bill becomes law, the candidate in Manitoba or the unorganized districts will not have an opportunity to see the voters' lists practically until polling day. What do you think of that, Mr. Speaker? Is that playing the game fairly? Is that giving the square deal to the opposition? Is that a reasonable measure to cram down the throats of the opposition?—to use the words of the Prime Minister. The Conservatives ask that the government allow the judges to take the present lists, and, where overlapping occurs, let them make the changes. That is all that is necessary in order to attain the end which the government says is the end desired in this case. We find the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) admitting that there were no irregularities in the Manitoba law; and the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) practically said that, so far as he was concerned, he knew of no irregularities in the Manitoba law. Man after man on that side is unable to find fault with the Manitoba law as it exists, but still all are ready to take advantage of the little province of Manitoba and of the unorganized districts.

I cannot but think that this is all part of a great election scheme prepared in advance by this government. Months ago, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) came from Europe amidst a great blowing of trumpets and firing of guns, with government ships to meet them as they approached our shores and many willing helpers to tell the news that a treaty had been made between the Dominion and the French republic. After these gentlemen landed, at public meetings in different parts of the country they gave the people to understand that the treaty was a wonderful thing that would give the people of this Dominion immense advantages in the French market. But when that treaty was laid on the table of this House, the members of the opposition were able to show that it would not benefit our agricultural classes and that only a few manufacturers would reap advantage from it. But this was only part of the election scheme. We had also the all red route. In the imperial conference, the Prime Minister took a position in which I am surprised to see hon. gentlemen opposite supporting him. He listened approvingly to a scheme of transportation by fast steamships on the Atlantic, then overland across our own country, thence by steamship to New Zealand and Australia. Next we heard it heralded throughout this country that the premier was going to have a fast line of steamships to Australia and New Zealand. But, when we came to this House expecting to find that some definite steps had been taken in regard to this measure, we found instead—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) will see that he is wandering a little away from the subject.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Possibly I am, Mr. Speaker. I was going to show that this measure was but a part of a government election scheme. This is the crowning act of the drama and the worst, for it takes an unfair advantage of the people and, instead of being for the general welfare, it will allow corruption to be sown broadcast throughout the country. Well, that is another blunder of the Minister of Justice, because we have seen many blunders on the part of that hon. gentleman since he became a member of the cabinet. I cannot think of a worse blunder than this. It simply means that ballots can be marked, that ballots can be stolen, as this government have been in the habit of doing, and burnt, as the Ross government have been in the habit of doing; it means that all kinds of corrupt acts are liable to be tried on if this measure becomes law. Are the requests of the opposition unreasonable? No, Sir, we are not unreasonable in asking the government to withdraw sections 1 and 17, because we believe that those sections will encourage corruption in elections. If hon. gentlemen who are so strenuously defending this Bill on the other side of the House will look back and read the words of the Hon. David Mills, or the Hon. Edward Blake, or of their own Mr. Sifton, or Mr. Fitzpatrick, and see what those gentlemen said in fa-

vour of adopting the provincial franchises, they would not persist in their advocacy of a measure like this. The Minister of Justice says that the Manitoba Act is tyranny and oppression as compared with this Bill; but he was unable to point to one section in the Manitoba Act which was either tyrannical or oppressive. I say that these two clauses in this Bill will open the door to all kinds of corrupt practice, and I think that this government should be better employed than in bringing down legislation of this character and asking us to pass it. There is no room in this Dominion for men who will bring down measures such as this, and try to force them down the throats of the opposition, when they know very well that they will have the effect of depriving of their franchise electors in the outlying districts of this Dominion. Now who are the people living in these outlying districts? They are the friends, the kinsmen and the relatives of members of this House. Instead of hon. gentlemen taking the position they are taking, they should bring down a measure that will do away with electoral corruption. The government should have brought down legislation dealing with corruption in elections. There is no provision in this Bill for holding by-elections at a certain time, no provision made as to the character of the returning officers, no provision with regard to corporations contributing to election funds. Civil servants are still allowed to take part in the elections, there is no statutory declaration for financial agents to take. The door is thrown wide open to criminals and the Lewises, the Pritchetts' and the Prestons will have full swing if this Bill becomes law. Are these people in the outlying districts not worthy of the protection of this government? The Minister of the Interior says that he is willing to allow men who are only receiving $30 a month in the civil service to go on the platform and take an active part in electoral campaigns. Did I understand aright, the Minister of the Interior to say that because officials in his department were only receiving some $600 or $800 a year, they had a perfect right to go on the platform, a perfect right to become scrutineers and to take an active part in elections? I can only say that if that is the position taken by the Minister of the Interior, the time has come when we should have a Civil Service Act that will do away with such abuses, and afford no occasion for ministers of the Crown to take such a position as that.

Now this Bill takes away the right of appeal before a judge, which is the safeguard of men living in the rural districts. This government would not dare to force such a measure on the older provinces, this government would not dare to force this measure on the province of Ontario. Let them come before the province of Ontario with such a nefarious measure as this, and they would very soon find reason to regret it. The Conservative party stands for hands off Manitoba, it stands for the rights of minorities, for purity in elections. But we cannot have purity in elections with such a law as this on the statute-book. However, we feel that brighter and better days are dawning for the people of this Dominion. The present government are tottering to their fall, their knees are shaking like Belshazzar's at the feast. All I can say to the opposition is, stand firm on this question and let dissolution come. Let the government go to the country on this question if they dare.

Mr. TALBOT. When?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Whenever they dare. The Minister of Agriculture who boasts down in the province of Quebec, of the little he has accomplished for the farmers, let him go out into the western provinces if he dare, and talk of the measures he has put on the statute-book. Instead of going into the province of Quebec and trying to rouse up the people and telling them to look out for what is coming, he had better go into the west and say to the people of Manitoba that he is going to give them a square deal in this matter. But I am afraid that the Minister of Agriculture is too much of a party man to be willing to give the opposition a square deal in regard to this Bill. I am afraid he is falling into the views of the men who sit behind him, that they cannot possibly win the next general election unless they bring in some nefarious measure like this which will give them an unfair advantage. I can only say to the men who are fighting this Bill to stand to their guns. It is our duty to stay here and to persist in our present attitude. I say that we are justified in withholding a large portion of the estimates, so that this government may not hold the whip hand over us for the next few weeks or the next few months. We feel that we are justified in taking the stand that we and our friends from the Northwest have taken in regard to this measure, we stand by the convincing statements that we have made, statements that no man who will investigate this question and who will take a reasonable view of it can fail to support, and we confidently believe that it is our duty to stay here until the snow flies if necessary, to fight this Bill. In closing, I would ask the government to take this matter into their serious consideration and to give to the western provinces and the unorganized districts of Ontario and Quebec a square deal. If the government will eliminate clause 1 and blot out clause 17 they will find the opposition ready and willing to sit down and discuss with them a measure that will be for the general benefit of the country.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, the objection to the present Manitoba law regarding voters' lists is not so much to the registration as to the revision. In the compilation of voters' lists there are two separate stages: registration and revision. Under ordinary conditions a voters' list is fixed by the revision, not by the registration, but under the Manitoba law as administered, registration is more important than revision. Names are placed on the preliminary or registration list by the registration clerk, on a statutory declaration being made personally before him by the applicant at a certain time and place. If personal presence is insisted upon in some cases and not in all and especially if it is insisted upon in the case of members of one political party and not in the case of members of the other—a great advantage is thereby given to the favoured persons or party in getting their names on the preliminary lists. An instance has been given and admitted in which three names and declarations were accepted by the registration clerk without the presence of the parties, which names were allowed by the judge at the final revision of the lists notwithstanding opposition based on the wording of the law. The position taken by the registration clerk, as stated by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), was that his duty was merely to accept applications for consideration and decision by the revising officer. The revising officer approved the application and added the names to the list although he was satisfied that application had not been made in person to the registration clerk, as required by the statute. Being satisfied of the qualifications of these voters he ruled, as stated by the hon. member for Marquette, that he would not allow the technicality of their failure to appear for registration to debar them from the list According to this precedent and under this ruling of the revising officer the presence of the voter is not an absolutely necessary condition of registration. Given registration clerks appointed by and only responsible to the provincial government, guided by such precedent and ruling, it is only reasonable to believe that the presence of the voters, as required by the statute, was not insisted upon by the registration clerks in the case of Conservative voters as it was in the case of Liberal voters. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Jackson) stated, in addressing this House, that on going to the registration office himself to have his own name placed upon the list, the name was placed upon the list by the registration clerk without any affidavit on his part and he personally saw the registration clerk add the names of a number of other voters without affidavits on their part. We have this indisputable evidence that names have been placed on the lists by the registration clerks without affidavit and again we have absolute evidence that they have been placed on the registration list and allowed by the revising officer without the person's presence at the registration booth. These two facts being established, we have not then a compilation of the list as required by the Act. This is an instance where the law is satisfactory but the administration is not satisfactory. In a country where population is scattered and distances great, registration without the presence of Conservatives while the presence of Liberals was insisted upon, would give a tremendous advantage to the Conservatives in getting names on the preliminary list. No provision was made for the printing of the preliminary list. It was posted on the door of the building in which the revision was held and copies could be demanded of the registration clerk, but to get the copy from the registration clerk was quite a different matter from making the demand. Compliance with the demand could at least be delayed so as to render the right of demand of little value. The list as compiled, in many cases, did not give the post office address of the voter. In case of an attempt to have a name struck off the list by the revising officer notice had to be sent to the person whose right was questioned. In case a person whose right to be on the list was questioned——

Mr. STAPLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what document he is reading from.

Mr. OLIVER. I am reading from a document of excellent authority, quite superior to the affidavits that my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) read.

Mr. STAPLES. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I ask your ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER. My ruling as to what.

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. Minister of the Interior is reading his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course the rule is plain that an hon. member is not permitted to read his speech.

Mr. OLIVER. I take the point of order that my hon. friend raises as a considerable compliment—that the remarks which have been placed before the House have been direct and to the point. I will admit that the remarks that I have been placing before the House are written. They are written for the purpose of enabling me to put before the House the arguments that I desire to place before it in the shortest and most concise form in order to save the time of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Whose are they?

Mr. OLIVER. When they are placed before the House they will be mine.

Mr. GRAHAM. They will be presented to the House.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. I want to continue if I may.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the point is pressed, of course the hon. gentleman cannot continue to read.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I would like to impress upon the attention of the House the eminent fairness with which it is proposed by our friends of the opposition to carry on this debate. I think that is a fair sample of the fairness with which they carry on the business of revising the voters' lists in the province of Manitoba. However, I do not think that the point of order, or the effort that they made, will at all deprive the House of the views that I desire to put before it although it may cost the House a little more time. As however it seems to be the object of hon. gentlemen to squander the time of the House and the country I presume they are thereby attaining their object. I was proceeding to say, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. FOSTER. No, to read.

Mr. OLIVER. I was proceeding to say, Mr. Speaker, that unless it could be shown to the satisfaction of the revising officer that the voter whose name was objected to had been notified at his post office address the revising officer properly and legally refused to strike the name off the list. By the device of not giving the post office address of the voter on the registration list the name was protected from revision by the revising officer, although the revising officer was a judge of the county court.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What list is the minister referring to?

Mr. OLIVER. The list as compiled by the registration clerks.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Appointed by the judges?

Mr. OLIVER. Appointed by the judges if you like.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). But not since they have been appointed by the government. They put the post office address in each case ; that is the superiority of the present system.

Mr. OLIVER. I have said that the lists as they stand to-day are without post office addresses of a large number of the men whose names are on them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OLIVER. That has been stated and restated here.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is wrong.

Mr. OLIVER. It has been stated and restated by hon. members whose word is absolutely good on the question.

Mr. FOSTER. Their word may be good, but their facts may be wrong.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, it is a fact or it is not a fact and it is not worth while arguing it. It was stated as a fact by hon. gentlemen who have personal knowledge and their statement was not contradicted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It was.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg pardon, it was explained very clearly that while the lists as they existed up to a certain time did not contain the post office addresses, names added to the lists after that time did contain the post office addresses. Therefore, the lists as they stand to-day contain names which have not post office addresses and, therefore, are not subject to the same scrutiny in revision as if the post office address were given. That seems to be admitted by gentlemen on both sides. It is also admitted, I think, that the time which elapses between the preparation of the preliminary lists and the revision is not sufficient. It was stated by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie that in one case the time allowed between the close of the registration and the opening of the court of revision was three days. Under the law the revising judge is entitled to have the lists in his hands three days before the court of revision opens and the registration clerk not being required to deliver up those lists until two days after the court of registration is closed, five days would be required therefore to fulfil the terms of the land and in this case only three days were allowed.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Who fixed the date of the court of revision?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The judge did.

Mr. OLIVER. It would appear from the proclamation which the hon. member for Kootenay had here to-day that it was fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). That is wrong.

Mr. OLIVER. It makes no difference as to that, because the point I am making is that there was absolutely no opportunity for revision in that case.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman refers to the case at Neepawa. It was the judge who appointed the date for the court of revision there and I stated at the time that I was convinced it was an oversight on the part of the judge. His attention has since been called to it and the judge has postponed the date of the

court of revision for upwards of twenty days.

Mr. OLIVER. Any way here is an indisputable instance of the allegation that has been made——

Mr. FOSTER. But it is not a partisan instance.

Mr. OLIVER. Never mind, it is an indisputable instance of the fact that there was not sufficient time allowed between the registration and revision. The allegations we make is that the whole system of administration is such as to prevent adequate revision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the non-partisan officer who had control of that has rectified it.

Mr. OLIVER. Admitting that, it is not yet established that there has been any rectification in other instances throughout the province which are not quite so glaring.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister know of any case which has been brought to the attention of a judge where it has not been rectified?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not here to give instances. The friends of my hon. friends have made a law and they have administered it, and when the attention of the country is called to an iniquitous piece of administration of that law it is not good enough to say it is rectified in that instance and left as it was in every other instance. The fact that there was such a case is evidence enough that a law which can be so administered is not a proper law or that its administration is not proper.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). But that is the law which this Act is going to perpetuate, and not only that, but it is the same revising barrister or judge who by this Act is going to administer the law.

Mr. OLIVER. We will come to that presently. We have established that there is not a fair opportunity for revising the lists, and that the lists in the first place are compiled with such lack of scrutiny, supervision and control as to give the advantage of so-called registration to the one party and to cut it off from the other.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Explain how that could be?

Mr. OLIVER. I don't object to make a long speech if gentlemen opposite insist on it, but I did intend to be brief. I have already stated how it is. May I go so far as to say that the very fact that my hon. friend and his friends are so determined to retain this law affords evidence that there is a great gain to them in doing so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

Mr. OLIVER. If they would be willing to discuss this matter fairly we might believe that they intended to play fair, but do they expect us to believe that in the back township of Manitoba with a registration clerk appointed by a government which, however much it is entitled to credit for energy and executive ability has never yet been accused of impartiality to its opponents, do they expect us to believe that the registration clerks appointed by such a government would give us any fairer play than these gentlemen opposite give us in the House of Commons in the broad light of publicity before the whole Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister think that the accidental oversight of a judge in fixing the date for revision in one instance is sufficient ground upon which to argue that the law ought to be entirely changed?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not at all admit that there was only one instance. The hon. gentlemen from Manitoba stated numerous instances but I mention only the most glaring one.

Mr. FOSTER. And that fell to the ground.

Mr. OLIVER. That did not fall to the ground. It is thoroughly established that the date fixed for the court of revision was not a proper date because the same authority that fixed it changed it. As far as I have followed the information given by the members who directly represent Manitoba, the interval between the closing of the court of registration and the holding of the court of revision was in the majority of cases too short to give a fair opportunity to revise the lists. It must be remembered that the constituencies in Manitoba are in some instances very large, that mail communication is not in all cases frequent and that notification to the voter whose name is on the list must practically be made by post, and unless he has been notified of the sitting of the court of revision by mail addressed to his post office then, when the removal of his name comes up before the court of revision, it cannot be struck off. Given a rural constituency 100 miles in length and given a desire to revise the list in regard to names of men residing in remote parts of the constituency with only a weekly mail, will any one say that an interval of a month between the sitting of the court of registration and of the court of revision is sufficient or more than sufficient? I say unquestionably it is not. There should be at least a month in many constituencies in Manitoba in order to secure a fair revision.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What proof is required by the judge that people have been notified?

Mr. OLIVER. It would vary in different cases.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. All that is necessary is simply a certificate of the registration of a letter from the office where is was posted.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose the judge would take account of the length of time necessary for the letter to reach the person to whom it was addressed and to permit that person to make appearance or to be represented at the court. If the judge does not give consideration to that feature of the case, I think we will have to revise our opinion as to the judgment of the judges. If the man whose name is appealed against is to have an opportunity to appear on his own behalf or to make representations on his own behalf there must be an allowance of time, and I submit that an allowance of a month between the closing of the court of registration and the opening of the court of revision is not more than sufficient time in some constituencies in Manitoba.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) the other night read to the House the times allowed in the diffenent constituencies, and in no case that I remember was more than a month allowed; it seemed to me that it was seldom that a month was allowed, in the large majority of cases it was considerably under a month.

Mr. FOSTER. Clause 1 of this Act states that the whole operation shall take place after the issue of the writ which runs for about 28 days. How does he propose to get all the other notices in and then give this month's notice of revision ?

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend had read the first clause as carefully as he probably has read some other portions of the Bill, he would have seen that the Bill does not confine action in the ordering of the revision to a date subsequent to the issue of the writ.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It permits it and why should it not ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and why should it not? If there had not been a revision before that time and a revision was required before the election it could not do anything else, it could only give the time available and no more. But when my hon. friend says that is the only provision in the Bill, he is mistaken, because he will find on reading that it provides after the issue of the writ or at such other time as the Governor in Council may see fit. Therefore the revision is not confined necessarily to that period after the issue of the writ, it is only confined to that period in case there has not been a revision previous to that time and I suppose my hon. friend will admit that even this government is not required to give more than is possible or more than exists.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman think he will be a better judge of the length of time necessary than the board of registration of the province of Manitoba which consists of all the county court judges of that province ?

Mr. OLIVER. I can only say it has been up before the House repeatedly——

Mr. BURROWS. The court of revision does not decide the date, it is fixed by proclamation based on order in council.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The judges in every case fix the time, hour and place. How else would the people be notified of the time except by proclamation.

Mr. BURROWS. The time is fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council by order in council.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is not.

Mr. BURROWS. I beg pardon, I can get the order in council. The Lieutenant Governor in Council are the only party having power to fix the time for the court of revision and they do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman went further he would see that is always done on the report of the board of county judges.

Mr. PATERSON. So what the hon. member (Mr. Crawford) says is true.

Mr. CRAWFORD The county court judges have no power to fix the time. The power is vested in the Lieutenant Governor in council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who in practice have always acted in the representation of the board of judges.

Mr. PATERSON. What the hon. member (Mr. Burrows) says is true then ?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman asked if it was not reasonable to suppose that the board of registration, composed of the county court judges, would know better and would be more likely to give adequate time between registration and revision than the Lieutenant Governor in Council. My only answer is that in the instance mentioned here a few minutes ago, whether it was determined by an individual judge or the Lieutenant Governor in Council, sufficient time was not given in a most glaring case. It strikes me as remarkable that this most glaring case should have occurred in the constituency of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie. It will be observed that it did not occur in the constituency of my hon. friend from Marquette or that of my hon. friend from Souris, or even that of my hon. friend from Macdonald—it occurred in the constituency of Portage la Prairie.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE That is rather a reflection upon the judge.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentlemen have said repeatedly that the judges fixed the dates for the sittings of the court of revision. The statement has been challenged from this side of the House and in explanation the leader of the opposition replied that the dates were fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the report of the judges.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which has never been departed from.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot accept the explanation. It is not good enough. When there is such a villainous case as that in the local constituency of Beautiful Plains, it is not sufficient to say that the order in council was based upon the report of the judges. I am not questioning the action of the judge but I am questioning the authority which passed the order in council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my hon. friend agree to withdraw this clause if the judges are called upon to substantiate what I have said and do so ?

Mr. OLIVER. Most undoubtedly not. I do not know whether my hon. friend has made the suggestion simply as a suggestion or to draw attention from the argument. I am rather inclined to the latter view. I say again that under the statute, the sittings of the court of revision are fixed by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Upon the report of the judges.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) The statute does not say that the judges alone shall be the revising barristers, but in practice they are.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the House is entitled to rather fairer treatment than it is receiving.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. When my hon friend said that this court of revision was appointed by the judges, he should have had better evidence. I now have the authority of the statute for saying that the dates are fixed by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I have the text of the proclamation fixing the dates by order in council. My hon. friend says that in practice the report of the judges is accepted by the Governor in Council. In reply I say that I think he is going too far in asking the country to believe that the judges of Manitoba—one or all of them—are responsible for the fixing of the date in the Beautiful Plains case.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The best way to find that out is to ask the judges to come down here.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

Mr. OLIVER. If our hon. friends are going to rest their case on a proposition of that kind, they should have come here fortified by a statement from the judges. It is established that the dates of the sittings of the court of revision are fixed by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council empowered thereto by a statute of the provincial legislature. Let me add that the period between the closing of the court of registration and the opening of the court of revision does not correspond, in the list the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) read, with the areas of the different local constituencies, with their means of communication, or with the opportunities within them of proper notification regarding the sittings of the court of revision. The dates did vary considerably. In some constituencies there were upwards of thirty days, in some there were less than twenty days, and in others they were down to seventeen and fifteeen days. I am not familiar with the actual circumstances, but I say that it is a fair supposition that the difference in the periods between the closing of the court of registration and the opening of the court of revision in the various local constituencies depended rather upon political exigencies, as understood by the provincial government, than upon the merits of the case or a desire to secure a fair revision, and I instance in this connection the case of the constituency of Beautiful Plains. The places at which the courts of revision sit are fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. They may be convenient or they may not. We have the instance often alluded to of the Lac du Bonnet case where the court was appointed to sit at a place where it was impossible for twenty or thirty voters to get their names on the list. When the court was adjourned so that these men could get their names on the list, the sittings were illegal and the names were not legally inscribed. Although on some occasions permission was given to have a number of registration offices in each local constituency, at which hundreds of names were registered, with or without personal presence, according to or contrary to the law, as the case may be, the court of revision—if I remember rightly the statement of the case made by the hon. member for Marquette—sat in a large majority of instances only one day or a part of a day in each local constituency. It is proposed under this measure that the revision shall take a day or part of a day when the registration took four, five, six, eight and ten days. I would ask the House how it could ever have been expected that a registration which took eight or ten days, could be revised in one day or less and yet have the revision adequate. The evidence is incontrovertible that the court of revision was not intended to revise. In fact it was in-

tended to prevent revision. We have the statement of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie that in his constituency there were 600 names of Conservatives on the list which should not be there as compared with 200 Liberals; and he told the House that it is impossible, under the law, to have these names struck off. If they are ever to be struck off, it must be by mutual agreement between the two parties in the interest of fair play. Just to revert to the point which we were discussing a few minutes ago. The Manitoba Election Act, chapter 52, revised statutes of Manitoba of 1902 with amendments of 1903 and 1904, published by authority, says, in section 21:

The list of electors shall hereafter only be made and revised at such times and in the manner hereinafter provided

Annually on or before the first day of May, the Lieutenant Governor shall, by order in council, authorize the issuing of a proclamation setting forth:

. . . . . .

4. The date or dates on, the place or places at, and the hours between which courts of revision will be held in the several electoral divisions of the province to consider and decide such applications, and to receive further applications of others to have their names added to the list of electors.

I find nothing there in regard to the authority of the judges to either revise or amend that authority. The 'Manitoba Gazette' of Saturday, April 25, 1908, contains a proclamation in regard to the revision of the voters' lists, and gives the names and post office addresses of the persons appointed as registration clerks in the several electoral divisions. It appoints the hours at which they shall sit and says:

That, where not otherwise stated, the hours between which registration clerks shall sit to receive applications for registration and the correction and striking off names of electors, shall be from 9 o'clock a.m. to 12 o'clock noon and from 1 o'clock p.m. till 6 o'clock p.m.

I find nothing, so far, stating that the judges have any authority whatever in this connection.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That is with regard to courts of registration.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I have already read with regard to the courts of revision.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Oh, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) does not understand it. He has posted you wrong.

Mr. OLIVER. I find in this publication, the same issue of the 'Maritime Gazette,' the following:

A proclamation.

Whereas it has been determined to add to and revise the lists of electors in and for the several electoral divisions in the province of Manitoba, pursuant to the provisions of the Manitoba Election Act, and it is necessary for the said purpose to constitute the several judges of the county courts in the said province a board of registration:

Now, therefore, we have thought fit and do hereby, pursuant to the powers and authority contained in the Manitoba Election Act, constitute the several judges of the county courts holding office in the province of Manitoba a board of registration for all and singular the premises.

In testimony whereof, we have, &c.

Now, our friends opposite have stated in so many words that the boards of registration composed of county judges, appointed the registration clerks.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Never.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. OLIVER. They did not?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I hope we have the point fixed——

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Certainly they did not.

Mr. OLIVER. Very well, that is accepted.

Mr. FOSTER. It never was contended otherwise.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was stated to-night.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Who stated it?

Mr. OLIVER. I think it was stated by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche).

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The member for Marquette stated nothing of the kind. I did not refer to the courts of registration at all.

Mr. OLIVER. When I was alluding to the instances of names which were put upon the lists without the presence of the voters, my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) rose and said: Who appointed that registration clerk?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes, because it was done under the original Act, the Act of 1903. The hon. minister (Mr. Oliver) is not posted; that is all.

Mr. OLIVER. Then, my hon. friend gave the House a most excellent impression in regard to the fairness of this Act, which, whether I am well posted or not, I have, in my ignorance, been fortunate enough to show clearly is not justified. My hon. friend by his statement, whether intentionally or not, conveyed to the House the impression that the registration clerks were appointed by the board of judges.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Originally.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So they were at one time.

Mr. OLIVER. So they were at one time? But they are not now. So, we have that established for the first time in this discussion. It is established that the registration clerks are appointed by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor in Council. They are then partisan appointments.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Do I understand they are not partisan appointments ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Do I understand the hon. Minister (Mr. Oliver) to say that when the judges appointed the registration clerks they did not appoint Liberals as well as Conservatives ? And, if so, does he claim that the Conservatives were partisans but that the Liberals were not ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not talking about that at all. What I am asking—if the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) wants cross-firing in this way—is : The registration clerks who, to-day, are appointed by His Honour the lieutenant governor, are they or are they not partisans of the government of the day ?

Mr. BERGERON. Why should they be ?

Mr. OLIVER. Are they or are they not ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What do you call a partisan ?

Mr. OLIVER. A man who votes consistently and persistently for one political party.

Mr. TALBOT. And is rewarded.

Mr. OLIVER. And I say that my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) will not deny that these registration clerks are partisans of the provincial government.

Mr. BERGERON. And then—— ?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, now, that point is established—that to these partisan appointees is entrusted the choice as to whether personal registration shall be insisted upon or not.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the law that is proposed here ?

Mr. OLIVER. If that is the case, I ask what is the provision as to personal registration but a provision to keep Grits off and let Tories on ?

Mr. BERGERON. What about the law that is proposed here ? Will it not be the same on the other side ?

Mr. OLIVER. We will come to that——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the minister (Mr. Oliver) aware that two of the main cases that have been relied upon on the other side are cases which occurred when these registration clerks were appointed by the judges ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think that has anything to do with the case. But now we have that preliminary point established —that the compilation of the preliminary list is absolutely in partisan hands under the interpretation that has been given to the law on the authority of my hon. friend from Marquette, and on the statement of my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. S. J. Jackson) they are given practically a free hand in the compilation of these lists to party advantage. Now, I said before, and, I beg to repeat, that in instances where it is considered necessary that there should be a number of courts of registration in a single constituency, it is not considered necessary that there should be an equal number, or anything like an equal number, of courts of revision. That is to say that, where names can be put upon the list by the partisan registration officer at his own sweet will, in four, five, six, eight or ten different places——

Mr. BURROWS. Seventeen.

Mr. OLIVER. —these names could only be struck off in one place in the constituency in one day or part of day. I said, and I beg to repeat, that that is not a provision for the revision of the lists, it is a provision to prevent the revision of the lists. The time that is allowed for the revision of the lists is, as I have shown, absolutely inadequate. There are naturally a number of people who have not been able to get their names on before the court of revision and who are anxious to get on. They may be of one political party or the other, or of both ; we will suppose they are of both parties. The court of revision has but one short day to sit. Now, it is natural and proper that the application of the men who are present to be on the list will be taken up before the applications to strike off are considered, with the result that in practice there is to all intents and purposes no striking off the lists compiled in the way I have described. Do my hon. friends contradict that statement?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I will refer them to the statement of my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner), who informed the House that at a certain date there was a revision in the city of Winnipeg which resulted in the striking of 2,500 names off the list. Nobody questions that it was a proper revision. The city of Winnipeg is a large city and has a very fluctuating population, much more so than any city in eastern Canada. My hon. friend from Souris informed the House that in the year succeeding that revision there had been in one year 25 names struck off, in another year I think 30 names and in another year 30 or 40 names. I think

he managed to total up in three or four years about 100 names that had been found to be improperly on the list in the great city of Winnipeg ; when in the revision immediately before that it was found there were 2,500 names that were improperly on the list. Now, these lists having been compiled as I have described, hon. gentlemen will not suggest that there is any good opportunity to get names off those lists improperly. When in the city of Winnipeg, where every effort is made, if it is made anywhere, to get the lists revised properly, it has only been possible to get a paltry hundred or so off the list in three or four years, the House need not go further for absolute evidence out of the mouth of the member for Souris that there is no such thing as a revision of lists in the province of Manitoba.

In this connection it might not be out of place to refer to the methods employed to secure names for insertion on the lists in the city of Winnipeg, as described by my hon. friend who represents that city. He placed before the House certain sworn statements by certain people, that at a certain day, a certain hour and a certain place, and under certain circumstances, some 450 men who, in a large majority of cases were not entitled to be naturalized, and in any case were not entitled to be naturalized as they were, were naturalized by the assistance of the party machinery of the local government in the city of Winnipeg. The affidavit is explicit, it gives time, place, dates and persons. The affidavit is denied by our friends on the other side and is denied by counter affidavits. It is not creditable to the city of Winnipeg, it is not creditable to the party in power there, that their party machine did, as admitted, employ the person who made this affidavit, and which affidavit they declare to be false. They declare that he was a jail bird and that now he is a fugitive from justice. This is the man that their party machine employed. They admitted that he was in their employ, that he is the man they employ to-day to do their work. He is the man who has made this affidavit as to the management of the party machine. We find that these 450 naturalizations took place on the day immediately preceding the day for registration of the voters in the city of Winnipeg. And we find on searching the records here the remarkable fact that there were some 790 naturalizations put through in the city of Winnipeg on that particular day. It is a coincidence of course that the affidavit of Rudneski accounting for 450 of these should happen to be made on the same date. But it is a coincidence our friends will admit. It is also a coincidence that in the constituency of North Winnipeg, which was considered to be a safe Liberal seat, one of the leading citizens, one of the oldest inhabitants in the city of Winnipeg, a man who had enjoyed the honour of being mayor of the city, in that safe Liberal seat was defeated in the election by the candidate of the Conservative party machine by a large majority, a majority, if I remember right, of about 400 or 450. Those who are acquainted with the political conditions in Manitoba were astonished when they heard how the election had gone. It was indeed a famous victory. It is only a coincidence that the Conservative majority in North Winnipeg was approximately the same as the number of manufactured naturalizations that Mr. Rudneski swears to. But it was a coincidence at any rate.

Now, it is said that this Rudneski is a very improper person, that he has been a jail bird, that he is now a fugitive from justice, and that he committed perjury in making that affidavit. That is a serious charge. It is asserted also that not only did he commit perjury, but that he was suborned to commit perjury, that he was paid for doing it by a cheque to the amount of $25 given to him by a certain gentleman named Walton, who acts in some capacity on behalf of the Liberal party. I submit that the statement on the part of members of the Manitoba government that Rudneski was a jail-bird, that he is now a fugitive from justice, that he is a suborned perjurer, or that Mr Walton suborned that perjury, is not good enough in this case. These gentlemen are charged with the administration of justice in the province of Manitoba. I hope that under their administration perjury has not become so common as to have no attention paid to it or that subornation of perjury should not be dealt with as the Criminal Code provides. If the facts are as these gentlemen have stated—have stated broadly in the newspapers—in the newspapers of their own ownership, as it is even said—their position it seems to me is not enviable. Either the Rudneski affidavit is true or the government of Manitoba is not maintaining the law as the government of Manitoba is charged with the responsibility of doing. The government of Manitoba is winking at perjury, at the subornation of perjury if it does not take every proceeding within its power to bring the men Rudneski and Walton to justice, to lay them by the heels in jail and to see that they are punished to the full extent of the law. That is the only answer they can make to the Rudneski affidavit. It is that or it is nothing. Either Rudneski and Walton should be in jail or the Rudneski affidavit is true. There is no escape from that. Rudneski is out of the country, it is said. Perhaps he is and perhaps he is not. We do not know whether he is. My hon. friend from Macdonald rather indicated to the House that the government of Manitoba, or at any rate the party machine in Manitoba, had

knowledge of the whereabouts of Rudneski while they had knowledge of the nature of the affidavits which he had made.

Mr. STAPLES I beg to contradict the hon. gentleman. I never made any such statement. I never said anything of the kind. I am surprised at the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend knew the price that was paid for the cheque ?

Mr. STAPLES. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. He says he knew the price that was paid for the cheque. Does he know who paid it ?

Mr. STAPLES Yes, I know who paid it.

Mr. OLIVER. Does he know where it was paid ? My hon. friend knows too much about this cheque for his own good and so do his friends know too much about it. This is a question of perjury, a matter of seven years' penitentiary if justice is done.

Mr. STAPLES. Did this government undertake to prosecute Nixon or Wagner ?

Mr. OLIVER. This government is not called upon to prosecute Rudneski any more than it was called upon to prosecute Nixon or Wagner. It is the business of the government of Manitoba to prosecute Rudneski.

Mr. STAPLES. May I ask the hon. gentleman whose duty it was in Wagner's case?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that it makes any difference as to whose duty it was to prosecute Wagner. But, I will say that Wagner was prosecuted. Wagner was convicted, I think, on improper evidence. Our friends who have been shouting in this House and out of it against Wagner, whose prosecution or persecution has been referred to by the hon. gentleman, are not taking any steps against Rudneski. Again I say that either the Rudneski affidavit is true or the government of Manitoba stands convicted of being a government unworthy to govern.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like, in reply to the minister, to say that the government of Manitoba are to-day trying to find Rudneski.

Mr. OLIVER My hon. friend had possession of the cheque which he held up in this House.

Mr. STAPLES. Do you want to see it ?

Mr. OLIVER. I saw it or what my hon. friend said was it, I am taking his word and it is good enough. He said that the cheque had not been cashed.

Mr. STAPLES. Neither it had.

Mr. OLIVER. That no more had been paid for it than its face value.

Mr. STAPLES. That was right.

Mr. OLIVER. Then my hon. friend knows that somebody got it from Rudneski.

Mr. STAPLES. Precisely so.

Mr. OLIVER. That it was not in the interests of the party machine in Manitoba.

Mr. STAPLES Why not ?

Mr. OLIVER. No reason in the world why not, but it could not have been got by the party machine in Manitoba for its face value unless there had been protection to Rudneski guaranteed by the province of Manitoba. Why should Rudneski give up a $25 cheque for $25 instead of taking it to the bank and getting it cashed ?

Mr. BENNETT. The bank was closed.

Mr. OLIVER. If it would give evidence of his having been suborned to perjury to the men who are charged with the responsibility of punishing him is it to be supposed that he would give up that cheque unless he got a promise of protection? Rudneski is accused of being a jail-bird, he is accused of being a fugitive from justice, he is accused of being a perjurer, but he is not accused of being such a consummate fool as that. However, we will drop the question of Rudneski.

There is an affidavit placed before the House by my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) of another person who, in so many words, confirmed every statement made by Rudneski. Apparently he was not paid anything for this, at any rate, our friends have no cheque to show that they got from him. They have not said that he is a fugitive from justice, that he is not in the province of Manitoba. If the Rudneski affidavit is false the affidavit of this other man is just as false, and it is the duty of the Attorney General of Manitoba to see that the man is laid by the heels in jail under the terms of the Criminal Code if they dare do it. It is not good enough to send broadcast statements in the newspapers that this, that, or the other statement is not true. It is not a question of veracity, it is a question of the breaking of the criminal law in one of its most important provisions; of the breaking down of one of the greatest safeguards of society done with the cognizance, in the case of Rudneski, and I very much fear with the assistance of the party machine in the province of Manitoba. Another affidavit was read in the House today from a citizen of Winnipeg and a voter in the province. It has not been alleged so far that he has been paid for his affidavit; it is not pretended that he is a jail-bird and a fugitive from justice ; it is up to the Manitoba government to put that man in jail on a charge of perjury and not ask this House to believe that the fact that Sandy Macdonald was defeated in North Winnipeg by 450 votes and that 450 names were improperly placed on the list, were merely a coincidence.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Was not that constituency already in the hands of the Conservatives by a very large majority?

Mr. OLIVER. And apparently the friends of my hon. friend did not think it was a safe seat or they would not have taken such strenuous measures to secure it. Had there been a fair opportunity for the revision of the lists in North Winnipeg this would not and could not have occurred for it would have been useless to put these bogus names upon the list. But it was in the full knowledge that there was no opportunity for revision that these measures were resorted to and these naturalizations made out in order to secure the defeat of the Liberal candidate on that occasion. And if these things were done in North Winnipeg what is there to hinder their being resorted to in every constituency of the province. The court of revisions is the safeguard of the liberties of the people and when the court of revision is not given a fair opportunity to discharge its duty it matters not whether it is a judge or a layman who presides over it. It is in restricting the opportunity for revising the lists that the great iniquity of the Manitoba law exists and it is because of that iniquity, it seems to me, that our hon. friends are so persistent in holding on to the law.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Can the minister quote any authority to say that there was any complaint from the Liberals of the city of Winnipeg about sufficient time not having been given for the court of revision to discharge its duty ?

Mr. OLIVER. They did not know what the results would be until the votes were polled and it was the surprise of the elections that this constituency went as it did. How were people to know that such acts had been perpetrated when they were not given a fair opportunity to know what names were on the list and to have the list revised ? To sum up : The registration clerks are appointed and hold sittings as directed by order in council. The requirement of personal registration is interpreted to give all the advantages to those whom a partisan registration clerk may desire to place on the list. Once the preliminary list is made up there is no fair opportunity to secure a proper revision of the names on it. The publicity given the list is not sufficient. The location of the persons whose names appear is not sufficient. That point has been established. The time allowed for the preparation of appeals may be and sometimes is manipulated by the local government so as to be absurdly insufficient. That point was established. The number of courts of revision allowed is insufficient. The time allowed the courts is insufficient. The place of sitting of the court is frequently inconvenient. The provision that the court may not adjourn from day to day until its work is completed makes the preliminary list compiled by a partisan registration clerk, and not the list as revised by the judge, practically final, under the present provincial law as it is administered. So far as the overlapping of provincial and federal constituencies is concerned there must be a revision or there cannot be an election. The present provision for correcting the overlapping by the returning officer has not been satisfactory in practice, therefore some other method should be provided. In order that the people may freely cast their votes it is necessary that polling divisons should be conveniently arranged. In a country where the population is rapidly increasing there is need for a frequent readjustment of polling subdivisions such as would not exist under other circumstances. There is the same need that the right to subdivide into federal polling divisions should exist, and should be used when needed independent of provincial divisions as that the boundaries of federal constituencies should be independent of the bounds of provincial constituencies.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a quotation ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it is a statement that I am making to the House. Does my hon. friend agree with it or not ?

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the minister's own statement ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is my own statement. No provision exists in the present law for such a readjustment of polling divisions and voters' lists and therefore provision should be made. The conditions actually existing demand a distribution of the voters on the provincial lists amongst the several constituencies of the province and amongst the several polling divisions in these constituencies by some legal authority. Given adequate opportunity for revision of the lists and for the proper distribution of polls and of voters, and the compilation of the lists as at present would not be greatly objected to. It is believed, however, that so long as the principle of personal registration is accepted there should be a registration office opened in each polling division as established at the last preceding election. But without proper revision of the lists and distribution of voters the compilation of the lists and distribution of the voters however made, is only a means of reaching the end of unfair lists.

What is wanted is :

Printing of the preliminary lists. The lists as printed to give post office address in all cases. A statutory minimum period between registration and revision that shall be sufficient in all ordinary cases. Actual dates to be fixed by registration board, not by order in council. I am suggesting that

what my hon. friend said was now the practice shall be made the law.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that in the Bill before ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not in the Bill before.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a new departure.

Mr. OLIVER. The times and places of sitting of courts of revision to be fixed by the registration board, not by order in council, and courts to be adjourned from day to day until all applications to put on or strike off names are disposed of. Officers appointed to revise the lists to adjust the voters' list as revised to the limit of the Dominion constituency to which they properly belong. Returning officer to have authority to establish polls, define polling divisions, and adjust lists to meet requirements as now done in provincial elections subject to appeal to the registration board. If the law as it stands at present were in itself fair and not subject to improper administration, there could be no reasonable objection to placing it in the hands of the federal government for administration in regard to federal lists as proposed by the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is very dangerous.

Mr. BERGERON. Would you do that in Nova Scotia ?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) said that would be very unfair.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, I said it would be dangerous.

Mr. OLIVER. The whole burden of the interruptions which have been directed to me to-night have been on that line, that it is not fair that the provisions of the Bill should be adopted. It is not fair that the provisions of the Bill should be adopted it surely is just as unfair that the Manitoba election law should remain as it is, because all that the Bill says is that the law as it stands shall be applied to a revision of the lists for federal purposes, and all the criticism and all the objections that my hon. friends have made have been with respect to their own law. They have accused us of all sorts of constitutional and political crimes because we have, in the innocence of our hearts, supposed that they would accept the application of their own law in this case. But, when we undertook to apply to them their own law administered by us, their shrieks of agony rent the heavens. They threatened a dissolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear, no, no.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and they threaten an obstruction of Supplies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. OLIVER. Their newspapers do. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) to make that threat on behalf of his colleagues.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not think the hon. gentleman wishes to misquote me. My statement was that my personal feeling and I know the general feeling of the country is that the sooner a dissolution comes the better for the people of the whole country.

Mr. OLIVER. Exactly, that is exactly what I said. Our hon. friends have threatened to exert every constitutional resource —and I must say they are prepared frequently to stretch the constitution—in order to prevent the application to themselves of their own law in our hands. Surely if that is the reason for the action which they threaten to take, it is as good a reason for our action in attacking the law now existing in that province. I speak of a law under which 450 names of men who are not entitled to vote have been put on the list. We know of the actions of these men in the election in North Winnipeg, and I submit that a law under which it is not possible to have a proper revision made in the time allowed by its provisions gives us every reason when it is applied to us to complain, and to ask for its amendment. I do not wonder, now that we have gone into this matter and have the facts before the House, that my hon. friends shrink against the taking of their own medicine. I am satisfied that neither the Minister of Justice nor the Prime Minister had any idea that the law and its administration was as it has been shown to be or they would never have thought of introducing the Bill in its present form. They never would have undertaken to apply to my hon. friends on the other side of the House such an administration and such a law as their friends have applied to us in Manitoba. In proof of that I have to point out that the right hon. the Prime Minister has said to the House that he does not wish now to take into his hands the power and authority that have been abused by the government of Manitoba, he does not want to be tied to such a law to be administered by this government ; he is willing and wishful to be clear of it, and not to ask the hon. members opposite to take their own medicine, he offers instead to produce to the House an amendment that will give the readjustment and the revision of the lists in the province of Manitoba into the hands of the registration board instead of the hands of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) have said to this House to-night that in practice that is what is done to-day. In all fairness, if that is the practice and if it is satisfactory to them as practice, where is their objection to its

being made law by us? We are not satisfied with the practice, we are not satisfied even that it is the practice, but if it is and they say it is, and they say the practice is fair, then I say give us the law instead of the practice and there is no disagreement between us on this question.

Mr. J G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, Sir, that the rules of the House did not permit my hon. friend to continue the reading of his speech; it would have been a great deal shorter and it would have been more to the point. My hon. friend is not quite posted upon the laws of Manitoba and while he displayed great cleverness, he had to work very hard to answer the criticisms and interruptions from this side of the House. I have listened to many of the speeches delivered during this discussion and I have to say to you, Sir, that I had no idea that the lists in Manitoba were made as well as they are. I do not believe that there is another province in Canada where the lists are as well made as in Manitoba. Of course I understand why the government want to make the lists in Manitoba, but the more I have listened to gentlemen on both sides of the House the more I have been convinced that everything that can be done to give the vote to a man who has a right to vote, is done in Manitoba. As far as British Columbia is concerned, we had this afternoon, from the lips of the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) a representative of that province, the statement that they are perfectly well satisfied with their election law. Why he says there are excellent things in that law. There are weak points. What are they? That registration does not have to be made in person, and for this he gave the reason that miners cannot come to central points to register, a perfectly good reason. Otherwise they are entirely satisfied with their lists. I asked him whether any objections had been made in the House at Victoria last session on account of the lists? He said: No, not a word. Did you ever hear of any complaint? No, on the contrary I have letters from Conservative clubs and even from Liberal clubs saying they are perfectly satisfied with the present lists in British Columbia.

The Minister of the Interior has been working very hard to defend this measure. I do not think that any one of us in the House will convince others on the opposite side. My intention, in the few remarks I have to make, is to talk to the man on the street. It seems to me that this measure is not well understood outside the House. Look at the great title of this Bill:

An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

That is a fine title. Is there any thing there to say that elections will be carried on in an honest and clean manner, and that the will of the people will be allowed to assert itself at the polls? Not a word. Is there any thing in this Bill to say that the election shall take place all on the same day? That was one of the old and sacred principles of the Liberal party, but there is not a word about it in this Bill. This Bill is an attempt to manufacture Liberal votes in some provinces in this Dominion. Quebec is introduced simply as a pretense. My right hon. friend admits what was said by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that there is no necessity for this measure in the province of Quebec. The franchise there is under the control of the local government and every thing is done there, as far as it can be, in a proper way, though the election law in Quebec is far from being as good as is the election law of Manitoba. And in Ontario, they are carrying on elections to-day for the local legislature. Why not carry them on for this House just as they are carried on for the local House? This Bill is simply an attempt by this government to elect their friends in Manitoba and British Columbia if possible.

We can discuss this Bill very briefly and very plainly. We can discuss it so that the man on the street will understand it thoroughly. We are discussing a principle. When I hear my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) arguing for all he is worth on a little technicality, such as whether the delay between the closing of the registration and the opening of the court of revision shall be thirty days or twenty days or fourteen days or whether a man shall have to travel ten miles or fifteen miles to register his vote, I need only reply that is not the question before the country. The question is shall we have a franchise made by the Dominion parliament or shall we accept those made by the local legislatures? That is the sole question. In 1885 we had a Dominion Franchise law passed by this parliament in spite of all the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite who were then on the opposition benches, and that law provided that the Dominion franchise would be the same all over Canada. It provided that every man elected to this House would be elected on the same franchise, whether he came from British Columbia or Prince Edward Island. Hon. gentlemen opposite fought that law as much as they could. They were afraid that partisan enumerators might not do them justice, and there might have been something in that contention, although subsequent events proved that their fears were unfounded and that no injustice was done then. It was under that system that my right hon. friend was returned in 1896 by an overwhelming majority, thus showing that no injustice was done him and his party by means of that Franchise Act. But of all the pledges made by the Liberal party when in opposition, every one has been

discarded except that to abolish the Dominion Franchise Act. They did abolish it in 1898, and in its stead they accepted the local franchise Acts, and the members of this parliament were to be elected upon franchises made by the local legislatures. That was the principle adopted by this government and that is the principle on which elections have since been held. Why are they not now willing to stand by that principle which they themselves established? When Manitoba had a Liberal majority in its provincial legislature, no man said a word about its franchise law. When British Columbia was Liberal, its franchise law was all right. When Ontario was Liberal, there was not a word against its franchise. But just as soon as a province becomes Conservative again, this Dominion government steps in and says: We shall not trust you to make the franchise; we are afraid you will not do it in the proper way. Surely no sensible man will take that as an argument. I say that this Bill is unconstitutional. This parliament has not the right to discriminate against any one or more provinces. It has not the right to legislate for one province against another. It has not the right to say that in one, two or three provinces, the local authorities shall make the election lists but that in the other provinces they shall be made by the Dominion officials. What have we had said by hon. gentlemen opposite as a reason for our passing this Bill? They say that things are not carried on exactly right in Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing perfect in this world. Although the Manitoba Election Act is the best in the whole Dominion it is not absolutely proof against defects or against illegal practices. You may find the same in the province of Quebec, where we have a good franchise law and also in Ontario, whose law is on the whole a model one. But as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has pointed out, is there any partisan list made in any province in the Dominion as partisan as that made in Nova Scotia, where the local officer may put on the list the names he wants and strike off those he wishes, and there is no appeal. My hon. friend said there were old men in Halifax who had been on the list twenty-five or forty years, whose names were struck off at the last election. I may be told that that was an error. Still there is nothing in this providing that the revision of the list in Nova Scotia shall be taken out of the hands of the local authorities in that province. Why that omission? Simply because the Nova Scotia government is a Liberal government. In the province of Quebec there are thousands of men who are disfranchised and will not be able to vote at the next election. There are men who lived in my county in the month of September last and have since gone to Montreal. They are not on the list of my county nor in that of Montreal, because the lists in Montreal were made the year before, and are only made every two years. Those men therefore will not vote in either place. And there are thousands of voters who travel around from one district to another, who are in the same position. How are you going to remedy that? Are you going to say that the lists shall be made here? If the right hon. the First Minister should come down with a law providing that the Dominion shall control the making of the lists, if he should come down with a Dominion Election Act, I will stand by him. But if he says he is in favour of the provincial legislatures controlling the franchise, let him stand by that. The present government obtained office by promising every thing they could imagine to the electorate, but not one of those promises has been carried out except their promise to adopt the local franchises, and now they are trying to get rid of a part of that. They have taken every possible means, both in and out of parliament, to secure power and retain it. They have carried on the elections in every possible way in their disposal or at the disposal of their friends. They have done every thing possible to prevent the election of Conservatives. We know the history of the West Huron election, where it was proven under oath that the votes of the electors were stolen by men who were sworn to do their duty—what has happened to them? The Minister of the Interior says that there was nobody sued for perjury in the province of Manitoba. He besmirched that government because of their failure to do so. Well, what is the matter with this government or with our Minister of Justice or our Department of Justice in not suing for perjury the men who swore they had stolen the votes of the electors in West Huron. We do not hear a word about that. When that matter was brought before parliament a second time for investigation, what were we promised by the right hon. the First Minister? He promised to give us a royal commission to investigate the West Huron and the other elections in which frauds were committed. But we have not heard a word about that royal commission since. Not a single appointment has been made to it. And the consequence has been that election crooks were given a free hand throughout the Dominion. They knew that they were protected by the Dominion government, and they did every thing they could to carry the elections for their party. They did it in West Elgin, in Brockville and in Belleville. They went down to St. James division, Montreal. Is there anything in this Bill to prevent such frauds as were committed in the St. James division, where it was proved that fifteen ballot boxes were opened by the deputy returning officers and the poll clerks, the Conservative ballots stolen out of them,

and replaced by ballots for the Liberal candidate. And there is nothing at all in this Act to prevent that kind of thing from occuring again. And when I——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) allow me? He refers to his own election in St. James division and the case of Brunet. The parties who were accused with tampering with the ballot boxes, were they not arrested? Were they not prosecuted?——

Mr. BERGERON. I was coming to that if my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) had given me another minute.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was the prosecutor in that case, and I think that my hon. friend will agree with me in saying that the offenders were sentenced and sent to the common jail. I think that, in that case at least, justice was done.

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend had waited a moment I think he would have had an answer to all that. I know the case very well, for I was the candidate; I was the man who was robbed. I got these men arrested. The one who had been the manipulator of the whole thing was sent to jail for four months, but the jail door was opened by the Minister of Justice of Canada and this man came out after he had served barely two months.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At the request of whom?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know. Does the hon. gentleman say that I asked——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Who signed the petition for their release? I could tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know. I did not. But even if a thousand people had asked to get this man out of jail I would not say that the Minister of Justice should have freed these men. Why they are the greatest criminals. The hon. minister (Mr. Lemieux) will not insinuate that I signed that petition or that any one that I know signed it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. What does the hon. gentleman mean—that I signed it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some one very near you.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the right hon. gentleman say that I signed anything of that kind?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not seen the petition.

Mr. MONK. I think you are alluding to me. I know that I got dozens of telegrams from Ottawa, and I think I could name the parties who sent them, saying that the Minister of Justice was disposed to act, but would not act unless I signed the petition. I knew the parties, and as they came to me and stated that as it depended upon me and not upon the Minister of Justice I signed it.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is well able to defend himself and I leave the case in his hands. I know I did not sign the petition, and I had to fight the people who asked me to sign, though to ask me to sign such a petition I thought was an insult to me. This man Brunet was sentenced to jail for four months, but he was set at liberty in two months. Yet a poor woman, who had personated a voter in a municipal election in St. Jean-Baptiste village, was sent to jail for four months, and though she was a widow and her children were on the street, she was not liberated until she had served the term of her sentence. And the deputy returning officer, Hetu, who had sworn to do his duty and who had manipulated the ballots as he himself declared, was found guilty and sentenced to jail for four months. But in two months he also was liberated by the Minister of Justice. I ask my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) if the Attorney General of Manitoba, knowing of such cases, would be likely to be anxious to put the whole legal machinery of the province of Manitoba in play to put a man in jail and then have the Minister of Justice of Canada use his authority to let him out?

Mr. OLIVER. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) has asked me, I may reply that, judging by the action and attitude of the Attorney General in the case of Leach, there is every reason to believe he would.

Mr. BERGERON. I was saying that this government have tried many different means of keeping in power. The rules of debate do not allow me to go as far into that subject at this time as I would like. The matter can be further discussed on another occasion. What does the government want now? They want to find new ways to keep in power. And hon. gentlemen opposite know very well what their record is. And they know very well what they can expect from the independent electors of this country when they appeal to those electors. They know what they can expect from the province of Ontario, and they are by no means in doubt as to what they may expect from New Brunswick. And they have a strong suspicion how Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island will treat them. And they will very soon know what to expect from the province of Quebec. So they look to these provinces in the west, believing that, if they can snatch a verdict there, it will be of assistance to them. And so they bring forward this Bill under which an officer is to be appointed for the preparation of the list. And he will not be a par-

tisan. Oh, no! This officer will be appointed by the Dominion government. He will not be a judge. But he will be a good Grit, I will swear to that, a good strong partisan. And for the purpose of preparing the list of voters, the Governor in Council is to be authorized to appoint all the necessary officers and to confer on them all the necessary powers. These men are to be appointed by the Dominion government to make the lists in the province of Manitoba. In that province the lists are prepared with every possible care and are revised by the judges of the land. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister will appoint his man. And what will he do, this man appointed by the head of the government? He will strike off the lists those whom he wants to strike off and will put on those whom he wants to put on. The Bill provides that he is to add the names of persons who are qualified and to strike off the names of those who are not qualified. The man on the street will not believe that there is a man on this side who is worthy the name of a man who would allow such a Bill to become law. I do not wish to discuss the details of the case, for I stand on the principle that we have not the right to touch these lists. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), when he was obliged to drop his manuscript, seemed to go astray when he dealt with the question of the time allowed for registration. How could he expect to make the people believe that it was better to allow, as under this Act, twenty three days when they have in Manitoba fifty-five days? And, if I understand this Bill, it is said that only when the time of election has arrived, when the writs are out, is the preparation of the list to be begun. How can you have time to prepare the lists and revise them after the issuing of the writs?

Mr. OLIVER. Might I suggest to my hon. friend that there would be just the same time for the compilation and revision of the lists after the issue of the writ for a Dominion election in the province of Manitoba, as now exists for the compilation and revision of the lists in the unorganized districts of the province of Ontario in respect of the provincial election now going on.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is certainly not correct. Those lists are now under revision in Ontario, and have been for nearly two months.

Mr. BRISTOL. They are first prepared by the sheriff and then revised by the stipendiary magistrate. It is done every year.

Mr. OLIVER. I am speaking on the authority of the member for Rainy River and Thunder Bay (Mr. Conmee), who represents one of those constituencies, and he informed the House that unless the date of the election was postponed a large number of electors in that district would be disfranchised under an application of the law regarding the revision of the lists as applied in the province of Ontario to-day.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. I represent the constituency, and I know whereof I speak.

Mr. BERGERON. Then my hon. friend switched off to the province of Ontario. I was talking about Manitoba, because it is Manitoba that the government wants to strike principally. Now this measure is very improperly put before the public. On Saturday last I was reading in one of the leading newspapers of Montreal an article speaking to this effect: Is it not extraordinary that the opposition in Ottawa are trying to prevent the government from giving to Manitoba voters' lists revised by the judges of the land? How unjust! The government at Ottawa wants every man to exercise the franchise who is qualified, and as the government do not make the lists in the west, they say they should be made and revised by the local judges. Of course, all that is a misstatement of the case, but that is the way the people are being misled.

Now I want to say a word more about section 17 where the government provide that even if a ballot is disfigured or mutilated, it shall remain good. I have heard my right hon. friend in years gone by speak about the sanctity of the ballot. Why, the Bill is not passed yet, and I do not think it ever will be passed, but I have heard some people in the provincial elections telling their friends that on the 8th of June they will be voting under this new law. The right hon. gentleman said the other day, why there are men who will lose their votes by a little spot on the ballot. Suppose a hundred or two hundred men lose their votes, it is very unfortunate, but if you pass this Bill with clause 17 in it, the result will be still more unfortunate. A man will say, how much will you give me for my vote?—$5—How can I know that you voted for me? I will make such and such a mark on the ballot. The deputy returning officer, who is a partisan, and the clerk of the poll, who is also a partisan, find this promised mark on the ballot, and the voter gets his $5. And my right hon. friend thinks we should allow a Bill of that kind to pass so that every voter and the deputy returning officer will know how such and such a man voted. Where is the secrecy of the ballot? Where is that principle that it required so many years of eloquence and work to obtain? And yet it is a so-called Liberal government that proposes a Bill which will abolish the secrecy of the ballot, a government who pretend that they follow the example of the Liberal party in England. They ask us to pass a Bill which will make of elections a farce, worse than that, criminal. My right hon. friend says —if not himself, some of his colleagues and

his press organs—why, we are threatened with a refusal of Supply. I am not going to make any such threat, but I am going to tell my right hon. friend that if everybody thought as I do, this Bill would never become law. I would revise the Bill and put in some clauses to insure honest elections, providing that if a deputy returning officer does not do his duty he shall go to jail, and the same with the clerk of the poll. There is nothing in the present law like that. When I wished to prosecute dishonest men in Montreal, I had to appeal to the Criminal Code, because there was nothing in the election law under which any of those men could be sent to jail. Why not put something like that in the law ? Why not have all the elections on the same day ? My right hon. friend knows that I am right, and that all the elections should be held on the same day. We know what it means to have by-elections after a party has got into power.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. How could you carry an election on the same day in the district of Yale-Cariboo, for instance ?

Mr. BERGERON. It is very easy, hold your nomination a week ahead of the other nominations. The right hon. gentleman need not laugh. That is done in the county of Gaspé ; the nomination is some two weeks before the election, and the election takes place on the same day as in other constituencies.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Assuming that that could be done, after the issue of the proclamation dissolving the House and calling an election is issued, how could you arrange to have the nomination in the district of Yale-Cariboo within a week of the general nomination ?

Mr. ALCORN. Have the writ in the returning officer's hands twenty-three days before the nomination.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that it is a physical impossibility to issue the proclamation in the various districts in Yale-Cariboo as required by law within twenty-three days.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, I think my hon. friend will have to accept the method I suggested. It is very easy, it is done in Gaspé and in some other counties, and it is done in the province of Ontario. There are cases where the nominations are held a fortnight before the election, and the election takes place on the same day as in the other constituencies, instead of weeks afterwards. That is perfectly feasible, and every man listening to me knows that it should be done so. The present mode takes an undue advantage of one party or the other.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. But you say you are going to win ?

Mr. BERGERON. We will not have the pleasure of his presence in this House if his election takes place on the same day.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Yes, you will.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what the electors told me when I was in the hon. gentleman's county. I stated at the commencement of these remarks that I was talking for the man on the street. When this measure is understood, when it is known that the government want to make the lists in provinces where the governments are Conservative and that they do not want to touch the lists in Nova Scotia which is a Liberal province and where the lists are so unjust to the Conservative party, the people will understand why we are fighting this measure with so much determination.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about Alberta and Saskatchewan ?

Mr. BERGERON. The preparation of the lists there is done through the instrumentality of this government. They are all right. Any man can go and register there and if he takes an oath that he has the right to vote he has the right to vote whether he is a British subject or not. We have heard a good deal of dissolution talk. I do not believe that the right hon. Prime Minister will ask for a dissolution. He dare not do it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why ?

Mr. BERGERON. He will not go to the country to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why?

Mr. BERGERON. Because the record of the government is too bad. That is as clear as day. There is no danger of it. We have read in some of the papers that we want to starve the civil service. We are not the government. The government are responsible for the civil service. The government are responsible for carrying on the public works. The government are responsible for everything that happens in the country whether it is good or bad. Why ? When we had good crops it was due to my right hon. friend, and if so why should he not take the responsibility for bad crops or anything that happens ? We have a duty to perform and we will perform that duty. It is to see that no iniquitous law shall be put upon the statute-book of this country. The House has been sitting for five months and hon. gentlemen opposite knew that they had this contentious Bill to bring before parliament. This was known at the commencement of the session. This Bill might have been brought down in December and discussed at that time. We had even to grant the government the courtesy of consenting to a one-eighth Supply Bill. They want an other eighth and we say: Hold on we are not going to do that until we know whether

you are going to carry this nefarious scheme through or not. They say that we are going to starve the public service and stop public works. Whose fault is that ? It is the fault of the government and they will be looked upon as being responsible for it by the people of the country when they understand the whole situation. As far as dissolution is concerned there is no danger. Never would there be a better time to go to the country than the present. The hon. gentlemen opposite are so much afraid of it that they had to appoint one commission to explain another. There was the Cassels Commission appointed to explain the Royal Commission, and when it had explained a very small part of the Royal Commission it adjourned sine die and probably we will never hear anything more about it. There is no danger of dissolution. The right hon. gentleman has only one thing to do and that is to withdraw the obnoxious clauses of this Bill, follow the kind advice given by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, strike out clauses Nos. 1 and 17 and let us see if we can devise some means of carrying out honest elections in the country.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I did not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat (Mr. Bergeron) but I wish to put one question. He spoke, once, twice, thrice of the partisan lists in the province of Nova Scotia, and he also spoke of the nefarious proceedings in the county of Halifax. I want to ask him now if he knows of his own personal knowledge that there were any more Liberal-Conservatives left off the list in the county of Halifax than there were Grits through inadvertence.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not care about working too hard. I will put the matter in the hands of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition who knows a great deal more about the province of Nova Scotia than I do and who will answer my hon. friend (Mr. Roche).

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). I only ask the hon. gentleman, if, in making that statement, he made it of his own personal knowledge ? I was not here when the leader of the opposition made his statement, but I heard the hon. member for Beauharnois.

Mr. BERGERON. No, I made it after hearing the statement made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in whom I have perfect confidence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may tell the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) that I do not know how many Liberals were left off but I do know of many Conservatives being left off.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). How many does the hon. gentleman know of to his own personal knowledge ?

Mr. BERGERON

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I could not state the exact number, but I know that dozens came to me during the election of 1904 and complained of it and I gave the names of a number of grits left off.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman kindly give me the names of any more than a dozen who came to him and complained ? There must have been a number of grits left off.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not doubt it at all. That only shows that the lists in Nova Scotia are very defective.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). I would tell my hon. friend that it was quite possible that a number of individuals who had the right to vote in the various districts, through the reviser's inadvertence, were left off the list. There were as many left off, to my certain knowledge, on the Grit side as on the other. But that there was a partisan revision I deny and repudiate. The lists were revised by the city clerk and they were scrutinized by both parties.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there an appeal to a judge ?

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). There is a revision. In certain country districts the lists are revised by the municipal authorities and every care is taken to have the names properly corrected. Any man whose name is left off can go and have it put on ; any man can apply to the sheriff and have it put on.

Mr BERGERON. Is there an appeal to a judge ?

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not state that the list in Halifax had been prepared in a partisan way. I stated that a great many people in Halifax who were Conservatives were left off in the last election and at the previous election, for that matter. I said that in some of the counties in the province the lists had been dealt with in a very partisan way, and I gave illustrations which I am prepared to bring before a committee of this House.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). I am only speaking to my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) who alluded in very pointed terms to partisanship in the county of Halifax. I knew my hon. friend was not speaking of his personal knowledge and that he knew nothing of what had taken place in the county of Halifax. Both parties did their utmost to put upon the lists all that were qualified. Every effort was made to do so in every possible way according to the law, and when my hon. friend charges the province of Nova Scotia generally with partisanship, with the preparation of improper lists and with nefarious conduct I deny and repudiate it

and I think the hon. gentleman ought to withdraw his statements if he has not made them on his own responsibility.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think my hon. friend followed what I said all through.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). I followed the hon. gentleman very closely.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want the hon. gentleman to put words in my mouth that I did not utter. I said that after hearing the remarks made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition I came to the conclusion that the making of the lists in the province of Nova Scotia was very far from being as fair to both parties as the making and revising of the lists in Manitoba, because there they are revised by the judges of the land, whilst in Nova Scotia there is no revision before a judge, but it is before a sheriff who is an appointee of the local government. If the government want to make the lists in some of the provinces, instead of going into Manitoba where they are well made, they should go into Nova Scotia where they are not well made.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) will have very great difficulty in producing before the people of this country or a committee of this House any evidence to show that in the province of Nova Scotia there has been any undue interference with the preparation of the lists by anybody on behalf of the Liberal party, and I can produce to my hon. friend the evidence that proves most conclusively that some of the gentlemen interested in the party which he supports have been guilty of improper conduct in connection with the preparation of the lists.

Mr. BERGERON. Where ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In the county represented by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield).

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). You would have to pass a new Act for the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We are looking after that.

Mr. BERGERON. The leader of the opposition has asked for a committee to investigate and he will bring evidence.

Mr. JOHNSTON. There is no necessity for an investigation. The evidence has been taken and neither my hon. friend nor anybody else in his behalf will undertake to challenge the evidence which is on record in Nova Scotia for some years as to the conduct of this political party in the county of Colchester.

On motion of Mr. Miller the debate was adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not prepared to say which just now, but we will either go into Supply or resume this debate.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 11.17 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May, 19, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 170) respecting the Nipissing Central Railway.—Mr. J. J. Hughes.

TREATIES BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I would like to lay on the table a treaty between Great Britain and the United States concerning the fisheries and waters contiguous to the Dominion of Canada and the United States, signed at Washington on April 11, 1908 ; treaty between Great Britain and the United States providing for the more complete definition and demarcation of the international boundary between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, signed at Washington on April 11, 1908.

The correspondence will come later on.

I beg to move that the treaties be printed forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY — ATTENDANCE OF MILITIA.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the attention of the Minister of Militia to a letter which I have received :

Mono Road, Ontario, May 15, 1908.

Dear Sir,—From information given out by the Toronto press we are led to think that only the permanent forces and city corps, Ontario and provinces east will be represented at Quebec in July. It is quite needless to note the rural corps have been our country's greatest asset in times of hostilities and should be in evidence at this event. As an officer in the rural district of the good loyal old county of Peel, I would very modestly ask you, as an honoured and trusted representative, to ask the government what they purpose doing in the matter. It will be a great disappointment if we be not given the privilege of showing our undoubted loyalty and paying our deepest respect to His Royal

Highness, the Prince of Wales, when he visits our Dominion on the above occasion.

Believe me, Sir,
I am yours very respectfully,
DAN. McCAUGHRIN,
Lieutenant,
'D' Company, 36th Peel Regiment.

I would ask the government what they purpose doing in the matter. There will be great disappointment if the rural militia are not given the privilege of showing their undoubted loyalty and paying their deepest respects to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. I would ask the Minister of Militia what has been decided ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). While I agree entirely in the high encomiums passed on the rural militia, I have nothing to add to what I said the other day. The statement I then made represents everything up to date that has been decided with reference to the tercentenary at Quebec.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister state that briefly again ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is all in the 'Hansard' about a week ago. I said that owing to the difficulties of transportation it had been found impossible to carry out the idea of assembling at Quebec a large camp. To mobilize the whole militia at Quebec was the original idea. That has been found impossible, and it had not yet been decided what portion of the militia would be sent to Quebec. I think my hon. friend the member for North Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) asked me the question, and I said I was unable to give any better answer. A considerable portion of the permanent force will be sent to Quebec. What other portions of the militia will be sent I cannot say, but as soon as it is decided I shall be prepared to make an announcement to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask whether a small proportion of my veterans will come in or not. I understand that application was made to the commission and the commission cannot see their way clear and referred it back to the Department of Militia. It will be a great shame if preparations are not made for the representation of these old veterans. They have scars ; we have not.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Some of them. I can only repeat what I said to my hon. friend the other day. In the letter which he sent me from Captain Collins reference was made to the fact that these veterans had appeared before the Prince during his last visit in 1901 at Toronto and I believe at other points. I pointed out then that this was done without any expense to the public whatever. Those veterans resident in Toronto and vicinity marched past there. The same thing might happen at Quebec and Halifax. I do not see why the veterans might not be represented at Quebec by that portion which happens to live in Quebec. I said I would submit the question to the commission. I have done so and have an answer which I am going to send to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). It is to the effect that the matter is being considered.

Mr. SPROULE. The militia think that if they are not allowed to go, the transportation companies will not have very much trouble in handling the crowd that will go.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would ask the right hon. the First Minister whether any other influences have been brought to bear on him or his government or the commission than the lack of transportation or accommodation or the other causes put forward to prevent these troops going to Quebec. If so, what were these other influences ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware of any kind of influence brought to bear on the First Minister either one way or the other unless it be the genial smile of my hon. friend.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to have some information with reference to a return ordered for copies of the tenders and contract for dredging let in 1907.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what province ?

Mr. BENNETT. Principally I think in Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am under the impression that return was brought down. When was it called for ?

Mr. BENNETT. Only three or four months ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall make inquiries.

Mr. LEFURGEY. When may we expect the return moved for early in the session in reference to the expenditure in Prince Edward Island?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I think that return is nearly ready; probably in a day or two.

Mr. LENNOX. Yesterday the Minister of the Interior promised that he would tell us to-day when the order in council with reference to immigration would be laid on the table.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). It escaped my memory; I promise to give the information to-morrow.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What steps, if any, have been taken by the government to establish telegraphic communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and what progress has been made in repairing the cable between the capes. I

have numerous complaints from the island that business is tied up and that great inconvenience is occasioned for want of telegraphic communication. I understand the Marconi system is working between the island and Pictou.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY. I am afraid my hon. friend does not receive the latest news from his native province. I received a telegram yesterday stating that with the assistance of the steamer 'Stanley' the cable had been repaired and was in operation.

SUPPLY—SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY LAND COMPANY—TIMBER LEASES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). There is a matter on which I want to speak before the House goes into Committee of Supply. My attention has been called to an article in the Halifax 'Evening Mail' containing a report of a speech delivered on the 18th of April last by the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames). Among other statements that are pretty wide of the mark there is one that is particularly so. The article refers to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. TURRIFF. You won't say hear, hear, so much when I am through. I will read the article so as not to do the hon. gentleman any injustice and in order that he may have an opportunity of correcting it.

Mr. AMES. What is the paper?

Mr. TURRIFF. The Halifax 'Evening Mail' of April 20 last. The article after referring to one of the planks of the Liberal platform is as follows:

We contend that this promise also has been completely shattered. Nowhere is this more clearly demonstrated than in that deal known as the Saskatchewan Valley Company concession. In the middle west, between Regina and Prince Albert, there lay a stretch of country which did not receive early settlement. It was regarded by some as semi-arid, but Dominion Colonization Agent Epeers, one of the best authorities in the west in his time, believed and said that this belt could support a thriving agricultural population. He reported his belief to the government and requested that he be given an opportunity to establish an experimental farm to show what could be done with the land. At that time Mr. Turriff was Deputy Minister of the Interior. He appears to have turned a deaf ear to Mr. Speers' request. But Mr. Turriff had a brother-in-law by the name of Adamson (they both have since become members of parliament). Mr. Adamson formed a syndicate for the purpose of acquiring land in the Saskatchewan valley. First of all the syndicate purchased from the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway their right to select 800,000 acres of land.

Then what follows is what I particularly wish to draw the attention of the House to; and as it is printed in large type I would judge that it is an exact report of what the hon. gentleman said.

Now so long as the government had been dealing with it, the railway company had been compelled to select its lands within a limited area north of Regina, but, no sooner had Mr. Adamson and his friends purchased the railway's right, than the area of selection was vastly enlarged so that it became no longer difficult to find enough good land to satisfy the grant. This kind of treatment by the government increased the value of the railway grant enormously.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to say that that statement from the first to the last in every shape, form, and manner is absolutely false. There is not one word of truth in it from the first word to the last word. I do not want to do the hon. member (Mr. Ames) any injustice, but he sat in this House when he heard the statement made clearly that instead of increasing the area it had been largely reduced, after Osler, Hammond and Nanton had sold their railway grant to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. I expect he will try and make out, from the fact that the order in council was passed in August granting 1,700,000 acres out of which they might select, that the land grant was increased; but that very order in council itself—if he is depending on that—points out that the large areas that had previously to this been set aside for the railway company represented by Osler, Hammond and Nanton—the Mr. Osler of that firm is Mr. E. B. Osler, member for West Toronto—that order in council pointed out that these large blocks set apart for this railway company from which to select its lands, had been withdrawn. Now in order that there should be no more misrepresentation in any respect with reference to this land grant at all events, I purpose placing before the House to-day the exact facts of the case so that the members of this House and the people of this country will be able to understand how little dependence may be placed on statements emanating from the source that statement emanated from.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the hon. gentleman proceds I would like to ask him a question. I understood him to say there was not one word of truth from start to finish in the article he read.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is what I said.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask my hon. friend if Mr. Adamson, M.P., is not a brother-in-law of his?

Mr. TURRIFF. I am glad you are not my brother-in-law. Now, Mr. Speaker, I

wish to give a short history of this railway land grant. In 1884, a land grant was given to this railway company and an area of some 2,822,000 acres was set apart out of which the land grant might be selected. Osler, Hammond and Nanton selected some 300,000 acres out of their total grant, and then they stated that they could get no more land that was fairly fit for settlement within the area of that land grant, and two years before the sale was made by them to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, the correspondence which I shall read took place between the Minister of the Interior of that date and Mr. Creelman, representing Osler, Hammond and Nanton. I will now read a letter from the Minister of the Interior.

Ottawa, January 25, 1900.

Sir,—I inclose herewith a map of Manitoba and the Northwest territories on which is coloured all the tracts of land in which chiefly the odd sections are set apart to satisfy the land grants of the various railways other than the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan railway and steamboat company. From the uncoloured portion of Manitoba and the territories the land grant to the above mentioned corporation could be selected, and I think there is ample to satisfy said grant, both as to quality and location, within the lines prescribed by the order in council of the 20th June, 1887.

In the uncoloured portion there are small areas set apart as reservations for stock watering, timber and probably for some other purposes. These areas, however, are each so small that they could not be delineated on a map of the scale of the inclosed, but the total amount is very inconsiderable and in any locality that you would desire to have a list of same, such will be furnished if requested.

This action is taken at the present time in view of your intimation of proceeding by a 'petition of right' to obtain a 'fiat' in the matter of the controversy now existing respecting the land grant available for the said railway. I am of the opinion that the department is in a position to offer land which satisfies the terms of your order in council and that the same can be found in unoccupied areas as shown on the inclosed map.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) CLIFFORD SIFTON,

Minister of the Interior.

Adam R. Creelman, Esq., Q.C.,
Barrister, Toronto, Ont.

Mr. Creelman, at that time, was acting as solicitor for Messrs. Osler, Hammond and Nanton in connection with their railway land grant. What that letter means is this: Mr. Sifton, as Minister of the Interior, sent them a map on which the areas set apart for the other railways were marked in colours, and advises them that they are entitled to go and take the odd sections in any other portion of the province of Manitoba or the territory which is now the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Wherever there was an available quarter-section that had not been set apart for any other railway company, they were entitled to go and select it. And here is Mr. Creelman's reply:

Toronto, February 14, 1900.

The Hon. the Minister of the Interior,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo, inclosing a map of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, the coloured portions of which indicate the tracts of land in which chiefly the odd sections are set apart to satisfy the land grants of the various railways other than the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan railroad and steamboat company.

I note also your statement that from the uncoloured portions the land grant to the Qu'Appelle company can be selected and your opinion that there is ample land within such portions to satisfy such land grant.

I gather also from the letter that this notice is given to me in consequence of my intimation that we are about to proceed by petition of right to secure a settlement of the controversy which has for many years existed between the government and this company respecting its land grant. In this connection I beg to say that at the time your letter was received I had just completed the petition of right to which you refer and the printing was then in progress and could not very well be stopped.

I hope very soon to have the pleasure of submitting this petition to you before its final presentation for fiat and at the same time I will embrace the opportunity of discussing with you your letter of the 25th.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) A. R. CREELMAN.

So, you see, Mr. Speaker, all the available odd sections in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta were made available two years before the sale to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, allowing them to go outside their land grant and select the land they wanted.

Mr. BRISTOL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) allow me a question for information? Do I understand that these lands were made available, or that Mr. Creelman claimed they should be available and proceeded to file a petition?

Mr. TURRIFF. Mr. Creelman was preparing to file a petition. The Minister of the Interior of that time wrote to him stating that, in addition to the original land grant of 2,822,000 acres which had been set apart, they were at liberty to go into any portion of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and select any of the odd numbered sections that were not then set apart for selection by the other companies. And that covered many millions of acres. However, that is not all. There was no further correspondence for about a year. But in May of 1901, and about a year before the sale was made by Messrs. Osler, Hammond and Nanton to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, Mr. Sifton wrote as follows:

Ottawa, May 22, 1901.

Qu'Appelle vs. The King.

Sir,—On January 25, 1900, I wrote you inclosing a map of Manitoba and the Northwest territories indicating certain tracts of land from which the grant claimed by the suppliants might be satisfied. To this letter I received no reply beyond yours of the 14th February, 1900, and your petition of right was presented immediately afterwards. While I do not admit that the Crown is bound to present to the suppliants the offer in this letter contained, yet in order to close the transaction my department is willing to permit the suppliants in satisfaction of the grant in question to take such of the odd numbered sections or portions thereof within ten miles of the line of the railway on either side thereof as the suppliants may deem proper subject only to an exception of the following areas therein which are not available by reason of previous grant or reserves.

Then follows a list of townships not available :

After making the aforesaid selections the suppliants may take the deficiency in area, if any, out of the following lands in the Northwest territories, namely, parcel 1—

Then follows a description of a block :

All the odd and even numbered sections within said Parcel 1 are open for selection by the suppliants, with the exception of Hudson bay and school sections, and other lands in actual occupation of settlers.

I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House, that in the block called No. 1, the map of which was sent to them, there are odd and even numbered sections to the extent of 3,290,000 acres, and this was made available to them in addition to their original land grant.

Parcel 2, the odd numbered sections within the area described as follows:

Then follows a description of the area in parcel No. 2, consisting of 1,250,000 acres of odd-numbered sections.

Parcel 3, from townships 1 to 6 inclusive in ranges 19 to 30 inclusive, west of the second meridian.

In the townships not yet subdivided within said parcel 3, as shown on the accompanying map all odd and even numbered sections, are open for selection by the suppliants, excepting Hudson bay and school sections and lands in actual occupation of settlers.

In parcel No. 3, there was a total area of 1,362,000 acres set apart for them.

Parcel 4.—From the south boundary of township 50 to the north boundary of township 60 and from the east boundary of range 16 westward to the third meridian.

All odd and even numbered sections within said parcel 4 are open for selection by the suppliants with the exception of Hudson bay sections, school sections, Indian reserves and timber berths as shown on the accompanying map.

Parcel No. 4 contained 950,000 acres. The letter concludes as follows :

The suppliants are within three months to designate the portion of land within the ten mile belt which they will accept upon notice of which to the department patents for the same, on payment of the survey fees at the rate of ten cents per acre will issue to them subject to the right of the Crown, under the agreement of August 5, 1889, between the Crown and the suppliant railway company. Upon such selection being made, the balance of the land within the ten mile belt will be withdrawn and may be used to answer land grants other than those of the suppliants. The suppliants must designate within six months the portions of land to be taken within the above mentioned parcels, 1, 2, 3 and 4, and upon notification thereof to the department patents will issue for these portions upon payment of the survey fees as above, and subject as above to the rights of the Crown under the said agreement. Failing such selections being made by the suppliants within the times mentioned above, the Crown will proceed to allot the lands and make out the patents which will be passed upon payment of the survey fees.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

CLIFFORD SIFTON,

Minister of the Interior.

That was the offer made to them by the government, and that offer contained in addition to the land originally set apart by order in council in 1884 and 1887, 9,267,000 acres, making, with the original grant, a total of 12,099,235 acres. So, at the date when the sale was made by Messrs. Osler, Hammond and Nanton to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, they had set apart for them blocks of land representing 12,099,235 acres from which to make their selection. After the sale was made to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, the company came down to Ottawa and maintained their right to have the same selection that Messrs. Osler, Hammond and Nanton had at the time the sale was made, and I am bound to say I think they were entitled to it. But they did not get it. Instead of leaving their 12,099,000 acres to select from, the government, by order in council of August 2 cut out all these others amounting to 9,267,000 acres and added 1,700,000 acres to the original land grant given in 1887, making a total of 4,545,435 acres from which they had the right to select.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, the facts of the case are as I have stated, and as I stated them a few years ago in this House, that instead of the area being increased, it was cut down from 12,000,000 to 4,500,000 acres. Now how, in the face of these figures, any hon. gentleman who has any regard for what he says, can go around the country and make the statement that the government after the land had been sold by Messrs. Osler, Hammond and Nanton, largely increased the area out of which, selection might be made, and thereby made it much more valuable, is something that I cannot possibly understand. In this connection I

want to make a further statement. The original land grant, as I have said, contained 2,822,235 acres, and since the date of the sale to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, there has been selected out of that original land grant over 2,000,000 acres, not by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, but by the Saskatchewan Land Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and the subsidy grants in connection with the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway ; so that in the original grant that they claimed was so very poor, and where they could not get the lands they required, in that grant alone there has been over 2,000,000 acres selected since that date. Now, Mr. Speaker, as this statement has been made, not only in Halifax, but I understand in Toronto, and was published by the 'Mail and Empire,' I wanted to put the facts of the case before the House, and to state absolutely that the area was not increased but was reduced from 12,000,000 acres to 4,500,000 acres.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have heard the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Turriff), and if I mistake not other members on the other side of the House, complain of a lack of courtesy when they thought that something was brought up on this side in which hon. gentlemen opposite were interested, without any due notice having been given. Now I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if, before making this attack on the member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames), an attack which he premeditated, which he prepared for, he in any way made an intimation to the member for St. Antoine that he was going to bring it up, and impugn his reputation for accuracy, and impugn also his veracity as a man. I took the precaution to ask my hon. friend from St. Antoine whether he had received any notice, and my understanding is that he had received none at all from the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). Very well. The hon. gentleman then will not complain if he receives a Roland in return for his Oliver. At this moment it seems apropos to bring another case before this House, which I think will have a good deal of interest to the country at large, and considerable interest to the department in which this hon. gentleman who has just made this fiery attack and then subsided, was at one time a very prominent officer, and perhaps of some little interest to himself, who has been on more than one occasion fond of impugning the veracity of my hon. friend from St. Antoine, a member in good standing on this side of the House, and in good standing as a business man from one end of the country to the other.

Now I propose with your permission to make a short analysis of the case and to lay the facts before this House and the country, and before the hon. member for East Assiniboia. There is a section of land known as section 29, township 1, range 6 west of the 2nd meridian, which at one time was school land ; I believe it was also coal land. I believe at present that section 29 is being developed as a coal field, and promises to be a pretty rich development. The coal field is called at the present time, if I mistake not, the Roche-Percé coal field. Now this land has a history, a history with which the hon. member for East Assiniboia is to a certain extent connected, and I propose shortly to trace that history. As I have said, this was a school section, and belonged to the category of coal lands. It was applied for in the years 1900, 1901 and 1902 in the order named, by T. H. Gilmour, August, 15, 1900, J. F. Howard, May 1, 1901, and S. J. Griffis, on March 25, 1902. When Gilmour applied he was told that the department was not anxious to sell the land, that it was in fact school land, and could only be sold by public auction, and that was not available for lease. So these three applicants in the order named received, I suppose, the same answer through and through. However, difficulties are made to be overcome ; and if that is not the proper way of putting it, departments are made for the purpose of overcoming and solving difficulties. So after a little consideration a way out was found, and an order in council was passed in June, 1902, opening this school section, and may be others in that vicinity, so that they could be leased as coal lands by the Department of the Interior. Now remember Gilmour one, Howard two, Griffis three, in the order of application, were all applicants before this was opened by the order in council for lease, and were all told that it could not be leased, as it was school land, and the department had to go according to a certain rule. It is on record that these people made no other application before the order in council opened it to lease, and the department had become, by that order in council, authorized to lease these school lands. In the end it turned out that Griffis, who was the last applicant, got the lease of the school lands on November 14, 1902 ; that is the last applicant became the final possessor of the lease of this section. Gilmour, the first applicant, does not seem to have been satisfied. Consequently through his solicitors, in the belief that he had not been fairly dealt with he brought legal training and service to his hand and on the 9th of May, 1903, certain solicitors sent in his behalf $96 as the rental for the six current months to the Department of the Interior and asked that it be credited to their client, the first applicant, Mr. Gilmour. This letter is replied to by Mr. Keyes who says that the lease has already been given to Mr. Griffis and that Mr. Griffis has paid the rent and the $96 is forthwith re-

turned to the solicitors of Mr. Gilmour. Mr. Gilmour is not satisfied yet and so he brings a suit in the Supreme Court in the Northwest Territories at Moosomin. An order was secured from the court dated the 25th of June, 1903, to one G. W. McLaren to examine J. G. Turriff who was, at the time of this transaction, commissioner of lands. On the 7th day of July, 1903, Mr. J. G. Turriff was duly examined under oath and gave his testimony. I think I shall have to read that testimony so as to have it upon the records of the House. In the first place I have a declaration by Mr. J. D. McLeod, deputy local registrar of the town of Moosomin, in the province of Saskatchewan, deputy to the local registrar of the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan, for the judicial district of Moosomin, and he says:

I do hereby certify that the annexed is a true copy and correct copy of the examination of one J. G. Turriff held in connection with the action brought by Thos. H. Gilmour against Silas I. Griffis, which said action now remains of record in the said Supreme Court of Saskatchewan for the judicial district of Moosomin and which said examination was filed in the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories for the judicial district of eastern Assiniboia on the 12th day of June, A.D. 1903.

Given at the town of Moosomin, in the province of Saskatchewan, the 7th day of April, A.D. 1908.

(Sgd.) J. D. McLEOD,
Deputy Local Registrar.

Here is the attached copy of the evidence, but before that comes we have a statement of Mr. McLaurin, the examiner:

In the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories, Judicial district of eastern Assiniboia, between Thomas H. Gilmour, plaintiff, and Silas I. Griffis, defendant.

I, whose name and seal is hereunto subscribed being the examined named in the order issued in this action dated the 25th day of June, A.D. 1903, hereunto annexed, hereby certify as follows:

1. Before I in any manner acted in execution of said order I on the 7th day of July, 1903, duly administered to John G. Turriff named in said order the following oath, namely: 'You are true answers to make to all such questions as shall be asked you, without favour or affection to either party, and therein you shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God.'

2. The deposition hereunto annexed is the deposition taken down before me of the said Turriff, examined, cross-examined and re-examined before me in my office according to my appointment herein hereto annexed and under the said order; and the signatures subscribed to such depositions are respectively the signatures of said Turriff and of me, before whom such deposition was taken; and each of the documents annexed to such deposition and marked by my initials was produced by said Turriff at the time he gave the evidence in such deposition contained and thereat declared by him each to be respectively true and certified copies of the originals thereof now on file in the Department of the Interior of the Dominion of Canada, and in his custody as the Commissioner of Dominion Lands in the said department.

3. The said deposition truly states the evidence given by said Turriff before me as examiner under such order at said time and place.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 7th day of July, A.D. 1903.

(Sgd.) G. W. McLAURIN,
Examiner.

(Seal.)

Here follows the evidence given in this court by this witness:

In the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories, judicial district of eastern Assiniboia, between Thomas H. Gilmour, plaintiff, and Silas I. Griffis, defendant.

Pursuant to order made herein the 25th day of June, 1903, John G. Turriff did appear before me on Tuesday the 7th day of July, 1903, to be examined herein.

Present—W. H. Curle for plaintiff, H. Millar for defendant, and the said John G. Turriff having been duly sworn said as follows:

I am the Commissioner of Dominion Lands in the Department of the Interior of the government of the Dominion of Canada and as such I have in my custody in such department all the papers and correspondence in connection with the lease of section 29, township 1, range 6, west of the second meridian, in the Northwest Territories, to Silas I. Griffis, dated the 14th day of November, 1902, from the said department.

There was an application from Mr. Gilmour to purchase the land but he was told that it was not for sale. This is school land and can only be sold by public auction to the highest bidder. The mode of disposing of these lands is fixed by the Dominion Lands Act. Subsequently it was decided that we might lease school lands for coal mining purposes; regulations were framed governing the leasing of school lands and an application was then made by J. F. Howard either to purchase or lease and also by a Mr. Griffis. Subsequently both Gilmour and Howard withdrew their applications on condition that the lease would issue to Mr. Griffis, and when that was done it left Mr. Griffis as the only applicant and the lease was granted to him in the ordinary course. Mr. Griffis paid six months rental and the lease was issued to him.

As commissioner, these matters are referred to me in the ordinary way, and I am speaking altogether from my knowledge of the letters on file in my office, certified copies of which I now produce.

I know the statement I have made is correct, because I have the correspondence on file now.

I produce certified copies of all correspondence from both Mr. Gilmour and Mr. Howard and Mr. Griffis as requested by counsel on both sides.

The papers marked exhibit 'A' are certified copies of all the correspondence between J. F. Howard and the department in connection with these lands, and exhibit 'B' is certified copies of all correspondence between

the department and T. H. Gilmour, and exhibit 'C' is certified copies of all correspondence with Mr. Griffis in connection with the same.

Exhibits 'A,' 'B' and 'C' constitute all the correspondence we have with Gilmour, Howard and Griffis in connection with these lands.

To Mr. Curle:

The department received the plaintiff's, Gilmour, application in August, 1900, John F. Howard's application in May, 1901, and the defendant, Griffis' application in March, 1902.

The department became authorized to lease school lands in the month of June, 1902.

Just above you will notice that the witness declared that the latter two made application after the order in council in 1902 had been issued authorizing the lease of school lands for coal mining purposes. There seems to be a little disparity in that. I imagine that the latter statement is the correct one. This would be a considerable time after the latest of the three applications:

The applications of these three persons were not renewed after the order in council was passed authorizing the lease of coal lands and the three original applications stood.

So that the witness of course has twice discussed his first proposition and he leans to the opinion in the last two utterances that these were not renewed after the order in council, so I imagine that is the proper statement of the case.

The department recognizes the relative time of applications in considering who shall be the successful applicant.

Q. Then which of these three applicants has the best right to the lease of these lands under the practice of the department?—A. Mr. Gilmour's application was first, Mr. Howard's was second and Mr. Griffis was third. If Mr. Gilmour and Mr. Howard had not withdrawn their applications Mr. Gilmour would have been given the first opportunity of leasing. If he had not carried it out then Mr. Howard would have been given the next opportunity. The custom of the department in all cases is to deal with the applications in the order of priority.

Q. Then Gilmour's withdrawal was of material assistance with Griffis in enabling him to get the lease?—A. Yes.

That finishes the evidence. I have said that Griffis, the last applicant, got the lease in the end. At a certain time Griffis got busy; he evidently wanted, if you can infer from the correspondence, to get that section of coal lands for himself and he wanted, if possible, to get rid of Gilmour and of Howard and I imagine pour parlers went on between them, Howard clinging to his right of priority and to have a portion if they made any arrangement amongst themselves and he does not seem to have got that portion. Some telegrams were produced by the witness at that time. He said he produced all the correspondence they had in the department. These letters and telegrams were introduced. What are they?

September 18, 1902.

Mark the date:

Winnipeg, Manitoba, September 18, 1902.

The Minister of the Interior,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Sir,—Re coal mining rights on section 29, township 1, range 6, west second meridian.

On or about July 2, A.D. 1902, I made application for lease of and right to mine coal on legal subdivisions 5 to 12 inclusive in section 29, township 1, range 6, west second meridian.

I hereby withdraw said application and do hereby relinquish all claim to any mining or other rights in or on said land, provided a lease therefore is granted to Silas Griffis.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) JOHN F. HOWARD.

That was on September 18, and by it he released absolutely and relinquished all claims on one condition, namely that this lease is issued to Mr. Griffis. But he does not seem to have lost interest after making the relinquishment, and on October 8 he telegraphs:

Winnipeg, Manitoba, October 9, 1902.

J. G. Turriff,

Department of the Interior, Ottawa, Ontario.

Kindly wire giving date when Griffis lease likely issue. Important.

(Sgd.) JOHN F. HOWARD.

Note that Mr. Howard has absolutely relinquished his right and all claims he has to these lands on condition that the lease goes to Griffis. A few days after having written that letter on September 18, he again becomes interested and he says:

Kindly wire giving date when Griffis' lease is likely to issue. Important.

(Sgd.) JOHN F. HOWARD.

Evidently the man must have some interest still in this property. We may exercise our own judgment as to what it was. Was it an interest arising out of an arrangement he had made with Griffis that the lease should issue in Griffis name but that he should receive consideration of some kind for relinquishing and assigning his rights.

On October 28, we have the following

John F. Howard,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Form of lease before Department of Justice. Am hastening matter as much as possible.

(Sgd.) J. G. TURRIFF.

That is the correspondence so far as it was brought down and Mr. J. G. Turriff swore that he had brought down 'All the correspondence which we have with reference to this lease with regard to Griffis, Howard and Gilmour.' Well, Sir, it was not quite all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. FOSTER. Howard got busy at Winnipeg with his letters to Turriff relinquishing his claim and his later telegram to Turriff urging him to hasten the issue of the lease to Griffis. On September 18, he started in to hurry and I have here a letter dated Ottawa, September 15, 1902, reading as follows:

Dear Mr. Howard,—I duly received yours of the 2nd instant, addressed to Mr. Sifton, in reference to the coal mining rights on section 29, township 1, range 6, west second. The way the matter stands, Gilmour might be considered the most entitled, although after the orders in council providing for leasing were passed your application and his are on even dates.

There was only one application made by each applicant up to this date, but Mr. Turriff in writing to Mr. Howard says:

The way the matter stands, Gilmour might be considered the most entitled, although after the orders in council providing for leasing were passed your application and his are on even dates.

He continues:

It will, however, be more satisfactory if Griffis can do as he says,—get an assignment or withdrawal from Gilmour—and we will issue lease to him for the whole section. I trust that you can get this arranged satisfactorily. If not, let me know and I will see if we cannot do it anyway, but I would much prefer to have Gilmour withdraw.

Yours truly,
J. G. TURRIFF.

This is marked private. That was correspondence as much as any correspondence that ever went on with reference to those negotiations between the deputy commissioner and the gentlemen themselves. What right had he to mark that as private and after swearing that he produced all the correspondence with reference to this section of the land retain this amongst his own private correspondence. What right had the commissioner of lands in the Interior Department of this government at this city of Ottawa to interest himself as between Howard and Gilmour and the man Griffis. What right in the world? None. He is the sworn officer of this government. He has to stand there as a judge in the case and issue in the final resort what is proper to be issued. He has no more right, Sir, than a judge upon the bench who is trying a case would have to write private letters to one of the litigants suggesting means and methods by which some of the litigants could be got out of the way to his pecuniary injury.

On September 15, Mr. Howard takes a hand and gets in his own relinquishment quick, and as a matter of course, I believe Mr. Gilmour was acted upon and put in his relinquishment too. But, the interest of Turriff did not wane after the writing of the letter of September 15. He slept over night—two nights—and then he thought and sent this telegram:

Ottawa, Ontario, September 17, 1902.

That is two days afterwards.

John F. Howard,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Do not act on my letter of fifteenth. Writing you to-day.

J. G. TURRIFF.

Well, he wrote on that same day, September 17. Here is the astounding letter that was written by an officer of this department, the Commissioner of Lands, who had all these lands under his particular care as lease issuer.

Private.

Ottawa, September, 17, 1908.

My dear Howard,—I just wired you to-day not to act on my letter of the 15th until you saw Griffis. I have just seen a friend of his here who tells me that possibly Gilmour will hold you up for one-quarter or one-third interest in the business, and I do not want to put you in that position, and unless Griffis can get Gilmour's withdrawal for a very trifling amount it would be better not to go near him at all, and we will issue the lease to Griffis.

Yours sincerely,
J. G. TURRIFF.

John F. Howard, Esq.,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Mr. SPROULE. Crooked as usual.

Mr. FOSTER. Those are letters written by J. G. Turriff, Commissioner of Crown Lands, to the contestants before him, Gilmour having the prior right, Howard the second and Griffis the last by his own sworn testimony. Gilmour having the prior right to be considered first, Turriff interfered by private letters and telegrams in the interest of the last applicant, Mr. Griffis, in order to save him paying a fair value to Gilmour for the prior right and telling him in the end: Don't let yourself be held up. I will see you are not held up and unless you can get rid of him for a mere trifle I will issue the lease—and it was issued. No comment is needful after that, I leave it with the House and with parliament and with the country.

Mr. TURRIFF. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course the only motion before the House is the one to go into Supply and the hon. member cannot speak unless with the consent of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let him speak.

Mr. TURRIFF. With reference to the hon. gentleman's first remarks as to the bringing up of a matter of privilege in connection with reflections made on myself by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) I certainly was not aware that in matters of that kind it was customary to give any notice, one way or an-

other. I notice that the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) does not give me any notice when he goes around the country traducing me. However, the facts of the matter which the hon. member for North Toronto has brought up are exactly as he has stated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not see that there is very much in it. I never met Mr. Griffis as far as I know, I have met Mr. Gilmour once and Mr. Howard was a friend of mine. He had failed in business in Winnipeg, was absolutely down on the rocks and he was applying for a lease of coal lands for this particular section. When Gilmour first applied to purchase they could not be sold, as I said, except by public auction but a year or so after, on an application by other parties to lease coal lands in other parts of the country, regulations were made and it was a question, as I said, whether the applications that came in beforehand would be covered by these regulations or not, especially as Gilmour's application was an application to purchase and not to lease if my memory serves me aright. At all events both Gilmour and Howard had withdrawn their applications in favour of Griffis, and I had not the slightest doubt that they had formed a coalition or arrangement among themselves. I had no interest in it one way or another and never had. I do not know who owns the land now and do not know if it was ever worked, I know in fact, nothing about it. I was dealing with it absolutely in an official manner. As to the letters which the hon. member has read, I do not know how he got them, but I will tell you this that when I was in Winnipeg some time after that a gentleman came to me and said: Mr. Gilmour has two private letters of yours that are very compromising, and if you do not give him a grazing lease for which he is an applicant he will publish those letters. I said to this gentleman: You go to Mr. Gilmour and tell him to go plumb.

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) did not have the courtesy to notify me that he intended in any way to deal with the question of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, and I do not propose to take up the time of the House with any observations on that particular subject; but I propose this afternoon to speak with reference to another matter which has, in one form or another, at various times occupied the attention of this House. Some weeks ago the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) made a motion asking for a general investigation into the policy of the present government in respect of the leasing of timber lands in the Canadian Northwest. That matter was discussed and the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) was voted down. Since that time, however, there have been laid on the table of the House a number of original documents, at that time refused. Since that time too, many returns which had been previously asked for by members on this side of the House have become accessible and a limited inquiry, very much hampered in many ways by the usual obstructionist methods, has been carried on in the Public Accounts Committee and from this and other sources we are now in possession of considerable new information which as yet has not been officially laid before the House and the country. I claim that this new information justifies us in reopening this question and in discussing it from a different point of view this afternon. A number of individual transactions have been examined to ascertain the method in which certain gentlemen, close to the administration, have acquired timber berths. This examination has necessarily been confined to a comparatively few transactions and yet the disclosures which have been made from these investigations are so significant that we cannot pass them over without reviewing them and submitting them to the further examination of the House. The documents and the evidence show that vast areas of timber land have been improvidently alienated and have fallen into the hands of speculators by whom they are held today. The documents and evidence show a series of remarkable coincidences, proving at least that there has been great looseness in the awarding of these timber berths and proving also that the method under which these concessions were granted has been such that it might easily have been taken advantage of by ill-disposed persons, in fact that it opened wide the door to fraud and imposition.

I propose to show this House a number of distances in which the success of the bidders has been so marked, so inexplicable, that it is difficult to find any other reason to account for that success other that there must have been collusion in connection with the granting of limits.

The documents that have been produced and the evidence that has been taken show beyond a doubt that immense areas of timber lands in the Northwest have been improvidently alienated and have fallen into the hands of speculators. Nor is that all. The transactions examined exhibit a series of remarkable coincidences, as yet wholly unaccounted for, disclose a looseness of method in awarding berths by so-called public competition that might easily have been taken advantage of by unscrupulous persons and present evidence of phenomenal success on the part of certain bidders in close relationship to the minister of the day, all of which, to say the least, demands some reasonable explanation.

Within the comparatively short period of three and a half years, between 1902 and 1905, more than three thousand square miles of selected timber, that is to say, about one-half of the entire area under lease in the western provinces, fell into the hands, not of operators, but of speculators. One-half of this amount, comprising 25 per cent of the timber of the three provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, was acquired by a group, which may be called the Burrows-Fraser combination, of which the brother-in-law of the then Minister of the Interior was the central figure, and acquired under circumstances so peculiar as to have excited general comment.

An analysis of the holdings of this group shows Mr. T. A. Burrows as having acquired 549 square miles, the Imperial Pulp Company, 417 square miles, the Big River Lumber Company 250 square miles, A. W. Fraser (alias John McBain) 250 square miles, A. W. Fraser, for himself, 120 square miles—in all, 1,586 square miles of selected timber, only 109 square miles of which are being operated, the remainder held presumably for speculation.

The extent of the holdings of this favoured group may be illustrated. Were these blocks, nearly 250 in number, selected out of an area many times their size, placed end to end they would form a continuous strip of thick timber one mile wide stretching from Montreal to Winnipeg, or, putting it another way, their combined area would completely cover two of our own counties such as Stanstead and Brome and make them one continuous forest.

Mr. BURROWS. Does the hon. gentleman say that I own 1,600 square miles of timber limit?

Mr. AMES. I say that you have been interested in 1,586 square miles of timber limits to my own knowledge, and I do not know how much more beside.

Mr. BURROWS. It is not true.

Mr. AMES. To go on with our illustration, on the sworn returns——

Mr. BURROWS. How does the hon. gentleman make out that I own 1,600 square miles of timber limits?

Mr. AMES. I shall have pleasure in taking fully an hour to do this. For the year ending the 30th April, 1907, sworn returns furnished the Department of the Interior show that 80 berths in the three provinces, aggregating 1,125 miles, furnished all the sawn lumber marketed during that year. The ex-Minister of the Interior has told us that the supply was ample to cover the demand. Hence we are justified in concluding that 1,200 square miles of timber limits could easily fulfil the present requirements of the three western provinces. The holdings of the Burrows-Fraser group, therefore, are more than sufficient to supply the entire demand of the western provinces for sawn spruce lumber.

In the acquisition of these limits, under the form of quasi competition then followed by this government, the members of the 'inner circle' have been remarkably successful. Mr. T. A. Burrows, brother-in-law to the ex-Minister of the Interior, owned in 1901 three limits. Between June of 1902 and June of 1905, Mr. Burrows bid, directly or indirectly, nineteen times for timber berths. He succeeded eighteen times; he failed once. The time he failed to get his limit is one worth considering. It was in respect of berth No. 1050. Mr. Burrows put in an offer of $6,000 and Mr. Macdonald put in a bid of $13,125.

Since June, 1905, Mr. Burrows has but once tested his luck. When berth No. 1281 was put up to competition he lost, but by a very narrow margin. His single tender of $5,000 was overstopped by a bidder who offered $5,195. Since June, 1805, Mr. Burrows does not appear to have ever tendered, at least not under any recognizable name. Naturally, we ask the reason why—whether it be because all the good timber is already annexed, or whether he does not find the present atmosphere as favourable to his operations as in years gone by.

Now, there is a company known as the Imperial Pulp Company, which has occupied, to a considerable extent, the attention of this House. It is one of those companies—there are many of them ; you will find them in every department—which keeps itself scrupulously hidden, but which has constant dealings for its own profit with the government. This Imperial Pulp Company, which has provoked curiosity and defied inquiry, entered the field as a bidder in December, 1902. It never applied for a limit. Search the records, and you will not find one case where the Imperial Pulp Company, in advance, indicated that they wanted timber ; but, during these two years, under diverse names—sometimes the name of one party and sometimes the name of another—the Imperial Pulp Company put in bids nine times, and it never failed to secure the limit it was after every time it put in a bid. So it was the Imperial Pulp Company, this mysterious company, whose identity we could not discover, which had no office, no post office address, except the box in Winnipeg, which did its business through a lawyer and a banker here, signed its letters with a stamp and 'R.R.P.' and could not be found in any business directory on the North American continent, this company went on bidding successfully until it had acquired 417 square miles of limits worth to-day a million dollars, if not more. Now, I took the trouble to add up the offers the Imperial Pulp Company made when they were acquiring limits, and I find the total amount they offered on 9 limits for which they tendered was $54,975,

and also that the combined bids of the next nearest highest bidders were $51,771.

Mr. BURROWS. Wrong again.

Mr. AMES. It is a difference of only 6 per cent. I have the official figures here.

Mr. BURROWS. Wrong again.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Burrows and the companies with which he is connected have been so remarkably successful, their success has differed so greatly from that of their competitors that it has excited a good deal of comment outside this House and has occasioned, I may say to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), a good deal of distrust of the Department of the Interior throughout the Canadian Northwest. We undertook a partial investigation, an investigation very limited—it could not be otherwise under the reference—and so we find ourselves with but little of the information we would like to have about the transactions with which this company is connected. In the Public Accounts Committee, however, the original documents were all produced, and we examined several witnesses. We examined Mr. Campbell and Mr. Finnie. When we asked Mr. Finnie—who did the banking for Mr. Burrows and supplied the cheques for him with most of the tenders—when we asked Mr. Finnie in one specific case the order of entry of the cheques and whether they had been accepted upon a certain day the committee stopped us and we could proceed no further. So, we reached the point where it was necessary for us to review the evidence and report to this House; and that is what I propose to do this afternoon.

Now, in all this inquiry, Mr. T. A. Burrows was the central figure, and his remarkable success is one of the features of the investigation. As I have said, on September 1, 1901, Mr. Burrows had limits 571a and 814, an aggregate area of 44 square miles. Between that date and June, 1905, he had added to his holdings about 500 square miles. He tendered in various names, but always with the same success. Twenty times during these four years he tendered, in nineteen cases with success and only once in that time did he fail. Compare the experience of the next largest speculative holders, Messrs. H. and K. MacDonald. They are shrewd firm of timber operators. There were two brothers. Kenneth was the practical man who went to the West and explored the timber limits and learned just what to offer. Hector was the Ottawa man; he stayed here and handled the business. They tendered thirty times during the period when Mr. Burrows was so successful, fourteen times they succeeded and sixteen times they failed. Add up their bids, and you find that they paid three and a half times as much for their limits as was offered by the next highest bidders. Contrast their bids in these thirty times, and you will see that they vary greatly. Trace the bids of Mr. Burrows and the Imperial Pulp Company and see by what narrow margins they always win.

Now, I propose to lay before this House a number of specific instances which have come out in connection with the Public Accounts Committee and have come to our knowledge by the study of the original documents that have been presented from time to time. This will enable us to ascertain something of the unique methods by which such success has been acquired by the brother-in-law of the late Minister of the Interior. The first limit is berth 1046. This lies on the Pembina river, 40 miles northeast of Edmonton. It is a selection berth and very valuable, or will be when the railway reaches Athabaska Landing. The bids were opened on May 7, 1903. They were four in number. The lowest was that of Crafts and Lee, of Edmonton, $815; next, James A. Powell, Edmonton, $1,510; then D. R. Fraser and Company, $3,015; and finally T. A. Burrows of Winnipeg, $3,500. If you examine the four original bids you will find that the tenders of Crafts and Lee, James A. Powell and D. R. Fraser and Company are all on the regular printed forms of the department. They were all filled out in perfectly proper manner, and in each case there was one accepted cheque and one only. There is other evidence that these three bids were perfectly regular. But when you examine the original Burrows tender, what do you find? He encloses two cheques on the Bank of Ottawa here, one for $3,000 and one for $500. These figures are somewhat significant when we consider the other tenders. Here was the next highest, that of D. R. Fraser and Company, $3,015. If only the Burrows $3,000 cheque had gone in, or he would have lost the limit, but the second cheque carried him over and he won the berth. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if there is not something strange and suggestive in these facts.

Again, take limit 1047, probably the most valuable limit of its size in the whole Canadian Northwest, traversed from end to end by the Canadian Northern Railway, lying right along the railroad and on both sides of it, a selection area of 50 square miles out of seven townships on the north slope of the Porcupine Hills. Last summer, an adjacent limit, 964, which contains only 32 square miles, selected from a smaller area, was sold by Shaw brothers to the Ruby Lake Lumber Company for $100,000 in cash. I have the documents to prove that fact. If this latter limit was worth $100,000, then limit 1047 was worth double the amount. Limit 1047 was applied for by Mr. Burrows, or rather by the Burrows interest—Mr. Burrows' stenographer in this case—and bids were opened on May 7, 1903. In this case there were five ten-

ders : Pritchard and Stone, $2,000 ; J. S. Hough, for client, $4,050 ; Mutchenbacker brothers, $5,510 ; H. and K. McDonald et al of Ottawa, $13,524, and T. A. Burrows, $15,000. And, when we came to examine the originals, we found—what we never could have learned from any copies—we learned, from the marginal notes, that Mr. Burrows' bid of $15.000 was made up of three cheques, $6,000, $5,000 and $4,000.

Until the McDonald bid arrived, Mr. Burrow's $6,000 cheque was quite enough to capture the limit. But after the McDonald tender came in for $13,524, it required the combined three cheques of $6,000, $5,000 and $4,000 to clear the barrier and capture the limit. Now, I ask : Is that coincidence or is it design ? When we came to study before the Public Accounts Committee the history of 1046 and 1047, we found that bids for both berths were opened on the same day, the 7th of May, 1903, and we learned that upon that day Mr. Burrows had out at least five cheques for $6,000, $5,000, $4,000, $3,000 and $500. Now we examined Mr. Finnie, and we said to Mr. Finnie, these cheques were on your bank, did you accept these cheques on that day, and if you did, in what order did you accept them ? Now I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the right hon. the leader of the government, if that was not a fair question to ask. Here was Mr. Bristol's question :

Q. On March 7, 1903, there appears from the record to have been five cheques of T. A. Burrows, one for $3,000 and one for $500 put in in respect of timber berth No. 1046, forming part of the tender, and in the other case of three cheques for $6,000, $5,000 and $4,000 respecively, put in in respect of timber berth No. 1047, and the record also shows that they are on the bank of Ottawa with whom you say Mr. Burrows had an account. I want you to tell me whether those cheques were charged up to Mr. Burrows' account on that day?

Mr. Macdonald objected to the question, and asked for the ruling of the chairman. The chairman ruled against the question, and on appeal being taken, it was voted down by the usual partisan majority. That is why the inquiry came to a close. That was a crucial question. We had to know the order in which those cheques were accepted in order to ascertain whether they were really there before 12 o'clock on the day when the tenders came in.

Now take up berth 1099, another berth of value.

Mr. BURROWS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? Is it not a fact that in the committee I said that if you would put me in the box I would tell you where the cheques were, and you would not do so, you would not give me an opportunity of telling you anything about the cheques ?

Mr. AMES. The hon. member was too busy drumming up Liberal members out in the corridors. He was quite at liberty to be called by his friends, if they had desired.

Now berth 1099 consisted of forty-four square miles on Brulé lake, west of Edmonton, and close to the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Bids were opened on the 11th November, 1903. There were three offers, J. W. Blain, of Strathcona, $3,300 ; Kidd and Thompson, of Ottawa, $5,116, and T. A. Burrows, $6,500. Mr. Blain's and Thompson's tenders were on the regular printed form of the department, and there was one accepted cheque in each and no more. They were both perfectly regular tenders. The higher of them came in just before 12 o'clock. When we came to examine Mr. Burrows' original tender we found it was on plain paper, but in a departmental envelope, with crest, and probably written in the department. We found it contained two cheques, one for $3,500 and the other for $3,000. There again you have the same coincidence. It is strange that Mr. Burrows' second cheque for $3,500 was just $200 above Mr. Blain's tender, and when at the last moment a tender comes from Kidd and Thompson, for $5,116, a second cheque of $3,000 makes it possible for Mr. Burrows to still capture the limit. Now again I ask : Is that coincidence or is it design ?

Take another berth, 1192, fifty square miles on the Pembina river, near the Grand Trunk Pacific. Bids were opened on December 7, 1904. There were three tenders, Hector and Kenneth McDonald for $5,551, John Walter, for $5,060, and T. A. Burrows for $5,500. There again there were two cheques of Mr. Burrows, one for $3,000 and one for $2,500, and the two cheques together were just a little above the John Walter tender. Once again: Is that coincidence or is it design ? If there were only one or two cases like these, we might say it was coincidence, but when we find case after case where the tender differs from the regular method, and where the results are always the same, and success always comes to the same individual, I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, to say whether these circumstances do not call for some explanation.

Now something was said in this House some time ago about timber berth 1108. I will not refer to that at great length. Timber berth 1108 consisted of sixty square miles on Moose lake, north of Lake Winnipegosis. It was transferred to the Imperial Pulp Company. When the originals came down in connection with that timber berth, what did we find ? We found that Mr. A. W. Fraser, of Ottawa, had written with his own hand an offer of $1,000, that Mr. James Currie, of Cumberland, bidding for another party, had put in an offer of $6,420, and that Mr. Fraser had written a second offer, signing W. H. Nolan's name to it, not

his own, and that second offer, was for $7,000. We asked Mr. Fraser, and he admitted that he had written both his own tender for $1,000 and Nolan's tender for $7,000; but he said that he wrote the $7,000 tender in Mr. Nolan's name on instructions from Mr. Burrows, that he put it in envelope which he gave to Mr. Burrows, and that Mr. Burrows must have added the $7,000 cheque. That was Mr. Fraser's testimony. At all events I may say that Mr. Currie firmly believes that he was euchred out of that berth. He believes that the other tender was either bogus or that it came in too late; and I would certainly say that the circumstances are such as to lend strength to such a belief. Now I will digress for a moment and deal with Mr. Fraser, because Mr. Fraser carried on several transactions, I do not know for whom; but inasmuch as he often acted for the Burrows syndicate, in all probability he is connected with these deals. There is a large and strong company known as the Red Deer Lumber Company. It is financed by American capital, and it controls a considerable area on the Red Deer river, and sells great quantities of cut lumber. The Red Deer Lumber Company, in the early days, found it apparently necessary to procure their limits through middlemen. Latterly they have been acting directly apparently with much better satisfaction. Among their earlier acquisitions was timber berth 988. That was put up on the 16th of December, 1901. There were two bidders, A. C. Fraser, of Brandon, for $3,500, and A. W. Fraser, of Ottawa, for $3,769. A. C. Fraser's bid arrived by mail the day before the tenders were opened. The other offer arrived on the morning of the last day. When the bids were opened it was found that A. W. Fraser's bid was accompanied by a letter which says: 'I inclose an accepted cheque.' Yet there were two cheques in it. Mr. Fraser acquired the limit, and sold it to the Red Deer Lumber Company for a very valuable consideration. It would be of interest to this House to know who were the parties with whom he divided. Again, there was berth No. 1051 which went in the same way; bids were opened on the 6th March, 1903. They were as follows:

Henry Christopherson, Yorkton.. ..	$2,800
Mutchenbacker Brothers, Rosseau..	3,510
John Hanbury, Brandon..	4,650
J. S. Hough, Winnipeg..	6,509
John McBain, Ottawa..	7,000

Now we find on examining them that Mutchenbacker's tender, Hanbury's tender and Hough's tender were all on the printed form of the department and were put in the regular way, but we find, when we come to the original John McBain tender, that it was written in A. W. Fraser's own handwriting. Thus Fraser has a second alias. He was first writing out tenders in the name of W. H. Nolan and now he is using the name of John McBain. In the McBain offer we find no amount stated, but there were three cheques which the marginal notes show came from Mr. Fraser, one for $3,000, another for $2,000 and a third for $2,000. It will be seen that the $3,000 and combined $2,000 would have been enough to have captured the limit against the first three competitors, but when J. F. Hough's bid arrived it was necessary to put in an additional cheque for $2,000 so as to make up the $7,000. This limit was also sold to the Red Deer Lumber Company for a good figure.

Look now at berth No. 1239. Berth No. 1239 acquired by the Red Deer Lumber Company shortly afterwards, without the intervention of the middleman, Mr. A. W. Fraser. It was acquired direct and the company paid for it $25,150; in other words, they paid the government instead of paying A. W. Fraser.

Now, I propose to discuss for a few minutes what is known as the Prince Albert deal. This story discloses a betrayal of trust for the benefit of the same parties which is without parallel in the history of the Department of the Interior. It is the story of the Big River Lumber Company and its twin aggregation the McBain-Munson combination. We will extricate the limits as we go on. On the 17th of January, 1903, Urquhart, Richard and Pattison, real estate agents of St. Paul and Winnipeg, writing, as they said, 'on behalf of a syndicate of Urquhart, Richards and Pattison, real estate American financial men,' asked that 50 blocks of timber, each ten miles in extent, at the head waters of the Churchill river to the northwest of Prince Albert, should be put up at one time to competition. The southeast corner of the area of selection came within 25 miles of Prince Albert and these people asked that they might have an opportunity of selecting this timber throughout an area 100 miles long by 70 miles wide. It was an unprecedented demand. There is no such demand as that in the history of the whole department; 500 square miles to be selected out of an area of 7,020 square miles. Both the area of selection and the other features in connection with it were most unusual. It is almost impossible to understand at first sight how the department should have been persuaded to put such a proposition up. Think of the magnitude of it! This means a strip of continuous woodland four miles wide all the way from Montreal to Ottawa. It meant a monopoly of the timber resources of Prince Albert for practically all time. There was a large number of people at Prince Albert dependent on the timber trade. It meant a monopoly which would shut them out to the last man and yet this enormous transaction, the largest on record, is characterized by practically the shortest

delay of almost any of these transactions. The delays allowed are in inverse ratio to the magnitude of the proposition. Of advertisements there was one in the Manitoba 'Free Press' and one in the Prince Albert 'Advocate.' The time allowed from the time that the advertisement left Ottawa till the bids got back to Ottawa, was from the 28th January to the 7th March, thirty-eight days from Ottawa to Ottawa. That meant four weeks for the people of Prince Albert to ascertain where that timber lay and to decide what they would pay for 500 square miles of timber spread out over 7,000 square miles. Protests galore came pouring into the department. The ex-Minister of the Interior told us the other day that only one protest had ever come to his notice, but let him look through the file in the department and he will find that there were protests in this instance from the mayor, from the board of trade and from everybody in Prince Albert who had any interest in the country. That made no difference. To all the protests the Commissioner of Dominion Lands made this curt reply :

As these berths were put up and advertised in the ordinary manner it was not thought advisable to make any change.

The tenders were opened on the 7th March, 1903 ; there was no competition. Not one of the Prince Albert people who had been objecting made any attempt to bid, and when the department and its friends learned that there was only one outside bidder, namely, Mutchenbacker Bros., they realized that they had the whole situation in their own hands and so they bid $5,000 for the first choice and they put in another bid of $1,000 for the second choice. A. W. Fraser, at one time president of the Ottawa Liberal Club, using the name of William Crown, of Prince Albert, but acting under the instructions of T. A .Burrows, put in a bid in the name of the Big River Lumber Company for the first choice at $5,000, and again, this time using John McBain's name, he put in a tender for the second choice, and we find that in the envelopes there were unidentifiable manager's cheques on the bank of Ottawa which were given in exchange for cheques of Mr. Burrows. So that Mr. Burrows in this way acquired berths Nos. 1048 and 1049, comprising 500 square miles with the right of selection out of 7,000 square miles for the sum of $6,000, or $12 per square mile, or two cents per acre.

Mr. BURROWS. Does the hon. gentleman say that I acquired berth No. 1049 ?

Mr. AMES. I do.

Mr. BURROWS. I say you are telling an absolute falsehood and you know it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That language is hardly parliamentary.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Fraser under oath, swore that he put in a tender in the name of John McBain and that he owned the limit.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The expression 'falsehood' is unparliamentary.

Mr. BURROWS. I will withdraw the expression, but I say that the hon. gentleman's statement is not correct. Mr. Fraser swore under oath that he put in a tender in the name of John McBain and that he owned the timber limit. My hon. friend knows that and yet he makes the statement that I acquired this timber berth.

Mr. AMES. You had No. 1048 and the two go together. Well, I will go on with my story.

Mr. BURROWS. You make a statement that is not correct and we have sworn evidence by a man who went into the witness box and stated that he put a tender in for himself, that he owned the limit and that he afterwards sold it.

Mr. AMES. If the hon. gentleman states that he has never had any interest directly or indirectly in berths 1048 and 1049 I will accept his statement. But, my statement that he retains an interest in 1048 remains.

Mr. BURROWS. I will deal with No. 1048 afterwards.

Mr. AMES. Very well.

Mr. BURROWS. Now will you take back your statement? You made a statement which is absolutely incorrect. You know it is incorrect because the printed evidence shows that Mr. Fraser put in a tender in the name of John McBain, who, I understand, is his brother-in-law. Mr. Bristol asked him what he got for it and he said it was his own business. In view of that fact you should not malign me by such a statement.

Mr. BRISTOL. May I ask you a question, Mr. Burrows? Do I understand you to say you never had an interest direct or indirect in No. 1049?

Mr. BURROWS. I had no interest whatever in the tender of Mr. McBain.

Mr. BRISTOL. I am not asking you that, I am asking had you any interest in 1049 at any time.

Mr. BURROWS. The only interest I had in it was that I afterwards acted as agent for Mr. Fraser and sold the limit for him. I never owned it myself and had no interest in it before or after the tender.

Mr. BRISTOL. I want to be absolutely fair. I see on the record that you paid the rental to the department on August 12, 1905, for this limit 1049 and you sent in your cheque for that.

Mr. BURROWS. That is quite correct, but I did not own the timber limit. Acting for Mr. Fraser I sold the limit to a party and at that time I paid the ground rent. I never was interested in the tender and Mr. Fraser swore so.

Mr. BRISTOL. You are quite right there, Mr. Fraser swore that.

Mr. BURROWS. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) should now take back the statement. He has absolute sworn evidence that I was not interested and I say I was not. Will he take it back?

Mr. AMES. So far as No. 1049 is concerned, if the hon. gentleman says he never had any interest directly or indirectly in No. 1049, I accept his word, but so far as No. 1048 is concerned I am going to continue my remarks. Now, these two limits, first and second choice, this immense area was disposed of by this government for $6,000, or $12 per square mile, or 2 cents per acre. That limit has been cruised and I understand it contains over 1,000,000,000 feet of spruce. It was the largest proposition that was ever put up in the Canadian Northwest of a timber character, and yet it was put up with such evidence of haste that the competition for it was practically nil. You may search the records of the department for that year and the year before and you will find that the average bonus the department was receiving in these two years was $150 per square mile throughout the whole department. And yet, they were prepared to let this immense area go, the timber reserve supply of Prince Albert, for the paltry sum of $12 per square mile. Now, as to No. 1048, although that limit stood in the name of the Big River Lumber Company it was a limit in which Mr. T. A. Burrows has shown a very great interest. Before it was explored, before it was even blocked out, Mr. T. A. Burrows sold his half interest in limit No. 1048 and whatever interest he may have had in No. 1049 for $80,000. What is more, he was paid in full in cash three instalments of $30,000, $25,000 and $25,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Speak now.

Mr. AMES. There is a member of this House who has seen all the documents connected with that case and who is prepared to show that my statement is correct.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AMES. In a former debate in this House there were certain members upon the opposite side of the House who had the effrontery to say that this limit went to Mr. Cowan, a Conservative.

An hon. MEMBER. So it did.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Cowan a Conservative —why, Mr. Cowan never would have got within 40 rows of apple trees of that limit if Mr. Burrows had not been behind him.

Mr. BRISTOL. Mr. Cowan would never have acquired that limit if it had not been for the force that drove it through in the person of the brother-in-law of the Minister of the Interior of that day, and Mr. Cowan and his associates, before they could become full owners of that limit, had to buy out that brother-in-law for $80,000. That is what the middleman cost in that job.

Mr. FOSTER. Great is the middleman.

Mr. AMES. Now, I say that if these ten timber limits had been put up, 50 miles at a time, every one of them would have brought $5,000 or $6,000 to the government. And I say that it was a perfect outrage to put up 500 square miles (the whole reserve supply for the district of Prince Albert) at one time and under conditions which forced out every local bidder, in order that it might go where it went.

I have a little more evidence on that same matter; a little more evidence to show the value of that immense proposition. Lying midway between that area and the city of Prince Albert there was a berth known as the Sturgeon Lake reserve. For the good of the country fortunately the putting up of that berth was in the hands of another section of the Interior Department, namely, the Department of Indian Affairs. The 35 square miles of timber in the neighbourhood of Sturgeon Lake were put up by the Department of Indian Affairs and they were well advertised. Very different indeed was the manner of their advertising from that of No. 1048 and No. 1049. They were advertised six times in the Manitoba 'Free Press,' three times in the 'Weekly Times' of Battleford, three times in the 'Weekly Phœnix' of Saskatoon, three times in the 'Weekly Advocate' of Prince Albert, and two whole months were allowed for interested parties to go out and explore that limit, although it is only 35 miles in extent and close to Prince Albert and just this side of the limit of which I have just spoken. Well, you can see what happens when a limit is properly advertised and when sufficient time is allowed. There were three bids for that limit: $21,300, $27,609 and $28,000. In other words, that limit sold for $800 a square mile, although the adjacent limit had been sold for $12 per square mile. This Sturgeon lake limit sold for $1.25 per acre, or for $5.50 per thousand feet standing, whereas the other limit sold at $12 per mile, or 2 cents an acre, or half a cent per thousand feet standing. No more iniquitous transaction ever went through the books of the department, and it never would have gone through if it had not been for the motive power behind it.

Mr. BURROWS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. AMES. Yes.

Mr. BURROWS. The hon. gentleman should state that No. 1048 was on the north side of the height of land where there were no rivers flowing through the country and where timber had not got the same value as timber in a well settled area easy of access. If this limit is worth $1,000,000 does any one think that I as a business man would have sold out my interest and got Mr. Fraser to sell out his interest for $80,000.

Mr. AMES. I did not say anything about $1,000,000.

Mr. BURROWS. Be honest about it.

Mr. AMES. You might deal with the other part of the transaction.

Now, I come for a few moments to speak of the Imperial Pulp Company, that same mysterious corporation whose identity we have been trying to discover for three years, which lived in a post office box in Winnipeg, which had no sawmill, no officers so far as we could find except R. R. P., and, when it is dug out in the Public Accounts Committee, the centre of which we find to be Mr. T. A. Burrows. That Imperial Pulp Company has limits on the North Saskatchewan river that are worth at least $750,000. It also has limits which their own agent has put on the market accompanied by a circular saying it was worth $500,000. Not a stick of timber has been cut on any of these limits, and yet the Minister of the Interior knows perfectly well that some of these limits have been held five or six years and nothing has been done to make the people cut on them.

That mysterious corporation the Imperial Pulp Company, which has provoked curiosity and baffled inquiry for more than five years, but which we now learn is controlled by the same Mr. Burrows, first entered the field as a competitive bidder on timber limits in December, 1902. It continued to operate with the department from 1902 to 1904. It never once applied in its own name for a limit. These bids always went in from Mr. A. W. Fraser, or some one of his coterie. Its cheques were usually managers' cheques on the Bank of Ottawa, which could not be identified, and everything the company did was shrouded in the deepest secrecy. But that company never once failed to get the limit it bid for. It only bid nine times, directly or indirectly, and it never once missed. During these two years this company, under diverse names, observing the greatest secrecy, bid upon nine limits. It never asked to have a limit put up, but it never failed to secure a limit upon which it bid. The total of its bids amounted to $54,975, the total of the next highest bidders in the nine cases amounted to $51,771, a difference of only $3,204. In other words this company secured its limits by an average excess bid of but 6 per cent above the next competitor. This mysterious company, that possessed no domicile, whose home was a Winnipeg post office box, whose communications had to pass through an Ottawa lawyer or banker, acquired, for less than $55,000, during these three years, 417 square miles of timber limits that have a value to-day exceeding $1,000,000.

I want to say something of the bids of the Imperial Pulp Company, and I shall do it as rapidly as I can. The first appearance of the Imperial Pulp Company on the records of the department is in reference to timber limit 1031. In the summer of 1902, a local Edmonton syndicate sent an exploration party to examine the timber along the upper waters of the North Saskatchewan river. In conformity with their report, application was made to the department to put up 118 square miles in eleven blocks. The applicants asked that there be no unnecessary delay, as they wished to construct a saw-mill and commence operations at once. In this case the government did not act as rapidly as they sometimes do. It only took them fourteen days to make up their minds about the great Prince Albert area, but they took a couple of months to decide whether they should open this Saskatchewan River section or not. In the meantime they instructed Mr. John Cameron, a homestead inspector, to investigate and send back a correct description of the timber to be found along the river. That was a praiseworthy thing to do and it is what the department should have done in other cases. In this case it had the additional recommendation of enabling the inner circle at Ottawa to know, from a reliable source of information, what timber there was along the river. Finally the department decided to put the berth up to tender.

On November 19, 1902, the notices were issued putting up the entire area for competition as a single proposition. Forty-two days were allowed from the issue of the notice to the date of opening bids. One advertisement appeared in the Edmonton 'Bulletin' about December 1. This gave about four weeks to outsiders to acquire information on which to make competitive offers. That this length of time was wholly insufficient is shown by a letter on file from W. S. Dwinnell, who represents wealthy Minneapolis capitalists and who has also a large interest in the Edmonton Lumber Company. Mr. Dwinnell in his letter says :

I have been endeavouring to secure information which would enable me to act intelligently, but have not had sufficient time to do so. I would ask you to have this sale postponed for thirty or sixty days preferably the latter, to the end that I may complete an examination and make a substantial bid for the property. I am satisfied that the interests of the Dominion government would be subserved thereby, and that a much larger

bid would be received than if the sale took place at this time. This tract comprising, as it does, 118 square miles, is so extensive that the time given under the notice is altogether insufficient to permit any one to make proper examination thereof.

It is the same story disclosed in connection with other transactions 'insufficient time' 'tract too large.' A further letter from Messrs. Crafts & Lee, of Edmonton, asks 'must the tenders be on each block separately or on the whole 'intimating that' if so large an area be put up at one time there were few possessed of sufficient capital to bid upon it. It meant shutting out the small Edmonton manufacturer and granting every advantage to the wealthy Ottawa speculator.

But the department did not postpone the sale as asked by Mr. Dwinnell. Presumably sufficient information was by this time in the possession of those in whose behalf information was desired. The bids were opened on December 31, 1902. They were as follows, omitting several smaller offerings:

a. T. A. Burrows.. .. ..$ 6,057
b. James Ross, on behalf of Edmonton syndicate.. 17,010
c. H. & K. McDonald & Frith.. .. 31,161
d. The Imperial Pulp Company.. 31,575

The tender of the Imperial Pulp Company was a model of brevity. It read:

Toronto, December 29, 1902.

To the Secretary,

Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

Sir,—Inclosed please find tender for timber berth No. 1,031.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) IMPERIAL PULP COMPANY,
Toronto.

That was all.

Mr. BENNETT. It should have been 'yours surely.'

Mr. AMES. There was no amount specified in the letter at all. We find, however, that there were two cheques, when we get the original documents. One was for $17,575 and the other for $14,000. We find that the cheques inclosed were managers' cheques on the Bank of Ottawa, given to Mr. Burrows in exchange for his own deposit. We find that the letter dated Toronto, December 29, was accompanied by cheques dated Ottawa and we assume that the element of union in this business was the same Mr. Burrows. Look at the way those cheques dovetailed in. The cheque which came in with the first tender was for $17,575, which slightly exceeds the bid of James Ross and the Edmonton syndicate. The combined cheques exceed the McDonald tender by a narrow margin. Is it any wonder the question is asked: 'Was this coincidence or design'?

Edmonton advices show that the local syndicate was represented at Ottawa on the day the tenders were opened by Frederick E. Moroney, who brought down the $17,010 Ross cheque. This gentleman told on his return of his experience and impressions. You will find his story, as repeated by Dr. H. L. McInnis, in the Edmonton 'Weekly Journal' of February 28, 1908. After stating that the Edmonton syndicate sent a man to Ottawa with a marked cheque the citation reads:

When the man got there a tender had been submitted by Burrows for $6,610. The man was at the office a few minutes before the tenders were opened. The tender was taken inside and in the meantime a conference took place and a blank cheque signed by Burrows was filled out. . . . This made Burrows' total amount $31,110 and so he got the berth.

The figures may not be quite accurate, but it is plain that, rightly or wrongly, the Edmonton representative believed that his tender was tapped. Certainly the circumstantial evidence in regard to this transaction does not tend to remove that impression.

We will now for a moment examine the circumstances connected with the acquisition of two small berths on the Pembina and Brazeau rivers (1052 and 1058) by this same company. The bids were opened for the berth 1052 on the 11th March, 1903. There were three tenders:

(a.) Grafts & Lee, Edmonton.. .. .. $110
(b.) John Walter, Edmonton.. 125
(c.) Imperial Pulp Co., Winnipeg.. .. 300

The tenders of the first two bidders are on the form of the department, properly filled out, with amounts stated and a single cheque enclosed. The tender of the Imperial Pulp Company is a typewritten letter as follows:

Enclosed please find tender for timber berth No. 1052.

Yours truly,
IMPERIAL PULP CO.
Per R. R. P.

It will be noted that no amount offered as a bonus is stated in the letter and that the marginal note on the original is the only clue as to the denomination of cheque enclosed. The letter is typewritten, the number of the berth filled in afterwards in ink. The cheque was a manager's cheque drawn on the Bank of Ottawa. The identity of the bidder was entirely concealed. It must be admitted that a tender so drafted opens wide the door to collusion and fraud.

The next is berth 1058. In this case the tenders were opened on April 22, 1903. The tenderers were R. B. Ferguson, Edmonton, $310; Crafts & Lee, Edmonton, $350; Imperial Pulp Company, Winnipeg, $500. Ferguson and Crafts & Lee sent their bids in on the regular forms of the department; they stated the

amount and inclosed a single cheque. The Imperial Pulp Company sent in another small typewritten letter :

Box 644, Winnipeg, Manitoba,
April, 18, 1903.

The Secretary, Department of Interior,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Sir,—We hereby inclose for yearly license to cut timber on timber berth 1058 being two and a half square miles on Brazeau river and also inclose cheque for bonus for same.

Yours truly,
The Imperial Pulp Co.,
per R.R.P.

No amount stated, typewritten letter, two cheques again, one for $350 and one for $150. It will be noticed that Crafts & Lee were the principal competitors, that if Burrows had put in only the $350 cheque he would not have got the limit, it was the second cheque of $150, making the total $500, that got him the lease. Again I ask, is that by coincidence or by arrangement ?

I now come to berths 1097 and 1098 on the Brazeau river. These two limits had a combined area of sixty square miles. They were put up on November 11, 1903, after a postponment of one month for which no reason was assigned. The bids for 1097 were John Campbell, $10 ; Aylmer & Featherstonhaugh, $500 ; H. & K. McDonald & Firth, $930; Imperial Pulp Company, $1,000.

The tender of the Imperial Pulp Company is on their own paper and reads as follows:

Winnipeg, Man., Nov. 7, 1903.

The Secretary,
Department of the Interior,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—

Enclosed please find tender for timber berth No. 1097 and bonus for same, $1,000.00.

Yours truly,
THE IMPERIAL PULP CO.
(Sgd.) R. R. Pattinson.

The letter is typewritten but the amount $1,000 is written in with pen, apparently at a time subsequent to the writing of the letter, the signature is made by a rubber stamp. From the endorsement on the original we learn that the $1,000 was in cash.

For berth No. 1098 there were three bidders:

a. Aylen & Featherstonhaugh, Fort Saskatchewan.. .. .. $ 300
b. H. and K. MacDonald & Frith, Ottawa.. 1,860
c. The Imperial Pulp Company.. .. 2,500

The tender of the Imperial Pulp Company reads as follows:

The Imperial Pulp Co., Limited,
Winnipeg, Man., Nov. 7, 1903.

The Secretary,
Department of the Interioir,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—

Enclosed please find tender for timber berth No. 1098 and bonus for same, $2,500.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) THE IMPERIAL PULP CO.
Per R. R. Pattinson.

Here again the body of the letter is typewritten, the figures setting forth the amount offered as bonus are written in ink and the signature is stamped. The marginal note on the original shows that $2,500 in cash accompanied the bid. These two tenders of the Imperial Pulp Company (1097 and 1098) are so drawn as to render collusion and fraud possible—were such action intended. It would not have been a difficult matter to have filled in the amounts and to have added the requisite cash after the offerings by the other bidders were known.

Berths 1118 and 1119 on the North Saskatchewan river and West Sheep creek have a combined area of 120 square miles. They are of great value, bearing magnificent timber, worth $150,000 or more. The Burrows interest applied in the fall of 1903. The advertisement was issued on December 10, once in the Manitoba 'Free Press' and once in the 'Albertan' and the 'Tribune' of Calgary. But any one will tell you that this district is tributary to Edmonton, it is up the river from Edmonton and the two advertisements issued in Calgary would not reach any Edmonton man who wanted to tender; there was not a shred of an advertisement in any Edmonton paper. Forty days were allowed from Ottawa to Ottawa leaving four weeks net to explore. Even if an Edmonton man had been tendering he would have had to go 150 miles up the river from Edmonton or seventy miles across the hills from Red Deer to get to the limit. It was impossible for him to explore it. As might be expected, when the day arrived there were no tenders except those from the Burrows interest. It would not do to have it go abroad that there was no competition, so A. W. Fraser was instructed to prepare two bids, one in the name of T. A. Burrows and the other in the name of W. H. Nolan, the deposit in each case being in cash. Nolan was awarded the limit and immediately transferred it to the Imperial Pulp Company. Although the Imperial Pulp Company were the owners of this limit within a few hours of its being awarded to Nolan, the fallacy was kept up in the books of the department for years that Nolan was the owner of that limit.

These two limits cost the Imperial Pulp Company $1,100 and their value must be in the neighbourhood of $100,000 or $150,000. At all events the limits went for $9 per square mile or about one and a half cents per acre, and these are valuable limits at the headwaters of the Saskatchewan.

I wish to refer to one more limit, No. 1122. The award of this limit was accompanied by every objectionable feature which appears in the case of practically every other limit to which I have referred. The applications were called for on November 27, 1903. They covered seven widely separated tracts amounting to 110 square miles, on the McLeod and Pembina rivers. When this was applied for the department acted immediately. The advertisement was issued on December 15, and the bids were to be received by January 22, 1904; that was forty-three days Ottawa to Ottawa, or four weeks net for any one in Edmonton to explore the limits. If you plot out on the map these tracts which were put up at that time for competition, it will be seen that a man would have to travel 450 miles from Edmonton to simply make a tour of the limits without any examination, and as this would have to be done in the dead of winter it was utterly impossible to explore the limits and put in an adequate bid. The country cannot fail to conceive that it was never intended or expected that anybody but men with advance knowledge would bid on that limit. The whole thing was a lottery as far as any one else was concerned. There were four tenders, McDonald & Frith $1,220; J. B. Lamont, $4,000; Kenneth H. McLeod, Edmonton, $10,025, and A. W. Fraser, (the Imperial Pulp Company) $11,000. The McLeod tender was doubtless put in by Edmonton people who knew more about the limit than any other group, but the offer of the Imperial Pulp Company was $11,000 which just cleared the jump. If you examine the original tenders of the Imperial Pulp Company what do you find? The offer consisted of a letter written by A. W. Fraser in his own hand, and signed by him. From the marginal notes it appears there were two cheques, one for $5,000 and one for $6,000. The letter was written at the instance of T. A. Burrows and it was handed to him unsealed and the cheques that accompanied it were those that he supplied. That is the evidence of A. W. Fraser. The Finnie evidence was that there were two managers' cheques that were issued by him in exchange for cheques given by Burrows and that the $5,000 cheque was the first. Look at the facts. J. B. Lamont offers $4,000; Kenneth H. McLeod, $10,025. Then on behalf of the Imperial Pulp Company you have one cheque for $5,000 and another cheque for $6,000 and with these two together the limit goes to the Imperial Pulp Company. I ask if that dovetailing does not indicate that there is design and that this is not merely coincidence. This limit was transferred by Fraser to the Imperial Pulp Company the very next day and it is now found to be covered with dense spruce which is valuable for railway ties and much of the timber on it will be sold to railways now going through that country. Look at the file and you will find hundreds of settlers protests against this concession. In fact after four years the government was forced to abandon one of these tracts because the settlers of the whole country rose in arms against having a lawyer in Ottawa keep them out of their own supply of building material.

To recapitulate, the Imperial Pulp Company have nine limits and you will find about every one of them something which is suspicious and which cannot but call for an investigation. As to 1031 I have spoken of the absence of amounts and in the cases of 1052 and 1058 no amounts are stated. 1097 and 1098 were accompanied by cash; 1118 and 1119 give evidence of friendly competition between Nolan and Burrows both representing the Imperial Pulp Company. In the case of 1122, it is perfectly impossible that there should have been any competition. So it is with all the Edmonton reserves for 150 miles around that city, to the value of $750,000. All these limits have been secured by this company which will hold its limits or sell them wholesale or perhaps retail but in any event they stand to make a very large amount.

I have brought to the attention of the House the unique method of tender they followed. The advertisement in the case of each one of these applications quotes the regulations under which a license will be issued and also states that a printed form of tender may be obtained at the land office or from the department. The department indicates to any one who wants to tender that there are regular printed forms and the natural inference is that they expect any on tendering to use those forms. The form of tender is:

> Sir,—I hereby offer a bonus of dollars for a timber berth of square miles selected, for which berth public competition is being invited, and I inclose an accepted cheque on the bank of for dollars, being the amount of said bonus
>
> I undertake to comply with all the conditions of the Timber Regulations.
>
> I have the honour to be, sir,
> Your obedient servant,
>
> The Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

That is the printed form used in 75 per cent of the cases. It is a form the department furnishes to the ordinary man who makes an application. It states in two places the amount and the bank on which the cheque is drawn. If that form were used in every case, there could be no such

hocus pocus as that in the case of the limits secured by the Imperial Pulp Company.

Mr. Speaker, at the recent meeting of the Canadian Forestry Association in Montreal, a very significant remark was made by Dr. Fernow. He said, 'The forests are the capital of the future not the spoils of the present.' I wish that this remark had been uttered about five years ago and had sunk deep into the minds of those who have the control of our western timber areas. To-day, half the timber areas in these three provinces are in speculators' hands, and for these areas the country has received a mere bagatelle. These forest areas are worth from three to five millions at a fair computation. There was no necessity for the government to put them up for sale at the time they did. There was no possible excuse for disposing of the outlaying areas. One-quarter of the area would have been sufficient, if those portions had been chosen within the range of transportation facilities, to supply the needs of the three provinces. The other three-quarters should have been held by the government until they became valuable, and the increase in the value should have belonged to the people and not have been given to the speculators for a mere song. So, I feel that a great opportunity has been lost; it has been lost in order that certain gentlemen, close to the government, might become millionaires. And to this end our three new provinces have been despoiled. The day will come when there will be handed over to these provinces the ragged remnants of the lands that should have been theirs long ago. But, before that is done, practically all the timber of value will have been given away. These are the assets that these provinces should have in order to develop themselves and carry on their internal affairs. A short time ago, the provincial treasurer of Ontario brought down his budget, showing that province had derived a revenue of $1,800,000 for the year from a judicious use of their timber supply. And we are not far behind in the province of Quebec. Hon. Mr. Weir, in his report, shows that $1,000,000 a year is received by the province of Quebec from its timber resources.

Yet you propose to shear the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan of practically all their assets to give them into the hands of speculators.

Mr. Speaker, the circumstances connected with the tenders we have examined and which I have endeavoured to review before the House lead, to my mind, to one inevitable conclusion, and that is that there has been either fraud or imposition practised in obtaining some of these limits. That belief is general throughout the west. If it is well founded, what is the logical conclusion of the matter? It is that the country has been robbed and that certain persons to-day are in possession of stolen goods, goods that should be restored to the people of Canada. Out in the constituency of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) they probably have read the evidence given in the Public Accounts Committee including the hon. member's valuable testimony, which, I am sure, will be all the more appreciated after what has been said on the floor of the House to-day. We find the farmers there gathering together and moving a resolution, not that there ought to be an investigation—they have got beyond that—but that the timber and coal and other lands which have been unjustly taken away from the people should be restored.

Take up the report of your Civil Service Royal Commission, and turn to what it says concerning the Department of the Interior. The commissioners say that they had not time to investigate that department:

> The commissioners regret extremely that with the short time at their disposal they were unable to visit the Northwest, much as they desired to see how the land, and more specially, the timber sales are affected.

The most cursory investigation of the Department of the Interior persuaded the commission that there was need to investigate the way the timber areas had been disposed of. A little while ago we had complaints brought before the government of my province showing that there was fraud in connection with the timber in the township of Boyer, that fake homesteading had been going on by speculators who took this means of securing the timber fraudulently. And what did they do in that good old province of Quebec? They held an investigation; they found 88 cases in which the timber had been acquired through fraud, and they cancelled every one of those leases, so that the timber came back to the Crown. We have an equally good reason to demand an investigation here and now. I would ask the Prime Minister to give an inquiry by an independent outside judicial authority into this whole question of the alienation of the timber of the Northwest, to ascertain whether these allegations are true or not. And if that were done, and if what I believe to be true were found to be true, I think the government would be right in taking back at least a million dollars' worth of timber and placing it once more at the command of the public.

Mr. T. A. BURROWS (Dauphin). Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to follow all the insinuations which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) has cast upon me, and upon the gentleman who opened these tenders, and upon the government for their management of the country's timber resources. The hon. gentleman was so voluble that speaking only from memory and immediately following him, I may not be able to deal with all that he has said. If I do not reply to all the remarks he has made, it will only be because some of them have escaped my memory.

I will first refer to the timber limits which I secured myself and to which the hon. gentleman referred. The hon. gentleman's criticism is very unfair; if parliamentary rules will allow me to use the word, I would say it was very mean because it was so unfair. He referred particularly to two limits I secured and tried to cast a reflection upon myself, and tried to misrepresent the conditions regarding these limits. Take, for instance, timber berth No. 1046 He said that in this case he tried to find out from the bank manager certain facts in regard to the cheque put in. And he insinuated—if the English language means anything, this is what he meant—that I was here in Ottawa and found what the competing tenders were and went to the bank to get a cheque covering a larger amount than the amount of the highest tender. When the matter came up in the Public Accounts Committee, the hon. gentleman made inquiry of the bank manager to see if he had the cheques. The manager said that he had not the cheques, that if he ever had them they were mine and must have been returned to me. The record shows that it was a Bank of Ottawa cheque that was put in. It was a cheque marked Winnipeg.

Now with regard to that matter, I will add what the hon. gentleman left out. He was very free in making insinuations, insinuations which he had no ground for making. But when it came down to making a clear representation of the facts, the hon. gentleman had not honour enough to do so. Now take berth 1046. Here is the copy of the application, and here is the original cheque. He could have got them from me in the Public Accounts Committee, but for some reason known to himself, he was afraid to put me into the witness box, he was afraid to let me show my side of the case. I was there, and the chairman of the committee said to him: If you want to find out about these cheques here is Mr. Burrows, put him in the box and he will produce his own cheques. The hon. gentleman was too mean, I will use that word——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BURROWS. I will say unfair then.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was the hon. gentleman in the Public Accounts Committee himself at the time he speaks of?

Mr. BURROWS. I was.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then why didn't he take the stand and give his evidence if he wanted to?

Mr. BURROWS. The member for St. Antoine went out of his way to subpoena everybody, and Mr. Macdonald asked him to subpoena me if he wanted to get this information, and he would not do it.

Mr. LANCASTER. You were there, and you didn't need a subpoena.

Mr. BURROWS. Now with regard to this timber berth 1046, I will read the application, and I defy the hon. gentleman to point out anything wrong with it. In putting in applications for timber, the hon. gentleman knows as well as anybody that in many cases the regular form is not used, lumbermen very seldom have the printed form, and the department do not exact the use of a printed form. But in this case I used the printed form, and I will read it. The tenders were opened on March 7, 1903. Here is my tender, dated Winnipeg, March 3, 1903:

I hereby offer a bonus of three thousand five hundred dollars for a timber berth No. 1046, containing forty square miles situated near the Pembina river for which public competition is being invited, and I inclose accepted cheques on the band of Ottawa for $3,500, being the amount of said bonus. I undertake to comply with all the conditions of the timber regulations.

I inclosed two accepted cheques on the Bank of Ottawa, and both cheques were marked good by the Bank of Ottawa in the city of Winnipeg. Both were dated on the same day, that is 46 days previous to the opening of the tenders. The application was in proper form, it specified the total amount of the tender, and the cheques were inclosed and sent to Winnipeg. I think that is clear enough.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why did you make two cheques instead of one?

Mr. BURROWS. The hon. gentleman was in the Public Accounts Committee when that matter was investigated, and he heard what the solicitor said with regard to it. In putting in tenders, lumbermen well know that the amount of a tender often becomes known. A competing tenderer could go to the bank and ask for the amount of my cheque. If the amount is known, and if there is a competing tenderer who wants to get a cheque at the same time, it is possible that one man may find out what another man's tender is.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. And none of the rest of the tenderers know anything else about that?

Mr. BURROWS. They do, that is just where the hon. gentleman is wrong. I will give him an instance. Mr. Fraser has acted for myself in regard to timber matters, he has acted in regard to the Red Deer Lumber Company, and he has acted for himself and his friends, because he is interested in the timber business. He was asked to say why more than one cheque was put in the tender, and here is what he said:

It is a pretty hard question, except in a general way. I have known clients who had an idea that by varying the cheques, by taking them from different banks and putting different amounts in, it would prevent the amount of their tender leaking out. They

have an idea, rightly or wrongly, that in getting cheques marked in the bank it might leark out what the amount of their cheque was.

Q. Leak out from where, from the bank?—A. From the bank. I have had cases where clients have sent cheques through the bank to me to put in with their tender, and have come along themselves and supplemented that cheque and asked me to put in an additional amount beyond what they had sent through the bank to inclose with their tender. As to their motives or reasons for doing so, I am not here to say so far as my practice goes that has not been confined to one individual, it has been adopted time and again by different clients.

Now that is quite understandable. The hon. gentleman who interrupted me asked me if anybody else did it. I will give him a little information in regard to some parties whom probably he knows. It is in regard to timber berth 1275, which was put up for public tender. W. Anderson, of Ottawa, manager for J. R. Booth, tendered one cheque of $15,050; and H. Finger, of Port Arthur, tendered $15,000, and inclosed cheques for $10,000, $2,000, $1,000, $1,000 and $1,000 making $15,000 in all. Now this circumstance proves two things; it proves that it is the practice of lumbermen to put in more than one cheque; it also proves that tenders are often very close to each other. In this case there was only $50 between the two tenders, although they were for the large amounts of $15,000. I am sure that if I had been the successful tenderer, the hon. member for St. Antoine would have been examining the tenders with a microscope, and he would have insinuated on the floor of the House that I had been doing something wrong.

Mr. AMES. If there were twenty cases like that, I would.

Mr. BURROWS. Here is another case. Take timber berth 360, that was old berth No. 208 on the Columbia river, B.C. Two tenders were put in very close to each other. One was by M. A. Anderson, manager of the Imperial Bank, on behalf of the Columbia River Lumber Company, for $20,611. The competing tender was put in by a firm of Ottawa barristers, Wyld & Osler, who I understand are Conservatives. They tendered on behalf of Messrs. Doherty, Bennis, Bird and Newton, of Bradford, Pennsylvania, and sent in two cheques, one on the Ontario Bank for $13,000, and one of the Molsons Bank for $7,566, making $20,566.65, or only $44.35 higher than the unsuccessful tenderer. This instance also proves that it is possible for two tenders to be very close together. I do not wish to insinuate that there was anything wrong in this case, far from it; but it proves what I have said, that even large tenders are sometimes remarkably close together. This case also proves that the firm of Wyld & Osler, in the city of Ottawa, apparently knew how to conduct their business. They not only put in two cheques, but they were not satisfied with one bank, and they put in one cheque on the Ontario Bank and another on the Molsons Bank.

I am referring to this point to show that it is a practice that is knwon to public men and governments. It is a practice among lumbermen and apparently it is a practice amongst lawyers. The hon. gentleman made some insinuating remarks about the fact that tenders were put in in other people's names, but he, himself, before he sat down, told us of the instances in which McDonald Bros., of the city of Ottawa, put in a tender for berth No. 1108 in the name of James Currie. It is quite a common occurrence and I do not know that it suggests any idea of wrong-doing. Here is another instance. Timber berth No. 1388 was put up during last year. There were various tenders put in, I think, five tenders altogether. I know something about this berth myself, because it was applied for by a gentleman who was my competitor in the lumbering business in Dauphin, Mr. Shaw. There was also a competitor in another gentleman who resides in the same district. Mr. Shaw tendered, in his own name, $430 and tendered, in the name of a broker in Ottawa, $6,300. Why did he do that? He aparently first put in a small tender in order that if anybody found out the amount of his cheque he would not find out the amount of his actual tender and then he came down to Ottawa and got a broker to put in another tender in the broker's name. I am not making any insinuation against Mr. Shaw. He just did what lumbermen do in a case of that kind.

An hon. MEMBER. Where does he live?

Mr. BURROWS. He lives in Dauphin and he is a good Conservative. He is a most respectable citizen and I am casting no reflection upon him at all. He did what I probably would have done myself. There were three cheques inclosed in one of the tenders in that case. Take another instance, berth 333 situated in British Columbia. There were a great many tenders for that limit. I believe it was a valuable limit. It was situated on the Arrow lakes and it contained large British Columbia timber. One of the competing tenders amounted to $25,225, made up of cheques for $10,575, $7,650, $4,000 and $3,000.

Mr. BRISTOL. Will the hon. gentleman tell me where he got all his information from and whether these are all the cases that have occurred in the department?

Mr. BURROWS. These are all the cases that have occurred in the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are these original files?

Mr. BURROWS. They are extracts from the original files. In regard to three of these cases I have personal knowledge my-

self. I referred a moment ago to my putting in a tender for berth No. 1046. I pointed out that the application was regular according to the criticism of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, that the application was on the printed form, that it specified the amount of the tender, the cheques were made out and marked good four days before the time for opening the tenders, and if the hon. gentleman wants to see them I will show him the cheques now. He could have seen them in the Public Accounts Committee if he had asked me or if he had put me into the box. In regard to berth No. 1047, I made application in that case. The tender is dated Winnipeg, March 3, 1903, and it is written on the printed form prescribed by the department as follows :

Winnipeg, March 3, 1903.

Sir,—I hereby offer a bonus of fifteen thousand dollars for a timber berth No. 1047, containing fifty square miles, situated near Red Deer lake and Arnut river for which public competition is being invited, and I inclose an accepted cheques on the Bank of Ottawa, for fifteen thousand dollars being the amount of said bonus.

This application read 'an accepted cheque.' I did not strike out the 'an,' but I put in an 's' at the end of 'cheque.' The hon. gentleman tried to make a point out of that.

I undertake to comply with all the conditions of the timber regulations.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
THEO. A. BURROWS.

To the Secretary,
Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

I inclosed three cheques. The tender was dated March 3, 1903. The cheques are dated March 3, 1903.

Winnipeg Manitoba, March 3, 1903.

The Bank of Ottawa, Winnipeg.

Pay to deputy Minister of Interior or order, $5,000. Five thousand dollars.
(Sgd.) THEO. A. BURROWS.

This cheque is marked 'good' on March 4, 1903. The next cheque is in the same form, drawn on the same day and also marked good on March 4, 1903, and the third is the same. There are the three original cheques The hon. gentleman can see them; they were marked good at the time I say and they have the endorsement on the back of them of a gentleman in the Department of the Interior who acted for the deputy minister—Mr. T. G. Rothwell. The tenders were opened on March 7, 1903, and the cheques were dated March 3, 1903, and marked good March 4, 1903, in the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would the hon. gentleman tell me if these cheques were all drawn on the same bank?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. And accepted on the same day?

Mr. BURROWS. Accepted on the same day.

Mr. LANCASTER. How would the hon. gentleman disguise the amount if he were afraid of a bank clerk telling on him?

Mr. BURROWS. As far as that is concerned there were three or four tenders put in on the same day.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understand that his reason for giving more than one cheque was that the bank clerks could not see what was the total amount.

Mr. BURROWS. I was tendering on more than one item that day.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understand that the cheques were all on the same bank and that they were tendered the same day ; how is it that the bank clerk would not know the total amount because it would be a matter of simple addition ?

Mr. BURROWS. There were several tenders put in at the same time. I was tendering on various limits at the same time. These two applications that I have read are dated the same day, March 3, and the tenders were opened on the same day, March 7.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) also spoke about berth No. 1099. I have also the application here. It is not on the printed form. Tenders were opened on November 11, 1903, and the application was made in Ottawa on November 11, 1903. It reads as follows :—

The Secretary, Department of Interior,
Ottawa.

Sir,—Inclosed please find tender for timber berth No. 1099, containing forty-four square miles on the Athabasca river and bonus for same amounting to six thousand five hundred dollars.

(Sgd.) THEO. A. BURROWS.

Inclosed two cheques for $3,500 and $3,000.

My tender in that case was $6,500 and the next highest was $5,116. My hon. friend tried to insinuate that there was collusion between myself and some gentleman in the Department of the Interior. If there was collusion between myself and some gentleman in the Department of the Interior by virtue of which I was able to find out what was the next highest tender, is it reasonable to assume that I would throw away $1,400 when I could have secured the limit by tendering $50 or $100 higher than the other tenderer ?

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

House in committee on Bill (No. 151) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Crawford.

Mr. LENNOX. When we last discussed this Bill in committee I moved an amendment. Although we have an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to take over, at the end of fifty years, branch lines which they may construct in connection with the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway, we have no such agreement with this, the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company. This latter company is identical in interest with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, but it is a distinct corporation and our agreements with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will not bind this company. I have framed my amendment somewhat differently from the provision of the contract of 1904 between the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the government in that I provide that the government shall have at the end of the fifty year period the right to take over all the branch lines and not such only as the company do not desire to retain. It would I believe be unfair for the country to be compelled to take the refuse lines and to leave in the hands of this company those branch lines which were profitable. If at the end of fifty years the government sees fit to resume possession of this national highway and to operate it, we certainly should have control of the important feeders which by that time will probably be constructed. If there is any doubt as to this company being the same practically as the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, that doubt will be removed by a reference to the first clause of the Bill which provides that Charles M. Hays, Frank W. Morse, Wm. Wainwright, W. H. Biggar and Darcy Tate, of Montreal, and others be incorporated under the name of the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company. These gentlemen are identified with the interests of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. There is no objection to these three companies having separate names so long as they are not enabled by that fact to evade their responsibilities to the country. I retire from the discussion of this matter for the time being in order that the House may have at once the advantage of hearing the opinion of the government on this question and that the Minister of Railways may state the attitude which the government takes. I hope the technical objection taken by the Minister of Public Works the other night does not mean that the government is hostile to the amendment I have taken considerable pains to draft and which I have at some inconvenience to myself attended here to support on several occasions. I may say for the benefit of those who were not in the House the other night that I have added to the amendment a provision safeguarding the people's rights by providing that any government which may happen to be in power when the fifty year period runs out shall not act without the consent of the people, and that parliament must give its approval before we avail ourselves of this option. I trust the Minister of Railways will give the amendment his friendly support and hearty endorsation.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a pleasure to hear the hon. gentleman speak so hopefuly. The whole Grand Trunk Pacific project is a question of national importance and so this amendment is of more than ordinary interest. The amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) has something to commend it. He tells us that this branch line company while not the same in name is yet the same in interest as the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. That being the case I presumed that if we treated this company in identically the same way as we treated the Grand Trunk Pacific in making the agreement with them as amended in 1904, no real objection could be made. That matter was threshed out at great length at that time as hon. members will remember. I had not then the honour of having a seat in the House, but I read with a good deal of interest the discussion of this very question of the right to take over branch lines in the transcontinental section of the railway. As I said a moment ago, granted, that the interests are the same in the Grand Trunk Branch Lines Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, I am not sure that this is correct, but for the moment we will grant that it is, legally it is another company and stands on another footing—but taking the statement of my hon. friend I again ask the committee to consider whether if we place this company in the same position as the Grand Trunk Pacific was placed in regard to taking over branch lines, we have not performed our duty to the public. The hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) the other night in discussing this asked me if I would be content to amend this Bill so as to confirm with the Act passed in 1904. That is a matter that I have had under consideration. I realize at once that the interests of the people ought to be safeguarded in these branch lines and I would not for a moment allow the Grand Trunk Branch Lines Company under the guise of getting a new charter for a new company to get away from provisions which the same people contracted for under the old arrange-

ment. I think we could not fairly do that If we went further than that I thought we would be going too far in placing this company in a position inferior to that in which we placed the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. The position as described by my hon. friend is this: In the agreement of 1904, the government took power to take over all the branch lines of the company at the end of the fifty-year period; if they concluded to take over the management of the road they took the power to take over such branches as the company did not elect to keep. That decision was arrived at after a full discussion in this House, and it was the decision of the committee that that was a fair proposition and so it went on the statute-book. It is hardly fair to say that in doing that we merely take over the refuse and leave the company only the paying roads. Superficially it looks as if that might be true, but as a matter of fact it is not. Roads can be profitable as branch lines that could not be profitable if made independent lines. The Act really and practically will work out in this way that at the conclusion of the fifty-year period if the government decides to take over the management of the Transcontinental they will take over such branch lines, as the company does not elect to keep. What does that mean? There may be some of these branches that will pay independently of the trunk line altogether, that is lines which as main lines will be paying propositions. If the company has a few of these I do not think it would be fair to the company to take over from them lines which they can operate independently on a paying basis. The other lines are not the refuse but they may be lines that in conjunction with the trunk line will pay as feeders to the trunk line, but which if left as independent lines will not pay. That distinction was made in this House in 1904. Without entering into a full discussion of that matter I may say that after considering the matter I have decided that it will be fair to all parties and will be a sufficient protection to the public to take the judgment of the House in 1904 and place the Grand Trunk Branch Lines Company in exactly the same position as the Grand Trunk Pacific would have been in, had this company not been formed in reference to branch lines; in other words to place the new company in exactly the same position as the Grand Trunk Pacific Company was placed in by the agreement of 1904. I shall read the amendment I propose which is identical with section 11 of the amended contract of 1904. The amendment is as follows:

In case the government as defined in the schedule to the National Transcontinental Railway Act, 1903, in pursuance of the terms of the said schedule, shall at any time determine to undertake the operation of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, the government shall take over such of the lines of railway running from a point or points in the eastern division authorized by chapter 99 of the Acts of this parliament of 1906 as the company may elect not to retain, at such value as may be agreed upon between the government and the company, or as may in case of failure so to agree, be determined in manner provided by paragraph 24 (2) of the agreement between the Government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, dated 29th July, 1903, forming schedule to chapter 71 of the statutes of 1903. If any such branch line or lines shall have received any grant or grants under the provisions of any Act of the parliament of Canada the amount of such grant or grants without interest shall be deducted from such value and the difference only shall be payable by the government upon the taking over of such branch line or lines. Provided, however, that nothing in this Act contained shall authorize the government to take over the said lines of railway or any of them without the consent of parliament previously obtained to the exercise of such right of taking over as aforesaid.

That means that on any lines taken over the government shall deduct from the price to be paid to the company under the arbitration any amounts that may have been given in subsidy to these lines. I submit that this is fair. It places this company in the position in which the parliament of Canada placed the Grand Trunk Pacific in 1904. As my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) has moved his amendment I would move this as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. I will support the amendment for the same reason that I opposed the amendment to the original proposition in 1904. I always regarded it as an unwise proposition from a business standpoint if we were to take over any part of the road to take over only such parts as the company elected to give up, allowing them to keep such portions as they found desirable to keep. Under such a proposition the most natural thing would be for the company to retain the paying portions and hand over the rest to the government. We have an example in some parts of the Intercolonial. Some parts of that never paid expenses, although others yield a profit from year to year. But because these roads were connected with the Intercolonial it was contended by the maritime province people that since we owned the main line we should take over the branch lines as well. And what has been the result? It is that these parts of the road have not paid and are not likely to pay for a long time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What branches are they?

Mr. SPROULE. I could not name them off-hand, but I have looked into the matter and am quite sure that my statement is

correct. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) knows that it is substantially correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was under the impression the Intercolonial did not purchase the branch lines.

Mr. SPROULE. Did it not purchase the Prince Edward Island Railway and some branches connected with it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That road was built as a government work.

Mr. SPROULE. But there are some branches connected with it, and did not we——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only branch that the Intercolonial has bought in the maritime provinces, so far as I am aware, is the Canada Eastern, and I am told that it is a line that pays very well.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the Gibson line?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It was not paying before we took it over.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But I am told it pays well to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. After very heavy expenditure. It certainly was not a paying line for years before we took it over, and it was not expected to pay the Intercolonial. Take any railway system you like—any such system as the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern, and if a proposition were made to buy them would it be regarded as wise to purchase only those portions of the road the company desired to give up and allow them to retain the other portions? We held that the principle was wrong and unsound when it was carried through before. It was carried through against the will of a large number of the members of this House, carried through by the force of the government majority. The mere fact that such a thing was carried at one time, it seems to me, does not justify the argument of the Minister of Railways and Canals that we must adopt it in connection with this Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company because we put a similar clause in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill. I imagine that there will be a connecting link between the main line and the city of Montreal and that will probably be a paying line. It is likely that there will be another such link with the city of Toronto. These lines connecting with metropolitan centres will probably pay well. These would not be the lines the company would wish to give up. If the government took over the line without these branches, having no feeders from the great cities, they would find the line in a condition of starvation for many years until, at heavy expense, they had completed these links between the great cities and the main line. This is a bad proposition from the point of view of sound business principles. It is a bad proposition from the point of view of the government. In my judgment, the country will not endorse it. The proposition made by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is a good one, and I am heartily in accord with it. I believe that a government that fails to accept this proposition will be regarded as one that is not doing its duty and is not maintaining the interest of the public.

Mr. HAGGART. The objection to the proposition of the Minister of Railways and Canals is the same as was urged in the case of taking over the branch lines of the Transcontinental. The bargain is that the government may after fifty years take over that line, but also, if it does so, it must take over any lines that the railway company may elect to give. That is, the company can compel the government to take over non-paying lines that are worth very little. The Minister of Railways is adding something to this Bill which the House does not want and did not mean to adopt. And to add this amendment to a private Bill is certainly a strange and unusual procedure. What is the object of adding this to the Bill? There is some sense in the amendment of my hon. friend from South Simcoe, for he gives the government the option to take over whatever lines it chooses if parliament consents to the transfer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to point out to my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that the amendment proposed by the hon member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) does not make it necessary for the government in case it exercises the option, to take over all the branches, but it allows the government to take over just such branches as it pleases. The result would be that the government could pick out all the paying lines when it took the main line, and leave the company with the non-paying branches. That would be most unjust.

Mr. HAGGART. But what about the others where the company had the option to say that the government must take them over?

Mr. LANCASTER. I cannot see why the Minister of Public Works should be so afraid of the government doing what it ought to do in the interest of the country against the Grand Trunk Pacific. This is another instance of the kind of legislation which this company gets through this parliament. Everybody representing the government is afraid that they won't give the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific everything that it is possible to give them. Two years ago when this proposition was up in regard to these branch lines, I made a strong opposition, and moved the six months' hoist of the Bill, because the gov-

ernment, represented by the present Minister of Justice, insisted upon putting the Bill through without any precaution being adopted to protect the public interest. Having failed to get the government to adopt any reasonable amendment to protect the people of this country, I had the temerity to move that the Bill be not then read the third time. Some of the objections I urged then are urged again to-day by the hon. member for Simcoe with regard to this measure, and I think very properly urged. I realize that no words of mine will stay the hand of this government in continuing every session to give to the Grand Trunk Pacific everything they want. The Minister of Public Works has indicated that the government is afraid that they will be unjust to the Grand Trunk Pacific. I must say with all courtesy to the present Minister of Public Works that I think he would be better employed in looking a little more carefully after the public interest as against the railway, instead of looking after the railway as against the public. These branch lines are something that never was contemplated in 1903 when the main contract was made. We thought then we were making a bargain with a concern which would keep its assets in its own name; we did not suppose that we were making an arrangement with a concern which would come to this parliament and ask for the privilege of doing a large part of their business in the name of another concern and thereby escape the liabilities of the original company. This Branch Lines Act which was passed in 1906, is still open to the objection that they are allowed, by doing business in the name of another company called the Branch Lines Company, to escape the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the people of Canada under the original contract which was made with that company in 1903, and confirmed again in 1904. The measure now before the House is a continuance or furtherance of an effort to give to this company every possible advantage that it can desire, and at the expense of the people of this country, I say this advisedly. They come to-day and ask for an extension of time, a privilege which they did not tell us in 1906 they would want. And when it is proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe to put in an amendment to the Bill that would give some slight measure of protection to the people by allowing them to take over the lines which the company may or may not build, I cannot understand how anybody wishing to protect the public interest can hesitate to vote for that amendment. It is only a slight measure or protection, but it is a measure that ought to be given. Speaking for myself alone, I would not be inclined to pass this Bill at all. As it is I do not think the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company has made out a case for the extension of time they are asking for all the lines. But if the measure is going through, at least it ought to contain an amendment which if not worded exactly like the amendment of my hon. friend, would at least contain a provision that this country shall not be at the mercy of the Grand Trunk Pacific as to what lines the company may choose to force this country to pay for. We are assisting this company, we are practically financing their concern, and if we buy this railway we have a right to buy it without being compelled to include all the branch lines which the company may choose to ask us to buy. Simply because they are the Grand Trunk Pacific Company is no reason why we should give them everything they want, as we did this session when we allowed them to take the most beautiful part of the people's park for the purpose of building a hotel.

Mr. BLAIN. I deem it my duty to support the amendment of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). I have before me the amendment moved by my hon. friend and also the amendment to the amendment moved by the Minister of Railways. I do not wish to weary the committee by reading them both, but will just select the important point out of each. The resolution of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) contains this paragraph :

> The government shall thereupon and thereafter have the right to take over any of the lines of railway authorized by chapter 99 of the Acts of this parliament, 1906, as are connected with that line and with any point or points on such eastern division, at such value as may be agreed upon between the government and the company.

The amendment to the amendment reads:

> The government shall take over such line or lines of railway running from a point or points in the eastern division authorized by chapter 99 of the Acts of this parliament, 1906, which such company may elect not to retain.

I prefer the amendment moved by my hon. friend from South Simcoe because it leaves to the discretion of the parliament of Canada what line or lines we shall take. If the Grand Trunk Pacific had on the floor of this House a special representative, that representative could not submit a resolution stronger in the interests of that company than the one proposed by the Minister of Railways. His amendment is strictly in the interests of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I am sure Canadian people will be surprised that my hon. friend would come forward with a resolution directly in the interests of that company. Surely my hon. friend has forgotten the promises he made to protect the interests of the people. I do not wish to weary the committee by going over the reasons which have been so fully given by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and my hon. friend from

East Grey (Mr. Sproule), but I do say that, in my opinion, it is in the interests of the people that we should adopt the amendment moved by my hon. friend from South Simcoe. Looking into the future I am sure that the people who will then have to deal with this matter will be surprised that a Minister of Railways should have felt it his duty to move a resolution directly in the interests of the Grand Trunk Pacific and against the interests of the Canadian people.

Mr. LENNOX. It is my duty to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, who has been at the trouble of drafting this amendment, that I should say a word or two to explain why I cannot agree with his suggestion. Whilst I am perfectly willing to accord to the Grand Trunk Pacific everything they have a right to, I am not willing to concede to them a discretion which is antagonistic to the rights of the people. The Minister of Public Works suggests that it is not equitable that we should take the right to select certain railway lines without taking over certain other lines constructed by this company. I would venture to submit that there is nothing in that contention. We are building, for the convenience and advantage to a large extent of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway, which is the difficult end of the proposition. And we are chartering some of these branch lines long in advance of the necessities of the country. We are giving that company a blanket charter to construct such branch lines as they may see fit. Having come to us two years ago to obtain a charter, we are disposed to renew it, but only upon fair and equitable terms. The minister says it would be unfair that we should take over a portion of these branch lines and not all of them. Why so? During a period of fifty years, the railway company may see fit to construct log lines, and these log lines, during the twenty-five or thirty years they may be in operation, may give an adequate return for the capital invested in them and at the end of that period they may not be worth one dollar to the company. The company may construct a line into a mining camp and the mine may become exhausted, and at the end of the fifty year period the line, which may have paid for itself over and over again, may not be worth anything to the company or the people. But the Minister of Public Works, for whose astuteness I have the greatest respect, suggests that it would be eminently fair that we should be compelled to take over such a line and operate it. I do not think so. On the other hand, the Minister of Railways suggests that we should re-enact section 11. I am afraid that would be worse than a blunder. See what section 11 of the schedule to the Act 1904 provides. It provides that we shall have the right to take over—what? To take over the useless line and leave to the company the valuable line. It provides that:

> If, at the expiration of the said lease, the company shall undertake the operation of the said eastern division, the government shall take over such branch lines as the company may elect not to retain.

That is the proposition of the minister to-day. That proposition amounts to this that if the country shall determine to operate the eastern division, these lines to defunct mines shall be taken over by the people of Canada and the company shall have the right to retain all their paying lines. I cannot consent to any such proposition I cannot agree that we are to be at the enormous expense—double or treble the expense announced to us when the scheme was launched some few years ago—of constructing the eastern division, and that after covering with blank charters the territory that contributes to those branch lines, then at the end of 50 years, if the company should operate it for that period—which I venture to think it is very uncertain—we can only take it back from the company upon the condition that we shall also take with it such refuse, exhausted and useless lines, as the company determine not to retain, and that, mark you, even though the feeling of the people in favour of government ownership and operation should be far more pronounced than it is to-day.

Let there be a fair, square deal in this transaction. We are furnishing for the Grand Trunk Pacific the means of access to the ocean. We are giving them the rich and fertile prairies of the west as well. We are allowing them to get the construction of all that is easy, and we have taken upon ourselves the construction of all that is difficult and hazardous. Surely, when we are doing that, when we are giving them the right to construct branch lines of railways which equal in extent the total mileage of the original Transcontinental Railway, lines of railway which are to determine whether the eastern division shall or shall not pay, it is not an unreasonable proposition that we should have the right to take over that railway upon some such terms as I have proposed in my amendment. I have so drawn my amendment that in extending this charter, in giving this additional concession to the Grand Trunk Branch Lines Railway Company, we shall make it a condition that the public may acquire all or any of the branch lines at the end of the fifty-year period, that in case of a dispute it shall be referred to an impartial tribunial, to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, with the right of appeal without leave by either party and that the sanction of parliament shall be obtained before we shall commit ourselves to the proposition. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that, as contrasted with the proposition of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals,

that we shall go back to the burdensome provision of the Act of 1904 and to the obscurely worded provisions of that Act there should not be a moment's hesitation on the part of the government in adopting this amendment. I trust that upon further consideration the Minister of Railways and Canals, after consulting, I hope, with the right hon. leader of the government, will see the eminent fairness of the proposition I have made and recognize that merely because, in 1904, at a time when a portion of this parliament appeared to be ready to concede almost anything to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, we made great blunder, is no reason why we should repeat the mistakes made at that time; and that the government will see the necessity, the wisdom and the justice of standing by the interests of the people in this regard and also see their duty, as has been suggested to me, and safeguard the rights of the public by securing not necessarily the exercise of the purchasing power in this matter, but by securing an option which will give the people a fair deal at the end of the fifty-year period.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish it to be understood that I would in any way favour any measure or any amendment that might be unfair or unreasonable towards this company, but I cannot help but remember that the people of Canada are contributing nine-tenths in money and guartee to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental Railway. In the light of that I feel that any amendment made to the charter which is now before us should be along the lines of giving greater protection to the people rather than to the company. I feel that we are doing nothing unfair in protecting the people's interests in so far as we possibly can in this matter, and for that reason I am in favour of the aemendment proposed by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) rather than the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). I realize that the first amendment is one that will give greater protection to the people and I believe that the other is an amendment designed to give the greater protection to the railway company.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—TIMBER LEASES.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BURROWS. When you left the chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the statement made by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) in reference to three timber limits secured by myself, Nos. 1046, 1047 and 1099. The hon. gentleman insinuated, in reference to these limits, that I, by some means, had found out what the tenders were which had been put in by those who were competing against me, and that I was thereby enabled to put in a tender just a little above the others. I showed to the House a copy of the original tenders sent from the city of Winnipeg four days before the tenders were opened in which the amounts of my tenders were specified and accompanying which were cheques marked, in the city of Winnipeg, four days before the tenders were opened in the city of Ottawa. That proved conclusively that four days before the tenders were opened four days before the other tenders were put in, my tender had been sent here and were bona fide. What is the inference to be drawn from the statement of the hon. gentlemen? The inference is that by virtue of my finding out what the next highest tender was I was enabled to put in a tender just a litle higher than the others. That argument refutes itself. The amounts of the competing tenders were as follows:

Berth No.	My tender.	Highest competing tender.
1046..	$ 3,500	$ 3,015
1047..	15,000	13,524
1099..	6,500	5,116

So that the aggregate of my three tenders was $25,000 and the aggregate of the highest competing tenders was $21,655. My three tenders therefore were $3,345 in the aggregate more than the next three highest tenders. If the argument presented by the hon. gentleman or the insinuation which the hon. gentleman endeavours to make had any ground in fact, namely, that I was enabled to know what the other tenders were, would it be fair to assume that I would have thrown away $3,345 when I could have got the limits by bidding $10 more than the next highest tender in each case? All that it is necessary to do in this case is to state the facts which will absolutely prove to any fair-minded man that the insinuations, in so far as these limits are concerned, are without foundation and altogether ridiculous.

The hon. member (Mr. Ames) made a statement this afternoon which I presume he did not know was incorrect until I pointed it out to him. However, this statement has gone the round of the party press for the past three months and the party press evidently under inspiration has been writing articles with reference to timber limits and at various times it has been stated that I owned so many limits. In the month of February the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' in an article sent as 'special' from Ottawa stated that I owned 1,336 square miles of limits; in another Conservative paper it was stated that I owed 1,500 square miles, and my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) in a speech he

delivered in Halifax was bold enough to say that I owned 1,600 square miles. It does not matter what limits I own so long as I got my limits in an honourable way, but just let me state that I never owned 1,336 square miles, I never owned 1,590 square miles, and I never owned 1,600 square miles so that all three of these statements are not true in any part. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) also stated that I owned timber limit 1049. Now, timber limit 1049 was tendered for by Mr. A. W. Fraser, of Ottawa, in the name of Mr. John McBain, and it was insinuated in the newspapers that Mr. Fraser was acting for me, and that Mr. McBain's name had been used virtually for that of Mr. T. A. Burrows. The fact is that I never was interested directly or indirectly in this tender and Mr. Fraser in the witness box before the Public Accounts Committee gave the following evidence which will be found at page 63 of the report of the committee :

By Mr. Macdonald (Pictou):
Q. Who is Mr. John McBain?—A. John McBain is a millwright and contractor by occupation, and at that time, and for some time previous had been carrying on building operations and real estate in the city of Ottawa in which he and I were interested.

Again at page 72 of his evidence, I read as follows:

By Mr. Macdonald (Pictou):
Q. On whose behalf was this tender of John McBain, of March 7, 1903, for berth No. 1049 put in?—A. On my own.
Q. No. 1049?—A. Yes, that was on my behalf.
Q. You have that limit still, have you?—A. Oh, no, I have not.
By Mr. Bristol:
Q. Did you sell the limit?—A. Yes.
Q. For how much?—A. That is my business, I am not going into that part of it.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) must have known of this if he read the evidence, indeed he was present when Mr. Fraser gave that evidence before the committee, and it was not fair for him to make the statement to which I have alluded or to assume that I owned that limit. I had no interest whatever in the tender or in the limit afterwards.

Mr. AMES. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to make a correction. He misunderstood me. I stated that the Burrows-Fraser combination owned 1,586 square miles. What Mr. Burrows did not own Mr. Fraser or those he represented did own.

Mr. BURROWS. I have nothing whatever to do with any limit that Mr. Fraser owns, and that brings up another question. The hon. gentleman referred to some limits that Mr. Fraser had tendered for and which he afterwards sold to the Red Deer Lumber Company, referring to limit No. 958 of forty square miles and No. 988 of twenty square miles, and I think he insinuated that I had something to do with these timber limits.

Mr. AMES. No.

Mr. BURROWS. I never had anything to do with them and I am glad the hon. gentleman is fair enough to admit that. In the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' of March 28, there was an inspired article written from Ottawa which contained certain statements regarding me, and these statements were copied into the western papers and went the rounds of the Tory press. This is one of them:

Few berths acquired by Burrows are without value far exceeding the price paid for them. For $500 a 50-mile limit on Cedar lake was acquired in the name of A. W. Fraser, and that property was subsequently put up for sale for $500,000.

I want to say that I never had a one half cent interest in that limit at Cedar Lake. I was not interested in the tender and have not been interested since directly or indirectly, so that that statement is absolutely without foundation. In another article the 'Mail and Empire' said that 120 miles appearing in the names of Mr. Fraser was virtually owned by Mr. T. A. Burrows, and that 120 miles is made up in this way : Timber limit No. 1051, thirty square miles, and No. 1107, ninety square miles. I want to say that I never was interested in either of these limits directly or indirectly before they were tendered for or afterwards. I have never had anything to do with them whatever. These are the kind of statements which have been going the round of the press regarding me. They are entirely incorrect, and I would have taken occasion to state so before this were it not that I knew this debate was coming up and that the whole question would come under review, and that I could then make a detailed statement in regard to these matters. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) said that I was interested in timber limit 1048. Now, timber limit 1048 was applied for by Wm. Cowan, a lumberman of Prince Albert, and Wm. Cowan and E. H. Moore, of Prince Albert, two lumbermen, and myself were associated together in the tender. We tendered for the limit; it was owned by an incorporated company in which the three of us were interested called the Big River Lumber Company, and I afterwards sold out my interest to Mr. Cowan in that business. With regard to the other limits I have a statement here which I want to make to the House. Since the present government came into power there has been put up to public competition, 1062 different parcels of timber in Manitoba and the Northwest To read the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' and other strong Conservative papers one would conclude that T. A. Burrows tendered on

about 1050 of these and that all the rest of Canada had tendered on about twelve. But here are the facts: Out of that 1062 timber limits I secured nineteen and I tendered on seven on which my tender was too low. Two of these which I secured were no good. I paid $3,800 on them and I found when I came to survey them that the descriptions were wrong and that they did not cover any timber, and I have thrown them back on the government and the government got my $3,800 for nothing. That leaves seventeen limits, six of which are owned in joint shares between myself and some other lumbermen in the Northwest Territories, so that I really own only eleven limits out of the seventeen personally and I have a half interest in the other six. But assuming that I owned all the other six what does it amount to. I intend to read a list of the limits and the tenders and how much my tender was above the others. &c. The first limit on the list is No. 814, fifteen square miles and my tender was $1,500, and the next highest tender was $1,100 which was put in by James Stewart of Winnipeg on behalf of Shaw Bros., of Dauphin. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have been casting insinuations on the idea of anybody tendering for timber limits in the name of anybody else, but here is a case where my opponents in business in Dauphin, good respectable lumbermen tendered for this limit in the name of somebody else. I do not cast any reflection on them for doing that, they could tender that way if they wanted to.

For the next limit, No. 986, 50 square miles, my tender was $4,600, and the next highest was $4,305. For limit No. 992, 40 square miles, my tender was $1,502 and the next highest $1,100. For timber limit No. 1000, containing 5 square miles, my tender was $625, and the next highest bid $210. Limit No. 1001, containing 6 square miles my tender was $1,003 and the next highest $640. Timber limit 1002, 4 square miles, my tender was $640 and the next highest $60. Limit No. 1046—this is one of those I had referred to this afternoon, my tender was $3,500 and the next highest $3,015. No. 1047, 50 square miles, my tender was $15,000 and the next highest $13,524. The next limit, No. 1054, containing 1 square mile, my tender was $500 and the next $200. No. 1068, 5¼ square miles, my tender was $400 and the next highest $310. This is one of the limits that is no good and has since been handed back to the government after I had paid $135 in dues. So that the government got that area back and my $535 for nothing. No. 1073, 20 square miles, my bid was $2,750 and the next highest $2,500. That is another case where the description was not correct and I relinquished the limit to the government so that the government got from me some $3,800 and the property back again.

Mr. BURROWS.

No.	Square miles.	My tender.	Next highest.
1093..	12	$1,500	$ 700
1094..	29	2,500	2,025
1099..	44	6,500	5,116
1120..	15	700	*
1121..	50	6,000	5,350
1191..	50	1,075	584
1192..	50	5,500	5,060
1219..	50	3,260	3,000

*No other tender.

These aggregate 534 square miles.

Mr. AMES. How about 571A ?

Mr. BURROWS. I did not buy it from the government but from a private individual.

Mr. AMES. You acquired it however.

Mr. BURROWS. Not from this government but from Shaw Bros., who bought it from the Tory government eighteen years ago. The whole area put up to public competition, which I secured, was 534 square miles. Deducting the area I have relinquished and adding the amount I have surveyed, I have secured altogether 433 square miles. In surveying these limits you often find a lot of waste area. In some instances I have cut that out, and instead of 534 miles I got 433. Six out of the seventeen are limits in which I have only a half interest. The total amount of my tenders was $59,069 and the total amount of the competing tenders was $48,799. My tenders therefore aggregated $10,290 higher than the next aggregate, or 21 per cent, so that the government received $10,270 more than if I had not tendered at all. The average price which I paid per mile was $112.50, and the average price during the time I was tendering, which the government received for timber limits, was $60 per mile. So that I paid pretty nearly twice as much as the average price paid for all the limits that were sold during that time.

It has been said by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) that vast areas of timber have been improvidently alienated. In answer to this, I will point out that that were a great many limits put up to tender during the last eleven or twelve years—some 1,062 altogether. In that western country, where there are so many men with speculative tendencies from all parts of the world, men with money which they are seeking to invest, surely there would have been some cases in which higher prices would have been paid for timber limits, if they were sold so cheap. But the fact is that until recently timber limits were not looked upon as a good speculation in that country at all. In fact they are not a good speculation at big prices, at present as there is great risk connected with them by reason of fires and considerable expense in carrying them. A short time ago my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) got a telegram from

the agent at Prince Albert, notifying him that there were extensive forest fires raging in the timber limits north of Prince Albert, and asking authority to send forty or fifty men to fight the fire, which request the minister granted. West of Edmonton there were forest fires in every direction. In 1906, I had a survey party out at that time, and for two months they did nothing else but fight the fire trying to save one of my limits, but all the work done by the forest guardians and the men who worked for me would have been of no avail were it not for a timely rain. Had rain not fallen most of the timber between Edmonton and Yellow Head Pass would have been burnt that summer. Here is a telegram which I find in an Ottawa paper of May 12 :

Devasting bush fires—Hundreds of square miles of timber destroyed.

Edmonton, May 12.—Charles Tompkins, contractor on the Grand Trunk Pacific, seventy miles west of here, brings a report of devasting bush fires which swept through the district last week. Hundreds of square miles of timber were destroyed, and a construction camp was only saved by the strenuous work of the men engaged on the grade, who worked all Thursday night, when the wind suddenly veered and the camp was saved.

I have myself had a report recently from the man who represents me in the neighbourhood of Edmonton to the effect that on two limits in which I am interested the fire this summer did considerable damage but I do not know to what extent. In that western country where the grass grows so luxuriously in the spring and autumn, the fire takes in the grass it is very dangerous for the timber. A fire there, is far more dangerous than it is in the eastern country where there is more moisture and not nearly so great a chance for bush fires to take place. In the east you have more moisture and there is not nearly as much danger of fire as there is in the west. Thus when you come to talk of timber limits as a speculation you find that there is a great risk of fire and that is why men who have money to invest would rather invest it in land than in timber limits ; you cannot insure a timber limit and if it is burned you lose all the money you have invested.

My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) said this afternoon that the government had been very improvident in the prices at which they have disposed of their timber. In answer to that I would say that if the timber was so cheap as the hon. gentleman tries to make out, surely in some cases men would have tendered at higher rates for the thousand limits that have been put up during this period.

It has been charged against me that I did not pay full price for the limits I secured. I have a statement here showing what has been paid by others for timber limits in that western country during the time I bought timber. I got the clerk of the Crown Timber Department to prepare me a short statement which is as follows :

Memorandum showing average bonuses paid for timber limits from 1896 to 1905 in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

Total area disposed of by public competition, 4,576·58 square miles. Bonus received, $276,-778.65, or an average per square mile of $60.

The following names apear as holders of the largest areas of limits (100 miles and upwards).

Names.	Miles.	Bonus.	Average per mile.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
T. A. Burrows	534·00	59,069 00	112 50
J. D. McArthur...	497·93	13,301 00	26 70
McDonald & Frith.	498·75	46,128 00	93 14
Imperial Pulp Co..	483·00	54,975 00	114 50
J. W. Stewart.....	330·00	7,000 00	21 21
Peter McArthur...	368·60	27,453 00	74 00
Thos. Mackie.....	201·00	26,194 00	130 32
Moore & Sanderson	159·00	1,830 00	11 51
Wm. Robinson	137·00	5,144 00	37 50
J. H. Sanderson...	97·27	559 55	5 75

It will be seen from the above memo. that the prices I paid were a good deal higher than those paid by any one else with the exception of the late Mr. Thomas Mackie, member for Pembroke, and the Imperial Pulp Company. Mr. Mackie paid an average of $130 per mile bonus, the Imperial Pulp Company an average of $114.50 and I paid an average of $112.50 per square mile. The average paid during that time for all the limits sold was $60 per square mile of timber. I give these facts in order to show that in securing timber in the west I paid prices not only equal to the average paid by others but nearly twice as high.

It has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that all the farmers of the western country are at the mercy of the lumber combine, and that the lumberman, having secured all the timber in the west, can charge what prices he likes. That statement is not correct. According to the regulations portable saw-mill men can secure and do secure timber berths of one square mile on which they can cut timber for the use of farmers without competition. Those berths are not put up for competition but any man who owns a little saw-mill can apply for one square mile and when the timber on this mile is cut they can secure another mile, get a permit to obtain timber for the use of the settlers and need only pay the same dues as the lumbermen, fifty cents per thousand feet, and $100 as a bonus for the square mile. There are a great many of these mills throughout the whole country. Take the district represented by the Minister of the Interior and there are in it hundreds of mills, cutting timber

for the settlers. In my own district it is the same.

I notice in the Dauphin 'Herald,' a Conservative paper published in Dauphin, in its issue of April 30, 1908, the following item:

The following is a statement of the timber cut under permit granted by the Dominion land office here from March 31, 1907, to March 31, 1908:

Lineal feet of logs	18,582
Board measure of lumber	4,945,752
Roof poles	6,945
Fence posts	44,330
Cords of wood	7,751
Shingles	25,000
Piles, lineal feet	8,000
Fence rails	25,700

It will be seen that in the county of Dauphin, which I represent and where my lumber business is situated, the farmers get a large portion of their supply of timber by going to the bush themselves, getting a permit to cut timber, getting it out themselves and having it manufactured by the portable mill. Although I have a lumber yard in Dauphin, I do not think we sell three-quarters of a million feet in the year to farmers. The farmers get their permits, they get out the timber themselves, using their own horses and men and in that way obtain it much cheaper than they could if they went to the mill and bought the lumber manufactured. I mention this to show that in Manitoba and the west there is ample provision by which the farmers can secure timber. A farmer has a right to secure a permit to cut 9,000 feet without charge. If he has exhausted his right to cut under a free permit, he can apply to the land office and get a permit to cut timber by paying $1.50 a thousand for as much as he wants to cut, or he can buy from the portable mill operator. There is a popular but very erroneous idea that the government having sold this timber receives no further revenue from it. This is not in accordance with the facts. The amount paid as a bonus is a very small proportion of the sum which the government secures on the cutting of timber. The regulations provide that the lumberman first of all cannot secure a limit except by paying a bonus for the right to do business. After that he has to cut the timber according to the regulations and pay the dues provided by the regulations. At the present time the dues are fifty cents a thousand, but it is in the power of the government to change the dues from time to time. If they wished they could charge $5 a thousand, their power is absolute to charge whatever dues they like at any time, now or hereafter.

I shall give a concrete instance in my own experience to show what the government received for one piece of timber. In 1898 I tendered for timber berth 814, for which I paid a bonus of $1,500 and I have since cut all the timber off that area. I have paid to the government, first of all, a bonus of $1,500. I have paid also, by way of dues, $11,907.48. So the government has received, through bonus and royalty on the timber cut on these 15 square miles the sum of $13,407.48. I did not secure any right to the land; I did not secure any right to the timber still left. There is growing timber on the land, and if this is cut hereafter dues will have to be paid on it. It sometimes happens that the government makes more out of the timber than the lumberman does. The lumberman may be unfortunate, but he has to pay his dues whether he makes money or not. Take the case of this berth No. 814 on which I paid $13,407.48 royalty. I secured the right, under a clause that used to be in operation, clause 17 of the regulations of 1897, to cut the timber on the adjacent area. One of the terms under which the concession was granted was that the man who cut the timber should pay double dues. I cut the timber and paid dues to the government amounting to $22,014.88. So that on this operation, at a place called Pine River, I paid the government for cutting these two pieces of pine timber $35,422.36 by way of dues and royalty. I venture the statement that if I had charged interest on the money invested, charged a salary for my own time when I was looking after that business, charged wear and tear on the plant and other expenses and losses, it would be found that the government made more out of that operation than I did. The government made between $35,000 and $36,000 at no expense whatever. But I had two fires—my mills were burned down twice. The mill was insured, but you can never get enough insurance to cover you for a loss of that kind. So I say emphatically that if I charged these expenses, it would be found that the government had made more money out of that timber than I made. When a lumberman secures a limit he has to pay all the cost of survey and half the cost of fire-guarding, and $5 per year per mile ground rent, besides the royalty on all the lumber he cuts.

Now, let me make a brief statement showing the amount of dues I have paid altogether since this government came into power. The amount of bonus I have paid on limits altogether is $59,069. Also I have paid in dues $58,585.42 in nine years—an average of between $6,000 and $7,000 a year in dues for cutting timber. Any lumberman carrying on business in an extensive way is a large contributor to the revenue of the country. This is a fact to which the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) takes no cognizance. The hon. member for St. Antoine may be an authority on some things, but certainly he is not an authority on the value of timber or the

quality of timber in the Northwest. I do not wish to cast any reflections on the hon. gentleman, but I do not see how he can know anything about these matters; when he speaks here he shows himself to be thoroughly incompetent to be a judge. The hon. gentleman talks freely about some timber limits of fifty square miles being worth $500,000. I state here, as a lumberman with twenty-nine years' experience—and I think I know as much about timber limits as any man in the Northwest country—that there is not a limit in the Northwest that is worth any such money. And I venture to say that no man but a novice would make any such statement as that which the hon. gentleman made. While timber there is valuable, it has no greater value than timber down here where you have the markets of the world to ship to. During a debate here some time ago the hon. gentleman spoke about a limit on Cormorant lake as being worth $375,000. Promptly the gentleman who owned that limit offered to take the $75,000 for it and allow the party who valued it so highly to pocket the $300,000. I feel sure that that gentleman would sell the limit for less than $75,000. I know that I have limits that I would be glad to get rid of at cost price. Some limits that I have secured, of course, are worth more than I paid for them—I am frank to say that.

But there is a case in my own experience which I will relate which shows what dependence can be placed on the statements of the hon. gentleman concerning the value of limits. This was the case of berth 571a which I bought from Messrs. Shaw Bros. This is an experienced lumber firm, and one worth considerable money. These men came from Shawville, up the Ottawa river. They moved out to that western country twenty-five years ago, and have been lumbering there ever since. They owned a limit on the Valley river, and I owned limits on that river also. I have a large mill there and they have no mill. If there was a limit anywhere that there was strong reason for me to obtain it was that one, because the Valley river is so small that it would be impossible for two of us to drive on it in a practical way, our logs would get all mixed up. Therefore, Shaw Bros. had me at a disadvantage—I simply had to buy their limit. This limit had an area of 28½ square miles, and three years ago I bought it for $16,000. This is a first-class limit. It is within three miles of the main line of the Canadian Northern, where a transcontinental train passes each way every day. It is within ten miles of my mill at Grand View. This shows what limits are really worth. Here were men who were not stuck for money, who did not have to sell, and who had me at a disadvantage. They figured there was about 16,000,000 feet, and that I was paying them $1 per thousand. I do not think there was 16,000,000 feet, and I figured I was paying $1.25 per thousand. So there you have an actual sale from bona fide lumbermen to a bona fide lumberman. I venture to say that this is the best situated limit in the whole of Manitoba and the Northwest. The limit was a very valuable one in proportion to the amount of timber that was on it. So I say that the statement made here by hon. gentlemen who have no knowledge of the facts that limits are worth from $300,000 to $500,000 has no foundation at all. No limits have ever been sold at any such prices. There have been but a few sales made of timber limits in the Northwest Territories. Had they been as valuable as the hon. gentleman tries to make out, surely there would have been more sales, because there are lots of people in that country who are looking for investments. But in the last five years, to my personal knowledge, there have not been half a dozen limits sold in that whole country, that is as a speculation. Big lumber firms from the United States have come into the west and bought limits at Prince Albert. They formed a company called the Prince Albert Lumber Company. This firm were worth a couple of million dollars. They were practical lumbermen and are still lumbering in the state of Minnesota. They bought these limits at Prince Albert and made a purchase on the basis of 50 cents a thousand for the standing timber. The Red Deer Lumber Company bought a couple of limits, one of which had been owned by Mr. Dickenson, of Ottawa, a former Conservative member for Russell. Mr. Dickenson secured timber limit No. 92 for nothing when his friends were in power. I understand that afterwards it fell into the hands of a financial corporation in the city of Toronto, who sold it to the Red Deer Lumber Company. Then Mr. A. W. Fraser, of Ottawa, sold two limits to the same company. Shaw Bros. sold a couple of small pieces of timber, besides what I bought from them. But outside of that, I do not know of any sale having been made throughout Manitoba and the Northwest for speculative purposes. I do not know of any lumberman who has bought timber limits, I did not buy any myself except the one I refer to, and I do not know of any limits being sold.

Mr. AMES. Has the hon. gentleman heard of the sale from Shaw Bros. to the Ruby Lake Lumber Company for $100,000?

Mr. BURROWS. I do not think they sold it for $100,000.

Mr. AMES. I have their statement to that effect.

Mr. BURROWS. That is all right, but I know differently. The company sold

that timber on the basis of stumpage; that is, when the timber is cut out, if it has not been burned, they will get $100,000 if there is enough timber on the limit to amount to that sum. But that was not a straight sale for cash.

Mr. AMES. I have the statement in writing from a member of the firm of the Ruby Lake Lumber Company that in 1906 the sum paid was $100,000. Here is the letter if the hon. gentleman wishes to see it.

Mr. BURROWS. They never paid $100,000; they may have agreed to. Will the hon. gentleman read the letter?

Mr. AMES. The letter is dated April 18, 1908:

Dear Mr. Ames,—I find the number of the timber berth about which we spoke is 964, and it was purchased by the Ruby Lake Lumber Company in the summer of 1906 from Shaw Bros., of Dauphin, for the sum of $100,000 not $110,000 as I stated to you. The Ruby Lake Lumber Company is composed of a number of Amherst men who took hold of the proposition as a prospective money maker

That is signed by Edgar N. Ross, of Amherst, N.S.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. That gentleman is a Conservative candidate in Cumberland, N.S. He knows nothing about lumber.

Mr. BURROWS. I have been criticised by hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with my timber operations. I would like to read an extract from a Tory paper published in my own town where I have my mill. It is a Conservative paper edited by Mr. George Graham. I believe he is a relative of the Minister of Railways, is a good strong Conservative, and a very decent man. When the question of the timber limits was under discussion in the House, he wrote this article. I quote it from the Grandview 'Exponent' of February 14, 1908:

Those Timber Deals.

During the past few weeks there has been considerable discussion in the Dominion House at Ottawa in the matter of timber deals, and there seems little doubt that some of these transactions have been of a very shady character. Locally we are interested, owing to our member, Mr. Burrows, being among those mentioned. In this case, however, the public have been getting results from the contracts, and while Mr. Burrows may not be in the business from philanthropic motives, he has been utilizing his timber limits, and his extensive milling establishment here in Grandview has meant much toward the advancement of our district. The people of Grandview as a whole have derived much benefit through Mr. Burrows' lumbering operations. He has for several years employed a large number of men, both winter and summer. His last season's cut for instance, was the largest in the history of his operations, and owing to the financial stringency throughout the country he may have to carry many millions feet of lumber in his yards here for a considerable time, and take long chances on the question of price, danger from fire, &c. In the interval he has expended a large amount in wages, &c, on which interest is constantly accruing. So that the criticisms can hardly apply in the case of Mr. Burrows.

That statement was written by a gentleman who is not a supporter of mine, but it shows the public sentiment in that district. The hon. member for St. Antoine has been very much affected over a company known as the Imperial Pulp Company. I have a statement here of the timber limits owned by that company. They are nine in number. The company secured nine timber limits aggregating some 407 square miles. The first limit they secured is 1031. When that limit was tendered for it was supposed to cover 118¼ square miles. It was divided into eleven different blocks situated on the Saskatchewan river, and they were accurately defined. The area covering them was described by metes and bounds. That limit has been surveyed since and it is found that instead of there being 118 square miles there was only 52½ square miles. The amount paid for that limit was $31,575. In the Public Accounts Committee the tenders for that limit were discussed, and Mr. Finnie, the manager of the Bank of Ottawa, was put into the witness box with regard to a tender given by the Bank of Ottawa through the manager. His evidence was to this effect: He said that I went to him and deposited $31,575 in the Bank of Ottawa, that I asked him to make out two manager's cheques for the whole amount, payable to the Deputy Minister of the Interior, and that he made two manager's cheques, dating them on the 30th December. The tenders were opened on the 31st December. These two cheques were put in with a tender for the Imperial Pulp Co., and secured the limit. Now, I want to make it plain that I deposited that much money in the Bank of Ottawa and I asked for two cheques, the cheques were made out by Mr. Finnie himself in his own handwriting; they were produced in the Public Accounts Committee and he swore to them. They covered all the money I had in the bank at the time, and they covered enough to secure the limit.

Now the hon. member for St. Antoine this afternoon undertook to criticise several other tenders in connection with the limits secured by that company. Amongst others he referred to limit No. 1098. Again he made the insinuation, or his remarks bore out the insinuation, that through some collusion between myself and some officer of the department—the insinuation was that it was between myself and the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), who at that time was Dominion Land Commissioner,—I was enabled to know what the next highest tender was and put my tender in accordingly. I think the hon. gentleman is

rather unfortunate in his statements. My tender was $2,500. He also made some reflections with reference to the fact that my tender was put in in cash. The next highest tender was $1,860. Does he think that I am so flush of money, that, knowing that the next highest tender was $1,860, I was going to put in $2,500 cash? I do not think that I am so easy as that. I think that if I had an opportunity of knowing how much money was going to take a timber limit I would not waste $500 or $600 more than was necessary. I think that is all that is necessary to show how ridiculous the statement made by the hon. gentleman is. The hon. gentleman's remarks about other tenders were equally ridiculous.

With regard to the Imperial Pulp Company I have stock in that organization. The company was formed with the object of going into the pulp business in the western country. We secured timber in the neighbourhood of Edmonton. The intention was to erect a pulp mill in that locality. We secured altogether four hundred and odd square miles but we have only three hundred and six square miles. The area was cut down. Berth No. 1097 proved to be of no use, so that notwithstanding the fact that we paid $1,500 for it on account of bonus and dues it was no good whatever and it will never be surveyed. Berth 1031, instead of getting one hundred and eighteen square miles we only got fifty-two square miles, and as to berth 1119, instead of getting twenty square miles, we only got eleven. The same applies to some other limits. We did not survey the whole of them because the timber was not there. The Imperial Pulp Company have secured three hundred and six square miles of timber limits and these timber limits were secured with the object of erecting a pulp mill in that western country. Upon going into the matter I found that that was not the place for a pulp mill, that while the timber is valuable for saw-mill purposes it is not valuable for pulp. To successfully manufacture pulp and make it pay in that western country you will have to have a a paper mill. If you ship pulp from a western point like Edmonton to an eastern mill the freight would be so great that you could not make a dollar out of it. That is one point against a pulp-mill in that particular district. Another point against it is that it is necessary to have water-power to operate the pulp-mill and it is also necessary to have good water. In that western country where freshets occur during many months in the year the water is so muddy that it would not be available for use in the pulp industry. The original idea of the company to erect a pulp-mill proved not to be a business proposition and the idea is now to use the limits for lumbering purposes. The company intend to erect mills and cut the timber into lumber. Hon. gentlemen opposite try to make out that there was some great secrecy about this company. This company was organized in the city of Toronto by a reputable firm there. Like any other company, it had its shareholders and, like any other company, it did not advertise on the streets who owned the shares in the company, but anybody who wants to know can easily find out. But, for political reasons hon. members of the opposition were trying to create the impression that we were trying to keep the identity of the company secret and notwithstanding the fact that my hon. friend the member for St. Antoine knew that I was a member of the company he scrupulously avoided asking me any question or putting me in the witness box when the committee was investigating this matter for fear that I would have an opportunity of stating the position regarding this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up the time of the House at considerable length, and there are just a few more remarks I wish to make. In the first place I have been in the lumbering business in Manitoba since 1879. I have never done anything else as a business except follow the lumbering business since I went to that western country and was able to conduct a business of my own. I have had saw-mills in various parts of the country. I first owned several mills on Lake Winnipeg and I afterwards changed my scene of operations to the western country so soon as we had railway communication in that district which made it possible to do a lumbering business there. I have at the present time three mills in operation. This year, the lumbermen in that country are not manufacturing so extensively as they did some few years ago. A couple of years ago there was a great agitation in regard to a lumber combine and it was stated that there was going to be a lumber famine. At one time there was shortage of lumber and all the lumbermen in the west undertook to get out large stocks. The consequence was that at all points when the hard times came, every lumberman throughout Manitoba, the Northwest and even British Columbia found himself with a very large stock of lumber that he could not sell. In the west you will find nearly every mill stocked up and in British Columbia you can buy fifty per cent of the mills at a good deal less than the cost price.

The limits which I secured and which I have enumerated to the House were secured by me before I became a member of parliament. I do not know that it makes much difference because I think a member is free to tender upon timber limits if he wants to, but at the time I bought most of these limits I never expected to be a member of parliament and did not aspire to the candidature. I do not understand why members of the opposition have picked me

out for attack. I am a lumberman and I have a right to follow my business if I want to. The timber areas, being owned by the Dominion government, it is necessary for all the lumbermen to deal with the Dominion government. In the east, where the provinces own the timber, as in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario, the lumbermen deal with the local governments, but in Manitoba and the Northwest it is absolutely necessary for the lumbermen to deal with the Dominion government. It therefore became necessary for me to deal with the Dominion government. Some time ago insinuations were made to the effect that because Mr. Sifton happened to be the Minister of the Interior I got advantages, being related to him, that I would not have got as a stranger. I never secured any advantages over any other man in my line of business and any timber limits that I have secured at any time have been secured by public competition with the exception of the timber patent which I have before referred to. There is one point I want to make again before I sit down. It is a point which has been hammered at considerably by the opposition press. I do not think that is material. As to how much timber I own I wish to make this statement from my place in parliament and upon my responsibility as a member of this House—I do not own 1,600 square miles as said by the hon. member for St. Antoine, nor do I own 1,500 square miles as said by the hon. member for Calgary, nor do I own 1,336 square miles as stated by the Toronto 'Mail.' The total amount of my holdings at the present time is four hundred and thirty-three square miles which I own myself—with the exception that I mentioned that in six of these limits I only own a half interest, but suppose I own them all they amount to four hundred and thirty-three square miles. Then I own one-half interest in the Imperial Pulp Company which has some three hundred and twenty square miles. Outside of that I have no limit interest in the west with the exception of a limit I bought from Shaw Brothers and it was not got from this government. Therefore, instead of owning 1,500 square miles, or 1,336 square miles, or 1,600 square miles I own about 600 square miles altogether, including some in which I own only an interest. I do not think it is germane to the question that I should make this statement but it has been debated so often and so unfairly that I thought it only just to myself that I should deal with the subject.

My. hon. friend (Mr. Ames) seems to have an eye for irregularities; he seems to be suspicious about any man that has holdings in the west. He singled me out specially for attack and I would judge from the diligence he has displayed that he has gone through all the public records and knows exactly what limits everybody owns. But it does seem very strange that everything else escaped his attention except what T. A. Burrows happened to own. If he had cast his eye out to British Columbia he would have found a firm out there—I am not saying anything against them for they are a good legitimate business firm—who secured 18 limits before this government came into power, and who have further secured in their own name and in the name of others 50 limits since this government came to power. They own to-day 68 different parcels of timber and it is not scattering spruce such as we have in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories but it is large timber growing on the Columbia river. That firm is the Columbia River Lumber Company. Why did not Mr. Ames with his natural disposition for suspicion cast his microscope on that transaction ?

As to the general statement that the government has been improvident with regard to the timber resources of the Northwest, I would point to the fact that since the present government came to power they disposed altogether of 6,400 square miles of timber by public competition and the records show they sold that timber at an average bonus of 81 dollars per square mile, in addition to the dues and ground rents which the lumbermen have to pay when they cut. The late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) speaking on this question some months ago pointed out that in the province of Quebec between 1885 and 1906, 26,000 square miles of timber were sold and that the average price obtained was $81.16 per square mile or just about the price the Dominion government obtained for its timber in the west. I am sure that any one who knows anything about timber in the Northwest and Quebec will agree that the timber areas tributary to the Ottawa and other rivers are of greater value are closer to market, are not so subject to fire, are a better investment in every way than timber areas in the Northwest where the timber is scattering and liable to be burnt up at any time. If you take that comparison which I think is a fair one, you will find that the statements of gentlemen opposite that this government has been improvident, are not borne out by the facts because we see that timber limits in the older parts of Canada have not realized any more per square mile than have the limits in the Northwest. Now, talking about areas owned by one limit holder, if you tell a lumberman in eastern Canada that a man owned 500 square miles, or 600 square miles, or 1,000 miles and gave that as an example of large holdings, he would simply laugh at you. There are men living within a 100 miles of the city of Ottawa who own more ; there is one man in the city of Ottawa who owns not 500 miles but 7,000 square miles of white pine, red pine, spruce, cedar, the very best timber in the Dominion. There are two other firms who own about the same area. There is a firm in the city of

Montreal, who I am credibly informed support the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and who own some 7,000 square miles of limits in Quebec, an area greater than the total amount of timber sold by this government in eleven years. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) that he might start his crusade on these people and point out to them that they own too much of the public domain and demand from them that they hand back some of it to the government of the province of Quebec.

In conclusion I wish to say that the references which have been made to me by the member for St. Antoine and his friends are very unfair, indeed. I came to this House a lumberman, I have been a lumberman for many years in the Northwest; in the pursuit of my business as a lumberman it became necessary for me to tender for limits and I tendered for timber in the regular way and I secured it and I had the right to do so. Sometimes I was successful and sometimes my tenders were too low, and in that case I did not get the limit. I do not see why it is that because I have the honour to be a member of the House of Commons I should be singled out for attack simply because I am following the business that I have followed during all my business career. If the criticism of me had been reasonable I would not have felt it so badly, but I have a character to sustain in the western country just as well as the hon. member (Mr. Ames) has in Montreal. I can tell him furthermore that if he goes out to the west and meets the people that have associated with me for the past quarter of a century he will find that my character stands just as high there as does his character in the city of Montreal or anywhere else. Therefore I say, Mr. Speaker, that many of the aspersions that have been cast upon me through the Conservative press and which have been used as a political lever more than as a personal attack in some cases, have been unfair, unjust, and without foundation. I have nothing to be ashamed of. I tendered for timber limits, I tendered in a legitimate way like other lumbermen, I got nothing except what I am entitled to get and I have no apologies to make.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). The hon. member (Mr. Burrows) has not attempted to make an answer to the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) which was a most powerful arraignment of the policy of the present government in its disposal of the timber areas of the Northwest. The only attempt at defence put up by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrows) was his statement that there are several people in some of the older provinces who own very large areas of timber and that because of that the Dominion government was not improvident in disposing of vast areas of our timber resources of the west for speculative purposes. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) has confined himself chiefly to a personal explanation as to the part he has played in the distribution of these limits, and he searched far and wide for individual cases of tenders which appear to be very close, and for instances in which more than one cheque was inclosed in the tender. But these do not account for the remarkable coincidence which time after time occurred in connection with his own tenders, nor do they account for the remarkable success of the hon. gentleman in securing 18 out of 19 limits for which he bid; nor do they account for the invariable success of the Imperial Pulp Company in their tendering, in which company, he tells us he owns a half share. The practice of lumbermen, which he says, is common of giving more than one cheque, sometimes on different banks, does not explain why it was advisable to go to one particular bank and get two or three cheques at the same time drawn on the same bank, because if secrecy were the reason for giving these different cheques, that end would not be accomplished by getting two or three cheques at the same time and on the same bank. I might further point out that when the time came to send the tender to the department, surely there was no reason for not stating then on the face of the tender itself what the amount was. The time for concealment as to the amount surely had expired by that time, and that excuse would not carry any weight when it came to sending in the tender.

The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) had been afraid, he said, to put him in the witness box, and he used some very strong terms in denouncing my hon. friend. But the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) seems to have forgotten that he himself could have asked to be placed in that box, or he could have got his friend and confident, the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to call him in as a witness. He passes over that as a very light matter. He must also have forgotten that only a short time ago in this Houes, he spoke and voted against a resolution calling for an inquiry by a commission of nine members into the whole disposal of the timber limits of the country. That very fact in itself would surely lead the hon. member for St. Antoine to conclude that the hon. member for Dauphin was not likely to be a candid and willing witness. If the hon. gentleman had desired to give evidence he would have gone into the box of his own accord. And it seems to me, as his name has been connected so closely with these timber limit transactions, he should have welcomed the idea of a committee being appointed to go into the whole question, so that everything might be cleared up, if there was nothing which was not capable of being cleared up in connection with this whole matter.

With regard to the Imperial Pulp Company, he told us that anybody who wanted to know who the shareholders were could easily have found out.

Mr. BURROWS I have them here and if the hon. member wants to see the names he can have them.

Mr. LAKE. I am not particularly anxious at present, but the point I wish to make is that he told us anybody could tell who the shareholders were if he wanted to find out. That question was asked more than once.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Who was asked?

Mr. BRISTOL. Mr. Fraser was asked, the solicitor of the company.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. And he told you the moment he was asked.

Mr. BRISTOL. No, he did not.

Mr. E. M MACDONALD. He told you you the moment he was asked.

Mr. BRISTOL. The evidence shows the contrary.

Mr. LAKE. Mr. Fraser's answer was that Mr. Burrows, Sir Daniel McMillan, the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, were members and that Mr. Pattinson was the secretary. Did they include the whole members of that company?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. I am glad to hear that at last. For a very long time inquiries were being made as to who the members of that company were. Throughout the Department of the Interior there was an immense amount of curiosity to know who the Imperial Pulp Company consisted of, and there was a great deal of secrecy in connection with the matter. The only address given of the company was a post office box at Winnipeg. That fact itself would show there was secrecy in connection with this matter. The statement of the hon. member is rather amusing when he says that anybody could have found out at any time of whom the company were composed. But it was not until the original papers—which we fought for from day to day and week to week—were brought down that it was discovered that Sir Daniel McMillan was the president and Mr. Pattinson the secretary. In the earlier part of his speech the hon. gentleman complained that the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) had not pointed out the small value of the limits lying to the north of Prince Albert. When he made that complaint, the hon. gentleman did not, as he might have well done, inform the House that he had been able to sell one half a share in the 250 miles of these limits which he had secured for some $80,000. It does not appear to me that he offered the slightest defence of the policy of the department in putting up these other timber limits which lie to the north of Prince Albert and the northwest of Edmonton. Then he went on at some trouble to deny certain allegations as to the specific amount of timber limits which were said to have been owned by him; and after a good deal of discussion, he finally brought down the amount from some 549 square miles—which was the amount he originally obtained—to 534 miles. For these limits he said he paid some $59,000, and he went on to say that the timber business was very poor indeed. He forgot that little transaction I have just mentioned in which he sold one half share in the limit, which he with two others procured for $7,000 for $80,000. That cannot be a bad business in which one can make a turnover of that sort. There are many who would like to have a look in at the same sort of business. He went on to say how very bad an investment timber limits were. He said that the government, out of one lot of timber he owned, had made some $39,000 in dues, and that if he were to charge against his profits the whole of his salary and interest on the money, he would not have made so much out of it. Well, if a man can make anything like $39,000 in addition to paying another $39,000 in dues out of a single limit, he is doing considerable business, and the hon. gentleman has no great complaint as regards the profitableness of his timber investments.

I do not intend to speak at any great length. My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has made out a case with great clearness and considerable trouble, and it is one on which we propose to protest against the policy of the government regarding the timber lands of the Northwest. This question was raised in the House on a previous occasion in the early part of the session. At that time we considered we had sufficient information at hand to demand a searching inquiry into the whole question of the disposal of the timber in that country, and I moved a resolution asking that a committee of nine should be appointed to inquire into the question. I laid down my reasons for making that request in a most categorical way, and looking over these reasons to-day I concluded that they contained nothing whatever on which I should now go back. But since that time a vast amount of additional information has been obtained. Some voluminous reports have been brought down and also a number of original documents for which we fought in a determined way, and we have also some partial inquiry before the Public Accounts Committee. All three sources of information have shown us not merely that we were justified in the statements and suggestions we made when we asked for an inquiry in the earlier part

of the session, but that we have far greater ground for asking for such a committee at this time, and that the reasons for as thorough an investigation into the whole timber business are far greater now even than when the resolution was moved a few months ago.

My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has called attention to many points that have been brought out since that time. He has pointed out that one group had acquired some 1,586 square miles of timber limits. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) has explained that some of these limits are not owned at the present moment by some of the persons in this group who acquired them. Nevertheless the fact remains that they did acquire these timber limits and, as the hon. member for St. Antoine pointed out, if that area could be placed in a continuous strip it would be seen to contain an astounding amount of timber. If you took a train at Montreal on Monday evening and travelled all the way to Vancouver, arriving there on Saturday after travelling over some 2,987 miles, this timber would give a strip more than half a mile broad over the whole of that immense stretch of country and these limits have been selected out of an area many times as great as that. That gives a graphic idea of the immense quantity of timber which has passed from the hands of the government into the hands of that group who are holding it to-day, to a very great extent, for speculative purposes. I speak of them as a group. They are the group who tendered through or by the firm of A. W. Fraser or his law firm of Perkins, Fraser & Burbidge. Then again we have those remarkable coincidences in the way of bids which Mr. Ames has pointed out, and the remarkable success of the member for Dauphin and the company in which he was interested, the Imperial Pulp Company, in the bids they made between 1901 and 1905. The fact that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) is a brother-in-law of the ex-Minister of the Interior and as a member of parliament is the possessor of vast areas in the Northwest which have been acquired from this government, would in itself be matter for some remark, though it would not necessarily mean that there is anything wrong in the acquisition of such limits by a gentleman who is a lumberman as Mr. Burrows is. That being the case I was very much surprised that he did not endorse the proposal that there should be a complete inquiry into the whole matter. But when you consider the peculiar facts which were brought to light in regard to tendering for these various limits by him and by his company, I think there is pretty strong ground for asking for a thorough inquiry into this matter and some ground for suspicion in regard to it. We have found that in the tenders put in, a considerable number of names and aliases have been used.,

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. When the hon. member speaks of a considerable number how many does he mean ?

Mr. LAKE. There are several of them.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. How many ? More than two ?

Mr. LAKE. There is Mr. Nolan, Mr. McBain, Mr. Fraser——

Mr. BURROWS. I told you I had no interest in Mr. McBain's limits.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Do you call these people aliases ?

Mr. LAKE. At any rate I have given two and there is also the Imperial Pulp Company. These have put in tenders, so that there were three at any rate. Mr. Fraser himself has used other names.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. How many other names did he use ?

Mr. LAKE. He used the names of McBain and Nolan.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend think it fair to use the words 'a considerable number' when he can only state one ?

Mr. LAKE. I have stated two at any rate and if the hon. gentleman takes exception to 'a considerable number,' I will say 'more than one.'

Mr. BURROWS. I never was interested in any timber limits or tenders with Mr. Fraser directly or indirectly and am not now.

Mr. LAKE. Of course I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. Has he ever in his own name tendered for the Imperial Pulp Company ?

Mr. BURROWS. In my own name ?

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman does not answer that but he has put in his own cheque in tendering for the Imperial Pulp Company, so I think it may be assumed that he has been one of the tenderers for that company.

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, I have tendered on behalf of the company.

Mr. LAKE. We have the Imperial Pulp Company, Fraser, Nolan and Mr. Burrows. all tendering for the Imperial Pulp Company. I think that in itself shows there is a necessity or ground for inquiry into the whole series of transactions. Then again duplicate tenders have been put in by the hon. member for Dauphin in his own name and in the name of the Imperial Pulp Company of which he is the half owner, as he has told us. In more than one

instance there has been bogus competition, two tenders put in apparently to lead the public to suppose there was competition, when in reality there was no competition at all. As I said, to many of us the Imperial Pulp Company was a matter of mystery for a considerable time and it came quite as a shock to myself and other gentlemen on this side of the House when we heard the member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) in the Public Accounts Committee say that of course he knew and supposed everybody knew that Mr. Burrows was a member of the Imperial Pulp Company. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrows) that I did not know, and, I am sure there were not many people on our side who did know that for a fact.

Mr. BURROWS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) may be interested in companies that I do not know anything about.

Mr. LAKE. Now, in connection with this Imperial Pulp Company there was another very peculiar circumstance, and that was the way the applications were made to have these limits put up. I looked through a few of the applications, and in almost every case it seemed to me the applications were put in by persons who, in some instances—in one, at any rate—did not put in any tender themselves at all. In fact, the persons who tendered for the Imperial Pulp Company seemed to comprise quite a large circle of gentlemen. In two instances the then member for West Assiniboia, Mr. Walter Scott, now the premier of Saskatchewan, made application on behalf of another gentleman to have limits put up for public tender, which were subsequently acquired, on tender, by the Imperial Pulp Company. And it certainly would strike one as a peculiar circumstance that there were gentlemen of such standing who were asking to have these limits put up for public competition. Now, there was another fact which struck me as rather peculiar and somewhat worthy of remark, and that was that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who appeared—if I may so style him—as the chief counsel of the government during the inquiry which took place, and who had inside information, which a considerable number of us, at any rate, did not possess, did everything he could to prevent the inquiry into the tenders in connection with these timber limits. He took up, I think, more than half the first day's session in protesting and arguing the point whether the inquiry should go on upon the lines on which it had been begun. It also struck me as peculiar that, when it came to the crucial point, when we thought we would get information which would settle things one way or the other, he was the one who stepped in and objected that Mr. Finnie should not be called upon to produce certain books. As I have said, it is curious to find that a gentleman who possessed this information was the one to block this inquiry as far as possible. I think the country has a great interest in knowing everything in connection with these matters. Their timber is being disposed of, and they ought to know for what it is being sold and to whom.

Another important matter, and one which has been called attention to by the hon. member for St. Antoine, is the way the tenders were made in blank with cheques inclosed. In the evidence given by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), if I understood him correctly—and I think I did—that hon. gentleman stated that the tenders were opened by him and that he noted the amounts of cheques inclosed in these blank tenders, and that Miss Monro, who was present with him as secretary, made a note of the amount. Let me point out that nothing of these memos. appears in the papers which were laid before the House. I looked at some of the original documents, and I notice that the blank tenders have initials on the margin, but they had not any statement of the amount of the cheques inclosed in them. The statement of the amount of the cheques only appears after the papers have got into the accountant's branch, one or two days later.

Mr. TURRIFF. May I set my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) right? When the papers were down before the Public Accounts Committee I went over a number of these files, and I think I found in every case but one, where the amount had not been stated in the tender, I made a memorandum of the amount.

Mr. LAKE. I went through several of them this morning, and found it the other way. Where the amount was stated in the tender the marginal note restated the amount, but where it was not stated—and there were many cases in which it was not stated in the tender—no amount appeared until it appeared in the handwriting of the assistant accountant or the gentleman who signed for the accountant. What I wish to point out is that in the interval it would be easy to manipulate the cheques after they passed through the hands of the commissioner and before they got to the accountant. It would be interesting to read the remarks made by the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee in regard to the system of tendering which was in vogue in that department when the matter was up for inquiry :

We have given a great deal of latitude because it has been suggested that on account of the form of the tenders there was room for suspicion that cheques might have been supplemented after the tenders were opened. As I understand it that is the suggestion. In some cases the tender does not say the amount of the bonus and the amount is only ascertained by the cheques that are inclosed with the ten-

der. That is not a good way to put in a tender and it leaves it open to that suggestion that there is a possibility that a cheque might be abstracted after the tender was opened or another cheque might be substituted, or something of that sort might be done.

Mr. LANCASTER. Whose language is that?

Mr. LAKE. That is the language of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke), the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. He did not consider it a good system of tendering. But I have pointed out that when these blank tenders came in there were cases in which no memo. was made as to the cheques inclosed, and, even in the one case where mention of the amount had been put in the body of the tender, the memo. was only in pencil and could easily be rubbed out. Nothing appeared on those tenders until they reached the accountant. During that time there was ample opportunity to take some such action as was suggested as possible by the hon. member for South Essex.

Mr. TURRIFF. If the hon. gentleman will allow me ; I think he is perfectly well aware that when I was giving evidence before the committee I stated that I had never opened a tender before twelve o'clock. I have never given out any information about tenders, and I have never received a cheque, or allowed any change or substitution of cheques after the tenders were opened. The remarks of the hon. gentleman are a sort of reflection that something like that could have been done, and I say it was not done.

Mr. LAKE. I made no statement or reflection in regard to that matter. The statement which I make is that tenders were opened by the hon. gentleman and that a certain space of time elapsed after they were opened and the time that the cheques were deposited in the hands of the official accountant of the government. Between these two periods there was room for such action as my hon. friend from South Essex declared to be possible under the circumstances in which these tenders were being dealt with.

Now, I propose to submit a resolution calling for an investigation into the sale of these timber limits, and if the investigation shows that there has been fraud or imposition practised, it says that those timber berths so disposed of shall be revested in the Crown. I will refer to only two cases in regard to which very suspicious circumstances have been shown, limits 1031 and 1048. 1031 was a limit of 118 square miles north-west of Edmonton. It was advertised on the 19th of November and only 40 days were given for inspection. The advertisement mentioned 11 different blocks of land, and they all had to be included in the tender. Protests were put in against the shortness of the time and applications were made for an extension of the time in order to ensure proper competition. Limit 1048 lies some distance to the north of Prince Albert. In this there were 10 blocks of 50 square miles each put up for sale. A very short time was given between the calling for tenders and the date of sale. These blocks had to be selected out of an area of some 7,000 square miles, and this fact alone would make the exploration a matter of absolute impossibility. These limits have been disposed of for a mere song. I consider that in view of the fact that the most strenuous objections were taken to the Prince Albert limits being put up and that a further time was called for by the citizens of Prince Albert by their board of trade and by the municipality and others, there should be a full inquiry into the whole matter, and this House should be put in a position to know why those reasonable protests were disregarded and why the sales went on. I beg to move the following amendment :

That all the words after the word 'that' be eliminated and the following substituted therefor:

This House regrets that the present government has permitted the improvident alienation of immense areas of valuable timber lands which are now held for speculative purposes to the detriment of the people, and records its opinion that such full and unrestricted investigation should be made and such available proceedings taken as may be necessary to revest in the Crown any timber lands in respect of which fraud or imposition has been practised.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). I am sure that every member of this House, with the exception of one or two who affect to take special interest in this matter, must have come to the conclusion that the attempt to discuss this question at the present stage of the session is nothing more than an attempt to resurrect an absolutely dead proposition. Ever since this matter was discussed in January and February the universal verdict of the House and the country was that the masterly addresses of the Minister of Interior and of the ex-Minister of the Interior had entirely disposed of the whole question.

Mr. LANCASTER. How was the verdict unanimous? Was there not a vote?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Well, my hon. friend sometimes votes differently from what he thinks.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman is joking I don't mind that, but if he means it seriously, he will have to take it back.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is not serious if he concludes that there are many members on his side of the House who have not arrived at the conclusion long ere this that nothing in the shape of a

serious argument has been brought forward to-day. Now, Mr. Speaker, following that discussion at that period of the session we had an investigation before the Public Accounts Committee of these fantastic theories and these unnatural insinuations. That investigation went to the point that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, became almost hysterical in his desire to have it stopped. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), who has just sat down, in alluding to me as having acted for the government before that committee, made a reference that was entirely unwarranted. His colleague, the hon. member for St. Antoine, took advantage of the fact that I, as a humble member of that committee, happened to be out of the committee one day to move that all proceedings should be closed and reported to the House when he himself had four or five witnesses subpœnaed who were still outstanding and whose evidence had not been taken. I leave it to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) whether or not in his experience in legal matters or in investigations of any kind it is usual that the gentleman who is initiating the proceedings, who is acting for the plaintiff, who is given every opportunity in the way of documents and evidence, asks that the proceeding be terminated in such a way.

Mr. LANCASTER. Since the hon. gentleman has appealed to me, we all know that the hon. member for St. Antoine could not discuss the matter in the House until a report was made by the committee. I think the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) knows that that was his sole and only reason for wanting the matter closed. It was that it could be debated on the floor of the House. We all understand that anyway.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is very ingenious. He is always ingenious. What I thought that the hon. member for St. Antoine wanted was not to have a discussion in the House, but was to have an investigation and when he had an opportunity of having an investigation he tried to stop it. Then, after this peculiar proceeding before the investigating committee my hon. friend attempts to resurrect this dead and buried question and after the statement made by my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) to-night and after the last vestige of the possibility of insinuation has been swept away, I think my hon. friend ought to do the candid, the fair, the honourable thing and stand up in this House and say that he was entirely unwarranted and unjustified in making the assertions that he did make. Why? My hon. friend very judiciously and insinuatingly couples together the question of the policy of dealing with timber lands and the question of whether or not the regulations made by the department with regard to the letting of these lands by public competition have been complied with and he asks us to talk about the improvident alienation of the immense areas of valuable timber lands. I do not think that the hon. member for St. Antoine wrote this resolution. While he is an adept at insinuation and while he possesses the quality of being able to distort language yet he is not an adept in the use of adjectives. Some hon. gentlemen whose idea of forming resolutions runs usually along the line of superlatives has been drafted for this occasion in order to write this resolution on the 'improvident alienation of immense areas of valuable timber limits to the detriment of the people.' My hon. friend from St. Antoine has been talking about this question so much that he has probably persuaded himself and, of course, judging from the remarks of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle and the peculiar opinion he has as to what went on in the Public Accounts Committee, he has evidently managed to persuade him that there is something to be said for his position.

Mr. LAKE. I was present during the whole of the investigation at the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. All I have to say to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle is that either his hearing or his judgment is bad.

Mr. LAKE. It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Whether the hon. member for St Antoine has persuaded the hon. member for Qu'Appelle upon this question, he, at least, wishes again to exploit in this House the peculiar statements that he has been making in the country and in regard to which, in the short time at my disposal, I hope to be able to show that the hon. member for St. Antoine has been deliberately misleading the people of this country.

Let us pass to the consideration of the question as to whether or not the proper policy has been in operation down to 1907 in dealing with the timber lands of the Northwest. Of course my hon. friend would like the people to forget altogether the fact that the policy of dealing with the timber lands of the Northwest was a policy adopted by his party in 1894 and followed exactly along the same lines down to 1907. Of course my hon. friend takes absolute care to suppress the fact before the people of the country that every one of the things which he says should be done in regard to the policy in dealing with these timber lands was accomplished and put into effect months before he spoke in this House by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). My hon. friend, in an adroit manipulation of the facts and conditions which were the basis of his speech, suppresses, while speaking all over the country and even in this House

the fact that these timber lands of such immense value are being exploited by the department in the interest of the treasury of this country and are not being given away to speculators. All the theories which he advanced as to how the latter result could be avoided were brought into effect by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior months before he ever discussed this question in the House.

Now, coming to the question as to whether there was a proper compliance with the regulations and as to whether every one was treated fairly in the disposal of these limits by the Department of the Interior, I apprehend that it is as to this subject upon which my hon. friend would allege that there should be an investigation. That is an investigation which he knew, there was no way of having and which he never expected to get when he addressed the House. We had a full and complete investigation upon this subject. Let me call your attention to what has taken place.

After the discussion in this House in the latter part of January my hon. friend went to the Public Accounts Committee and, on February 7, he moved for all the papers relating to payments on account of rental first made by R. E. McCracken, second, by W. Anderson, third, by Perkins, Fraser and Gibson, made in 1907 in the Winnipeg district, fourth, by Charles R. Smith and fifth, by Herman Finger.

On the first day he moved that the original documents in connection with all these payments should be brought down. This original document question is one that vexes the soul of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. If my hon. friend was in the Public Accounts Committee and I think he was there, he ought to have known and he must have known that there never was a time during this or any other session of this parliament at which original documents moved for in the Public Accounts Committee by any hon. gentleman were not at once produced and brought before that committee for inspection. So that, when the hon. gentleman talks about the long and weary effort to get original documents he ought to know this fact now that there never was a time in this or any other parliament when original documents moved for in the committee were not produced before that committee. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, got them. He moved for them on February 7.

On February 13, what did he do? He moved for further documents regarding payments made by Perkins, Fraser and Gibson, in the Prince Albert district in addition to the Edmonton district, regarding payments made by William Cowan, by the Big River Lumber Company by John McBain, by Perkins, Fraser and Gibson in the Calgary district and by T. A. Burrows. No less than twelve large files moved for by the hon. gentleman on these two days were brought over to the Public Accounts Committee and inspected by him with his miscroscopic and photographic machines and all the paraphernalia which he has. They were thoroughly and fully investigated. What followed? We have heard talk about attempts at obstruction by the chairman. Did my hon. friend come to the Public Accounts Committee and say: I desire to go into an investigation of these papers with a view of showing this substantive wrong-dong on the part of any hon. gentleman or on the part of the administration. No. On the contrary he said: I want to be permitted to go back to the original advertisement and tenders in order that I may show that the amount paid by the lessee to the government in the way of rental was not the amount that ought to be paid according to the original tender.

Mr. AMES. Has the hon. gentleman any proof of that statement?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Yes, that will be found in the very first day's proceedings and every hon. gentleman who belongs to the committee knows it, and the chairman of that committee permitted my hon. friend to go back to the original tender and the original advertisement and to the last shred of every document in every one of these files.

Mr. AMES. Which is far more than you would have done if you could prevent it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. This afternoon the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) abused the chairman of that committee because he did not rule according to his view, but now he admits that the chairman of the committee permitted him to go back to the very last document and the very last file.

And now as to this talk of obstruction which the Conservative press indulges in at the suggestion of hon. gentlemen in this House in reference to myself and other members of that committee who are endeavouring to see that parliamentary usage and rule is observed, and that there should be some regard for the traditions not only of this parliament, but the traditions of the mother of parliaments as well. We are accused of obstruction because forsooth we want to see parliamentary usage followed and because we venture to suggest that irrelevant questions which do not relate to the matter before the committee should not be allowed. But let us remember that when there was a question as to whether two cheques or three cheques inclosed with the tender was suspicious, and when it was sought to show that if this absurd insinuation was to tell against the hon. member for Dauphin it was an insinuation that should be made against most of the other people who tendered; when it was sought to prove this very relevant fact it was the member for

St. Antoine and those associated with him in the committee who were the obstructionists.

Mr. AMES. Will you allow me to make one statement? I want to set you perfectly right in that respect. Never has there been the slightest objection on our side of the House to Mr. Burrows going into the box if he wanted to. You could have called him any time you wished. It was not our business to call him and we did not call him. We never obstructed or objected to any thing.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is now referring to a point which I have not yet mentioned, but I will discuss the singular unwillingness of my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) to not only call Mr. Burrows but several other people whom he knew were in possession of all the evidence and whom he did not call because he did not want to prove the truth.

Mr. AMES. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it right to say that I did not want the truth to come out?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is a suggestion the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) should not make.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I want to observe the rules of this House to the fullest possible extent, and while I do not want to discuss your decision, Mr. Speaker, and while I shall gladly withdraw anything you think is improper, I must say that I have sat here and heard some hon. gentlemen opposite make use of language in regard to the ministers we follow and with regard to those with whom we are associated (and whom we know to be just as good as they are) which would not seem under that ruling to be parliamentary. In a case like this we are dealing with a tissue of absolute insinuations and nothing else, and I desire to characterize the conduct of some hon. gentlemen opposite in this respect in as plain and clear and definite language as possible, and to treat this question as it is and this story as it is. I want to say that when I hear some hon. gentlemen opposite and when I see the Conservative press of this country describing myself and those associated with me as being obstructionists, I resent any such imputation.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand that the expression objected to is withdrawn?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend had better wait.

Mr. LAKE. Withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. The suggestion has been made that the hon. gentleman for St. Antoine did not want the truth. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) has taken objection to that and I think it is a statement which should be withdrawn.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. With all due deference to you, Mr. Speaker, suppose I said that the hon. member for St. Antoine did not want the country to get the truth that is a statement which I believe is absolutely in order and which I am also sure is absolutely correct.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That imputation as to my motives in the matter should not be made.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I shall also have to rule that the amended suggestion is an imputation which an hon. member should not make in reference to another hon. member.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Of course, in deference to your ruling I take back the proposition as it is understood by you, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HENDERSON. Don't qualify it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Now that my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) has interrupted I will go on with my remarks.

Mr. AMES. Has he taken it back, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the expression has been withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Take your medicine; it's a little bitter.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. While I want to keep within parliamentary rules, Mr. Speaker, yet when I see the good name of hon. gentlemen who sit around me defamed I am inclined to think that the language I have used was not in contravention of the rules of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I believe that in dealing with this question I have a perfect right to deal with it in the broadest possible way because it is only in the broadest possible way that it can be discussed. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is the first occasion since I have had the honour to sit in this House that you have had occasion to direct my attention to any utterance not strictly parliamentary but such has been the line of conduct pursued against my hon. friends here that the offence calls for special treatment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what were the subjects we had before that committee? I have told you of the different papers that were moved for and that were there to be investigated. Here is a list of files on which were based the imputations made in regard to my hon. friend from Dauphin—the files which relate to berths 1281, 1282, 1118, 1119, 1122, 1031, 1052, 1058, 1068, 1097, 1098, 1108 and 1048. Well, in regard to berth 1281 it

was discovered that the highest tenderer for that berth was Mr. O. A. Robertson whose tender was $5,195, and the next highest was Mr. D. M. Finnie, tendering for Mr. Burrows at $5,000, and the next tender was $4.013. Mr. O. A. Robertson's tender was only $195 higher than Mr. Burrows' tender, and Mr. Robertson got the berth, and although Mr. Burrows had been in regard to other tenders $400 and $500 higher than the gentleman who was next to him, and although that in the mind of my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) was a cause for deep suspicion, yet because Mr. O. A. Robertson was only $195 more than Mr. Burrows and got the berth we never heard anything more from my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) about berth No. 1281. It was dropped out of mind altogether, no witnesses were examined, no analysis of envelopes and of red ink or black ink. There was no Sherlock Holmes business indulged in by the hon. member for St. Antoine. Indeed, the difference between my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) and Sherlock Holmes is that the hon. gentleman always draws wrong conclusions whereas Sherlock Holmes always seemed to draw right conclusions. My hon. friend did not exhaust much of his energy on berths 1281 and 1282, because he found that Mr. O. A. Robertson again had bought these and Mr. Burrows had not tendered for the latter, and therefore it was not possible to find any evidence in that connection which could be possibly tortured into some possible connection with the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) either through relationship or other cause.

But with regard to eleven berths we did hear something. He summoned Franz Loyer, P. Robertson, G. U. Kyley, D. M. Finnie. Mr. A. W. Fraser he summoned twice. On March 3rd he subpoenaed Mr. Hector Macdonald, Mr. C. H. Beddoe, Mr. R. A. Campbell. On March 6th he summoned Mr. R. R. Pattinson. On the 11th he subpœnaed Mr. Greenway, Sir Daniel McMillan, and later he got after Fraser again and again subpœnaed him, and also D. M. Finnie on two separate occasions. That made thirteen witnesses.

An hon. MEMBER. At whose expense?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. At the expense of the country, of course ; and if the number of the witnesses be a fair indication, the case is an unlucky one for its sponsor. That fatal number was significant of its collapse. My hon. friend who is so anxious for an investigation that he even gets the hon. member for Qu'Appelle to move a resolution for further inquiry, what did he do when he had every opportunity to investigate? Why, he only examined six of those witnesses. On the 7th of March Mr. Fraser, after he had been hanging around a day and a-half waiting to be called, was told to go away either by the hon. member for St. Antoine or one of his friends. He was told that they would not have him at all. He was not asked to give a word of evidence about the Nolan tender or the $7,000 being inserted in different ink, whether that was done by Fraser or somebody else. After Mr. Fraser had been subpœnaed no less than four different times, and after he had come there and been in waiting on the committee, my hon. friend or some one for him told him to go away, that they did not want him at all, and we would have never heard his testimony if my hon. friend for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) had not moved in the matter, and called him to the stand.

Mr. AMES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to say what would have happened in that case. He has no right to say that I would never have called Mr. Fraser. He has no right to intimate what I would or would not do.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend is serious about that proposition, I do not think it is wise on his part. Why did he not apply the same rule to himself this afternoon when he was insinuating anything and everything under the sun?

Mr. SPEAKER. I can hardly see that in this case there is any insinuation.

Mr. LAKE. I ask your ruling, Sir, as to whether the hon. member is correct in constantly accusing my hon. hon. friend from St. Antoine of insinuations. He accused him constantly of insinuating against hon. gentlemen on that side.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can hardly apply the rule unless a concrete case is put before me.

Mr. LAKE. That was the case.

Mr. SPEAKER. If, when a case comes up, the point is taken, I shall endeavour to rule upon it, but can hardly rule upon some general statements.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I was referring to the fact that we would not have had Mr. Fraser's evidence unless some hon. gentleman not associated with the hon. member for St. Antoine had insisted upon his going on the stand. Nor did the hon. gentleman put Mr. Loyer or Mr. Robertson on the stand. He or some of his friends pledged their word that these witnesses could give important evidence or the subpœnas for them could not have been issued. They did the same with regard to Mr. Hector McDonald and Mr. C. A. Beddoe and Mr. Fraser. Mr. McDonald was one of the gentlemen who had tendered on this timber limit No 1031 we have heard so much about. That was the limit concerning which we had the theory put forward by the hon. gentleman that Mr. Burrows had put

in an additional cheque of some $14,000 to the cheque first given in order to cut McDonald out. The hon. gentleman had subpœnaed Mr. McDonald, but although the latter was in attendance from day to day, waiting to be called, he was not asked to give evidence. Neither was Mr. Beddoe put in the box. The hon. gentleman had also a subpœna served on Mr. Pattinson, of Winnipeg, the secretary of the Imperial Pulp Company, and he received a telegram from Mr. Pattinson stating there was illness in his family and his examination would have to be deferred until a certain date, but my hon. friend, at the time indicated by Mr. Pattinson, did not take the slightest interest about his coming, but tried to get the investigation closed, and put up an attack on myself and gentlemen associated with me in that committee as being obstructionists, because we stood in his path and prevented him from closing the investigation. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), whose soul was yearning for information with regard to the Imperial Pulp Company, did not push for the examination of Mr. Pattinson. That was very surprising. One would have thought these gentlemen would have pressed for the examination of Mr. Pattinson, but they did nothing of the kind, and Mr. Pattinson never was called.

Then when it was discovered that Fraser's examination disclosed frankly, without the slightest reservation, who the membres of the Imperial Pulp Company were, and that there had never been any doubts about it except in the imagination of some hon. gentlemen opposite, these gentlemen who were talking so much about subpœnaing my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), never called upon him to give evidence. What then occurred? One would have thought that if the hon. gentlemen were honestly carrying on an investigation into the management of the Department of the Interior down to a period anterior to 1907, the first man he would have called as a witness would have been my hon. friend. But what actually took place ? The committee met on March 5 and 6, and, no request was made to call him. On March 13, at the next meeting of the committee, my hon. friend asked to be called. At that time we were sailing along under innuendoes and all kind of peculiar constructions, and things were going rather swimmingly for my hon. friend, The hon. member for Dauphin, seeing that there was no indication of calling him, said that as his name had been mentioned several times in this connection, that as prejudicial inferences had been drawn, he would like to be heard. What did the hon. member for St. Antoine, who wanted this investigation so badly say? He said nothing. He never once suggested that he wanted to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff). On the next meeting of the committee, March 19, Mr. Turriff said :

I desire to say that during one of the previous sittings of the committee, Mr. Ames tried to prove by Mr. Ryley, when he was on the stand, that I opened the tenders for these timber limits in secret. I have been here every day expecting Mr. Ames to call me. If he wanted to get the truth, why did he not ask for me to be called? I was not called at the last meeting although I asked to be. I have come here again to-day and I am prepared to come at any time and give evidence under oath and be cross-examined. I have nothing to hide or to be afraid or ashamed of.

If the hon. member wanted to get the truth why did he not ask that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) be called ? Here is the hon. gentleman who wants an investigation. Why, when his soul was yearning for this truth which he wanted so much and he had the gentleman at hand to go on the witness stand, why did he not ask for him to be called ? Mr. Turriff stated that he was not called at the last meeting although he had asked to be. He invited the fullest examination saying that he had nothing to be ashamed of or afraid of. Would you believe it that my hon. friend still failed to yield to the insistent requests of my hon. friend from the west ? It was not until the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) moved in committee on the 19th day of March that Mr. Turriff be summoned to appear before it that we were able to hear Mr. Turriff's evidence. We had a right to expect that my hon. friend who was pushing this investigation and was so anxious to have it, would have called that hon. gentleman, but he did not do so. Then in regard to Mr. Burrows who know all about the pulp company, as my hon. friend was aware, because Mr. Fraser had told us who were the members of the company,

I was surprised that my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) did not insist on Mr. Burrows being called. I had suggested several times to the hon. gentleman for St. Antoine division that if he wanted information in regard to these matters he should call Mr. Burrows, but we could not coax the hon. member to call Mr. Burrows, he did not want to hear the story, he was perfectly willing to let all this distortion in regard to envelopes and red and black ink and peculiar dates and alleged difficulties in documents and all that sort of thing to go to the country without explanation. He did not want it and did not have it, but he stood up here to-day, after telling us that the hon. gentleman who was chairman of that committee was eminently fair and gave the fullest opportunity for investigation, and complained that he did not get fair treatment in regard to the question of the examination of Mr. Finnie upon the cheques. What were the facts ? Mr.

Finnie is manager of the Bank of Ottawa in this city. He said that certain cheques had been issued by him as manager, in place of cheques given by Mr. Burrows. Certain of these cheques were in the bank and they were produced in the committee and given to the committee. As regards the other cheques they were in the possession of Mr. Burrows, being his property and having been handed over to him. We suggested that all they had to do was to call Mr. Burrows and they could obtain the cheques. Mr. Burrows produced them here to-day during this discussion and gave my hon. friends a chance to look at them, but they did not want them ; they saw that they were on the wrong side of the story and that they could not make out their case. My hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) found that the wiser heads around him, the older and shrewder and calmer and perhaps fairer men of his party who had watched the proceedings in the committee, the men who wanted to give a semblance of fair play to decent people in the country and had heard the evidence, told my hon. friend just where he stood and that it was about time to drop this business. Ever since then, instead of my hon. friend wanting investigation, he has done the best he could to prevent investigation all over the country. Even to-night in regard to this resolution we have a most peculiar situation. Mr. Ames is asking for an investigation when, with all the original documents before him and with six or seven witnesses whom he did not call and with power to subpœna any witness in the country, he had run away from the chance to investigate the matter in the committee. Is it any wonder that I should use language that may be deemed to be trespassing on the rules of debate, is it any wonder that I should say to you that I doubt the sincerity of my hon. friend in this matter?

My hon. friend went down to Nova Scotia a few weeks ago and held two meetings there, one on Saturday and one on Sunday afternoon. My hon. friend's Sunday afternoon address was delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association in the city of Halifax, and what was his subject? Hon. members of the Public Accounts Committee on both sides of the House away down in their hearts, even the hon. gentlemen who sit around my hon. friend, will, I am sure, be surprised at the title which my hon. friend took for his speech that Sabbath day. The subject was 'Fair Play.' He went on to speak about fair play in sport, business and politics, and here is a surprising statement to come from my hon. friend in view of my hon. friend's course in this matter both in and outside of the House. He is reported as saying :

> That there was nothing in public life to make him lay aside the principles for which Christianity stands.

Now, I hope that every hon. gentleman in this House stands for the principles for which Christianity stands, and I do not think my hon. friend should have found it necessary to have suggested the possibility of a different attitude on the part of any member of this House. He went on :

> If democratic government is worth anything we must see that the maximum of opportunity is given and unless fair play is recognized this cannot be.—Fair play, respect for ourselves and for the other men.

Just think of that, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) honestly, in his heart of hearts, feels that this man who sits in this parliament as the member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) who went up to the Northwest land when it cost something to be a pioneer, who went up there and grew up with the country, grew up with it honestly, grew up with it along legitimate lines, developing proper business conditions, until he reached a position where he received the confidence of the people and was elected as their representative first in provincial politics and subsequently in the broader arena here—I wonder if, following the principles my hon. friend enunciated in Halifax, he in his heart of hearts feels that he was giving fair play to Mr. Burrows.

> Fair play, respect for ourselves and for other men is a fundamental principle which must be observed in the interests of our country.

I agree with that doctrine ; I agree that unless we have fair play all around in politics it will be very bad for the interests of this country, and I know that there is a good old Golden Rule, one which should always guide our actions in politics or anything else, that we should do unto others as we would they should do unto us, and I am in the judgment of this House and of any hon. gentleman who is familiar with this subject whether without being in anywise unfair to my hon. friend, there has been an exemplification of those Christian principles which some of us are not so loud in proclaiming from the house tops but perhaps observe as well as he does, or an exemplification of the principles of that Golden Rule or that fair consideration of the rights and position and good name and fair name of hon. members of this House who have been wantonly attacked and insinuated against by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames). Nineteen hundred years ago there were men going up and down the country who thanked God that they were not as other men were and they received their just rebuke from the great Teacher who came to lead us all along the way we should go and in the land from which my forefathers came the poet of our race has sung of 'Holy Willie' and his prayers. I want to say in the light of the evidence I am going to endeavour to pre-

sent to you that we have to-day in this twentieth century some people who bear a strong resemblance to these men who lived in the olden days.

Now, my hon. friend, speaking at Halifax, endeavoured to lead the people of the province of Nova Scotia to believe that there were not to-day upon the statute-books of this country fair and proper regulations in regard to the disposition of timber limits. Why did not my hon. friend tell his Halifax audience about the regulations made by the Minister of the Interior last December? Why did not he tell them that the Minister of the Interior, even before he (Mr. Ames) had said a word in this House upon this question, had provided for preliminary investigation and survey before timber limits were put up for sale, had provided for reports to be kept in the department, had provided for sales by auction, had provided for the compulsory establishment of mills and in the event of non-compliance the cancellation of the leases? If he was so strong an advocate of fair play, why did he not tell the people of Nova Scotia all this?

But what did he tell the people of my province? He told them that over 6,500 square miles of timber had been granted by this government. Whereas, I find, at page 2271 of 'Hansard' that he said that 1,840 square miles had been leased previously to 1896—that is, there were only 4,562 square miles of timber to be charged to this government according to his own statement on record in 'Hansard' in this House. But he came down to the province of Nova Scotia, and, in the city of Halifax, told the people that the quantity granted by this government was 6,500 square miles, which was 1,938 square miles out of the way and to that extent incorrect. Was that fair play to this government? Was that fair play to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton)? Was it fair play to the people of Nova Scotia?

And, if he so strongly desires fair play, why did he not tell the people that there are to-day in Ontario and Quebec men belonging to his own political party who own in their own right individually more square miles of timber than have been granted by this government since it came into power in 1896? Would not you think, Mr. Speaker, that a gentleman who enunciated these glorious principles—principles to which no one will take exception—should be the first to stand by them and should be most careful that there should be no departure in his statements from that accuracy which we have a right to expect from a public man? He did not tell the people that we have in Nova Scotia, in the person of Mr. T. G. McMullen, a Conservative and a former member of the local legislature, a man who is said to own in his own right 150,000 acres of land, not by lease, but by absolute title. And my hon. friend knows, when he was talking about this 6,500 square miles of timber limits that he was astray to the extent of 1,938 square miles. He knew, when he was telling the people of Nova Scotia of the alleged enormity of the grants in the Northwest, that there were in his own province of Quebec men who own timber lands equal in extent to all this aggregate of grants by this government of which he was speaking.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman in order in saying I knew I was leading the people astray?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) said that the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) said that he knew he was leading the people astray, that would be an unparliamentary expression.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I simply assumed that my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) knew what he was saying——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. If he did not know what he was saying, then there is nothing more to be said about it. And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that is the most charitable view to take of it—that he did not know what he was saying.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) used the expression that it has been suggested he used, or not. If he did, I think that expression exceeds the bounds of parliamentary discussion, and, of course, should be withdrawn.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am very much surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the objection taken by my hon. friend. I ventured to make the statement that my hon. friend had said in Nova Scotia that 6,500 square miles of timber had been granted by this government, though he knew at the time that there were men in Ontario and Quebec who held timber of an area equal to that—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Unless my hon. friend wants to take the position that he did not know what he was talking about, I do not understand the point he is now raising.

Mr. LENNOX. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) did say—I think he will agree that I understood him correctly—was that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) made the statement he knew that he was representing the leases by this government to be 1,938 square miles more than they actually were. He ought to take that back.

Mr. LAKE. I understood the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to state that the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) made a statement which he knew to be untrue.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Not at all. Mr. Speaker, I want to keep myself right, and I bow to your suggestion that I should take back any expression I may have used that is an infraction of the Rules of the House. My only desire is to discuss the material before me. My comment was based on the statement of the hon. member as it appeared in 'Hansard' and what I have under my hand as representing what he stated in the city of Halifax. When he spoke in Nova Scotia he attempted to give the impression to the people that this quantity of land had been given away by this government covering all the timber lands to be found in the Northwest Territories. There is no question about that. I am not going to take up time quoting the statements he made ; I simply say that he endeavoured to convey the impression to the people of my province that this government, since 1896, had given away all the available timber land found in the Northwest countr. If I am not stating a correct conception of my hon. friend's language, I speak subject to correction. My hon. friend knew that that was the idea he was attempting to put forth, and also knew that the superintendent of forestry had been discussing that question not so very long before and had reported that, over and above the timber land granted, there remained 722,578 square miles of timber in the Northwest country and that of this 130,000 square miles were of the very best timber land. That is even making allowance for all the small timber, the scrub and that fit only for pulp and other purposes of that kind, there still remains 130,000 square miles of the best timber lands, after allowing for every foot of land granted not only by this government since 1896 but also by every government since 1867. Yet my hon. friend, not only there but all up and down this country, attempted to show that this government had wasted the timber lands of the Northwest, and had given away to political favourites all the available timber lands ; and he sympathized with the poor settler, because when he goes now to the Northwest he finds there is no timber, it has all been given away to Mr. Burrows. Now was my hon. friend carrying out the golden rule, was he playing the game fair when he attempted to lead the people of Nova Scotia to believe that there was no available timber land in the Northwest to-day owing to the action of this government, whereas he knew that not one-thirtieth of the total available timber lands in the Northwest had been affected by all the grants made by this government ?

Then he attempted to lead the people of Nova Scotia to believe that these lands, which he said had been given away, had passed into the absolute ownership of Mr. Burrows and his friends for all time. I will quote what he said :

> Often times he was the only tenderer. At other times several offers for paltry sums would be received, but as a rule the man who wanted a berth though a form of public competition was gone through with, would secure the limit at his own price, and once having obtained it he was practically the owner for ever.

Mr. AMES. I say that statement is absolutely true.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. He wanted the people of my province to run away with the idea that every one of these 6,500 square miles of land had gone to Mr. Burrows and his associates and had become their property and the property of their heirs and assigns for ever. Now what are the facts? My hon. friend knows that they were not the owners in fee simple of the land, they were only tenants. He knows, but he did not tell the people of Nova Scotia, that over and above any possible bonus that might be paid in public competition every man who had received timber lands from this government since 1896 was bound to pay $5 per square mile for ground rent, and had to pay it annually ; not only that, but the lease runs from year to year, it was not even a twenty-one years lease, but was a yearly lease, and could only be renewed from year to year by compliance with all the regulations which were contained in the lease granted by the government. He did not tell the people that every man who had a timber limit was obliged to cut lumber upon it and to pay to the government fees, under the provisions of section 20 of the regulations for sawn lumber fifty cents per thousand feet board measure. Railway ties 8 feet long one and one half cents each. Railway ties nine feet long one and three quarter cents each. Shingle bolts twenty-five cents per cord and five per cent on the sale of all other products of the berth. In addition to that, there were provisions in regard to putting up a mill which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior attended to last year by giving notice to the holders of limits requiring them to put up a mill. In face of all this, what possible grounds had my hon. friend, this apostle of the gospel of fair-play, to tell the people of Nova Scotia that when a man got a lease from year to year of timber limits he practically became the owner for ever ?

Mr. AMES. So long as there was merchantable timber upon it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. According to the regulations made by the department a lease can be cancelled whenever the government sees fit, if the conditions are not performed under which the lease is held.

My hon. friend wished to lead the people of Nova Scotia to believe that all these gentlemen owned in fee simple for themselves, their heirs and assigns for ever, these 6,500 square miles of land that had been given away by this government.

Mr. AMES. Absolutely untrue, for I showed them the form of the lease.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman characterizes a statement made by my hon. friend from Pictou as absolutely untrue. His words are equally objectionable to those that he has complained of himself.

Mr. AMES. I say that the member for Pictou was misinformed, inasmuch as I showed the people the very form of the regulation.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that he takes back his previous statement.

Mr. AMES. Certainly.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am glad to see that my hon. friend is willing to take back something that is palpably wrong. Again, my hon. friend told the people down in Nova Scotia that thirty per cent of the transactions were legitimate, that twenty per cent of the lease holders were reserve men, and fifty per cent were speculators. Of course these are figures he has made up himself, he has no data whatever to back them up. He has never given to this House any list of the people whom he put down in the class of speculators, or as reserve holders, or whom he put down as honest lumbermen. This is a pure figment of his imagination. And to show how ridiculous his position is let me quote what he says again :

> Foremost among these speculators is T. A. Burrows, M.P., the brother-in-law of the Hon. Clifford Sifton, who, in his own name, and as a member of various companies owns or controls nearly 1,600 square miles, or twenty-five per cent of all the timber under lease in three provinces.

Now I think that the hon. gentleman owes the amende honorable to my hon. friend from Dauphin, in view of the latter's positive statement to-night that he does not own 1,600 square miles of timber limits, but only 640. I hope that the hon. gentleman will do the square thing by my hon. friend from Dauphin. When he attempted to show that Mr. Burrows has been speculating in land he was doing something that he knew was not fair, he knew that he was not playing the game fair ; because I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, whether, in view of Mr. Burrow's record as he has given it to us to-night, going out into the Northwest as a pioneer, spending his whole life in the lumber business, growing up with the country, he is open to the insinuation of the hon. gentleman that Mr. Burrows is not a bona fide operator in timber limits. This is the impression that he wanted the people of Nova Scotia to get from his remarks because the hon. gentleman did not want to tell the people there that Mr. Burrows was one of the largest operators in timber limits.

Mr. AMES. I did.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I have the report of the hon. gentleman's utterances in the Halifax ' Herald '.

Mr. AMES. I have the lantern slide that I showed.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. You have the lantern slide?

Mr. AMES. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Bring them on.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am afraid that the dignity of parliament would hardly permit of an exhibition of this kind. But the point I wanted to make was this, that the official organ of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia says that foremost amongst these speculators was T. A. Burrows, who we here and the people of Manitoba know to be the mill owner, the mill operator, the man whose men did the cutting upon these limits to supply his mills. That is the type of man the member of Dauphin is. But the member of St. Antoine described him as T. A. Burrows, brother-in-law of the Hon. Clifford Sifton, the man who got these limits when he had no right to get them and the man who got these limits not as a mill man but as a speculator.

Mr. AMES. How about 1048?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. We had a curious exhibition with regard to 1048. My hon. friend produced a letter presumably from some one in the Northwest Territories telling us about the price at which lumber was selling and his informant turned out to be not a man from the Northwest but a young man from Amherst, Cumberland County, Nova Scotia, who happens to be the Conservative candidate there and who knows no more about timber lands in the Northwest than my hon. friend knows about some of the people in Nova Scotia. My hon. friend talks about giving authority in making statements. My hon. friend's conduct to-night in regard to that question is a fair indication of how much reliance we can put upon some of the statements and suggestions put forward on this subject.

Mr. AMES. The Red Deer Lumber Company is made up of a number of people from Amherst, N.S. Even the people of Nova Scotia are interested in these timber limits, and if a company is formed and if the stockholders are there are they not in a position to say what they have paid for lumber?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. If it had not been for the suggestion of my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Harty) that the letter

had better be read and the name of the gentleman who wrote the letter had better be given, the hon. member for St. Antoine would have allowed this House to get away with the idea that some expert lumberman in the Northwest had written that letter. I say that my hon. friend's conduct upon this subject was characteristic of and in keeping with his whole conduct in the discussion of this question. My hon. friend had no right to characterize Mr. Burrows as being a speculator. If my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) is not a bona fide lumberman in this country I would like to know where you are going to find them and it was a matter of pure malevolence on the part of the hon. member for St. Antoine that he should have gone down to Nova Scotia where Mr. Burrows was not known and, instead of playing the game fairly and telling the people that Mr. Burrows was one of the foremost lumber operators in the Northwest, he entirely suppressed that fact and told the people of Nova Scotia that he was not a bona fide operator, but a speculator.

Mr. AMES. I told them about every square mile over which Mr. Burrows had cut a stick of timber and the quantity.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I must not keep the House at this late hour, but this is a subject that perhaps had better be threshed out. I have dealt with the way in which my hon. friend exemplifies the principles of fair-play.

One of his charges is the making of leases with fictitious persons and this idea of fictitious persons seem also to have got into the head of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. I think my hon. friend has hardly got over the wrong impressions that some people get on coming out from the old country. I am afraid that he requires to be educated along certain lines yet. He has been travelling in bad company, because if he had not he would not have given to this House, the peculiar impressions he did give with reference to what took place in the Public Accounts Committee. He told us that there was a considerable number of fictitious persons. I always understood that when you spoke of fictitious persons you had reference to persons who did not exist.

Mr. LAKE. I do not think I used the word 'fictitious,' I used the word 'aliases.'

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Well, we will take that. My hon. friend has got into a worse hole because he must know that when we speak of a man using an alias we refer to an existent person using the name of another person who is or is not existent.

Mr. LAKE. I merely wanted to correct the hon. gentleman.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is welcome to any correction that he thinks he has made in that regard. I am afraid that he is getting into the mire a little farther. He will have to get away from the influences that surround him because, while I regard my hon. friend as being sincerely desirous of doing that which is right, I think he gets off pretty often. My hon. friend got the idea from the hon. member for St. Antoine about the fictitious persons. The delightfully natural way in which the hon. member for St. Antoine insinuates and suggests and makes innuendoes of a most improper character is found at page 47 of the Minutes when we were discussing the question of evidence. Mr. Ames says :

I want to prove the facts—you have finished with what is on the margin of that bid, have you Mr. Campbell?

Mr. Campbell says :

I have answered all the questions I was asked.

The discussion went on and then Mr. Ames said:

Supposing John McBain never wrote that bid at all, supposing he is a fictitious person altogether?

The chairman says :

That does not make any difference so far as this inquiry is concerned. The money has been paid, that is the question we are investigating.

Mr. AMES. The question is, was the government making leases with fictitious persons?

I believe that the hon. member for St. Antoine thought, down to a short time ago, because with that naturally suspicious mind of his, he is certain to go wrong, that the government had made leases with fictitious persons. How in the world does he imagine that the Minister of the Interior was going to avoid giving a lease to a man who came in, no matter what name he used and paid his money, he being the highest bidder at the sale ? I would like to know how my hon. friend would be held responsible if any person came along at an auction and bid or had some one else bid for them. But my hon. friend suggests that this government were making leases with fictitious persons though he knows now they did not. My hon. friend went down to Halifax and misled them there upon this subject although he knew days before that it was sworn to by Mr. Fraser in answer to a question by myself, because I felt that the hon. member for St. Antoine ought to be corrected and that that terrible body of suspicion ought to be removed from his mind, that Mr. McBain was not a fictitious person. I asked the question : Who is John McBain ? Mr. Fraser said upon oath :

John McBain is a millwright and contractor by occupation, and for some time previous and at that time had been carrying on building operations and real estate in the city of Ottawa in which he and I were interested.

So that he was not a fictitious person after all, nor an alias either.

We have heard a good deal about the tenders being in irregular form, and it is said that because the tenders were not on the regular form of the department there should be investigation. Now, it appears to me that if a man were going about the task of misleading the department, and if he could get a printed form of tender, is it not common sense that the man who was going to do wrong would take the proper form to do it on? He might want to juggle with the amount, but what sense there would be in writing informal tenders if he wanted to do wrong is more than I can conceive. Any one who takes the trouble to think must come to the conclusion that any such inference as the hon. member (Mr. Ames) draws from that is so absolutely foreign to what a sane business man would suggest that it is impossible for me to imagine how my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) could put such an idea forth. Here is the proposition he lays down : A brother-in-law of the minister wants to get a timber limit and he wants to get it through connivance with an official in the department and instead of writing out his tender upon the printed form and leaving the name blank—which according to the theory of my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) would be the proper thing—Mr. Burrows wrote the tender hurriedly, did not see that every 'i' was dotted and every 't' crossed and therefore it must be assumed that there was wrong-doing. I say that proposition is absurd and untenable.

Then we heard something about Mr. William Sifton, the brother of the Hon. Clifford Sifton, and my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) read this afternoon, and it is quite characteristic of him, the fairy tale that some Dr. McInnes, Edmonton, told about some man named Maloney, who came to Ottawa, and although his statements and everything were wrong in connection with the story it was thought to be something to base an insinuation on. Why, this Dr. McInnes was the gentleman who said in Edmonton that the Imperial Pulp Company was made up of William Sifton, the brother of the Hon. Clifford Sifton, and prominent gentlemen of the Conservative party went up and down talking about William Sifton, the brother of Clifford Sifton being interested in the Pulp Company, and it did not make any difference to them that the Hon. Clifford Sifton had denied that story in parliament on his honour as a member, nor did it make any difference to them that the Hon. Clifford Sifton never had a brother named 'William Sifton.'

Then the hon. gentleman for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) was strong on envelopes. When the unfortunate official in the Public Accounts Committee had gone through these documents with the greatest possible care the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) said : Let me see the envelopes, and if there was a tear here or a pencil mark there the hon. gentleman noted it down. He had the science down so fine that he distinguished between an envelope provided by the department and marked 'tender for timber berth' and an envelope with the simple stamp of the department on the outside, and he inferred something from that, and then of course if the envelope did not bear any official mark at all there was another inference to be drawn and the inference was always against the government. As to the question of different cheques with each tender we had a frank statement on that subject from the hon. member for Dauphin and we have the evidence of Mr. Fraser and we had other evidence which went to show that it was a common practice of the people tendering here and elsewhere to use different cheques in the tenders. But here is the amusing part of it—my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) was perfectly willing to insinuate that because Mr. Burrows had used three cheques when he put in his tender he was a frightful speculator and a man whom the people of Canada ought to condemn. But when we wanted to show that it was a common practice for other people to use different cheques in putting in their tenders, who was the obstructionist who wanted to prevent that evidence going in ? None other than the great investigator from St. Antoine. Let me read from the record. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) had just said :

Will you turn us the envelope and tell us whether there were any marks on it?

And the answer was :

There is a memorandum 'received 7-3-03 at 11.35,' I think it is.

Then says my hon. friend from St. Antoine :

In——

And of course the clerk knew what he meant and he said :

In pencil.

Then the hon. member for St. Antoine said :

You recognize the writing?

And the clerk answered :

I cannot say whose writing it is.

And then Mr. Ames said :

It is in black lead pencil?

And what do you think the clerk answered ; he answered, yes. Now, this is very significant, for if it had been red pencil or blue pencil instead of black, just fancy the frightful consequences. Then I asked :

Just turn to the tender of the Macdonald Brothers on that file.

And the record says :

Mr. Ames objected to the question on the ground that he had been refused permission to examine witnesses with reference to other tenders than the successful ones.

Mr. AMES. Quite so.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) objected to my asking a question as to other people having put three cheques in, not because that he thought I should have the right to ask him upon that ground, but he says :

I object because I have been refused to ask in regard to other tenders.

Then I went on to say :

I want to say upon this question that when my hon. friend asks a question which is practically irrelevant to the inquiry, as he did when he asked Mr. Campbell how many cheques mae up the $15,000 bonus——

And you will remark, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend had brought out from Mr. Campbell that the $15,000 bonus was made up of three different cheques. Then I said :

I want to show him that if there is any significance about there being three cheques making up the aggregate of the bonus it does not apply to that particular tender alone because in McDonald Brothers' tender, which is on the file alongside that of Mr. Burrows, there were three cheques inclosed which made up the amount of $13,500.

Mark, because my hon. friend from Dauphin puts in three cheques which make up $15,000, then according to the member from St. Antoine you are to infer there was all kinds of villainy. But when another gentleman puts in three cheques footing up $13,500, the hon. member (Mr. Ames) thinks there is nothing significant about that at all. I said :

Perhaps my hon. friend will withdraw his question as to the number of cheques?

Because I thought my hon. friend ought to have some appreciation of the ridiculous position in which he was in view of the evidence. Then I said :

Perhaps my friend will withdraw his question as to the number of cheques, but if he does not, I think it is quite proper to show that these cheques also accompanied another tender for the same berth, and that the sending of three cheques making up the amount of the bonus, is not confined to Mr Burrows. If you go through these files you will find that in almost every case there is more than one cheque making up the amount of the bonus. That is why I want to ask the question. If Mr. Ames is willing to withdraw the irrelevant question, I do not wish to go further on this line.

Mr. AMES. Would the hon. gentleman kindly read the next five lines ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Certainly. My hon. friend then said :

If the hon. gentleman wants to put this upon record I have no objection, but in that case I shall find it necessary to bring Mr. McDonald here in order to show that in every instance where there is more than one cheque whenever there have been two cheques or three cheques inclosed with his tender it has been because he has had partners in the transaction, each of whom has forwarded his cheque and that there could not possibly be any collusion.

Now the great trouble with the member for St. Antoine was he had Mr. Macdonald sitting around waiting for days and never put him on oath and never called him.

Mr. AMES. Does the hon. gentleman remember that the chairman, at the beginning of the inquiry, said that he would not permit any one to be examined except the successful tenderer, and consequently we were not permitted to call any other tenderer who had not succeeded in getting a limit.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I do not remember anything of the kind. I do not remember his having asked that Mr. Macdonald be called and he did not call him ? If he had, he would have had the assistance of those present on the government side to have him examined. I can go through this evidence and show where my hon. friend's innuendoes were unfair and his insinuations unjust.

Let us take this innuendo regarding the way tenders were opened. There was no subject dwelt upon so earnestly and concerning which so much suspicion was sought to be aroused, as the method in which the tenders were opened. The wail of my hon. friend on that subject was almost equal to that of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) about original documents and equally as misplaced. What did the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) say on that question ? He made a very violent speech. He dwelt with that question along lines it is perhaps just as well to recall. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) was a little more cautious than his leader on the front benches but this is what the hon. member for North Toronto said :

And that gentleman was formerly——

He was there referring to my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff).

And that gentleman was formerly a trusted employee who went into his own private room, locked the door, kept all inconvenient witnesses away and adjudicated upon the application of his brother-in-law and other relatives and party friends. I say, and I do not fear to say it, that the exhibition he made of himself in this House and in Stanstead for the advantage of his party, stamps him as a partisan who in the inmost recesses of his unwatched room, would not be beyond doing something for the good of a party supporter in the matter of tenders.

In another place he said :

When all that took place, a strong partisanship dying every fibre of his body, he was put into a darkened and seclued room and given the full power of making a decision in reference to these matters.

I need not quote the remarks of my hon. friend on this subject, though it might be

as well to put them on record because I am sure, if he has any sense of fair play, he will have the manliness to stand up and declare that all the insinuations and allusions he and his confrere had made concerning the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) have been shown to be absolutely unfounded. But I shall not take time to hunt his remarks up. What was the position of affairs ? I have told you the difficulty we had in getting Mr. Turriff on the stand. My hon. friends refused to call him, but he came on the stand, and then it was evident why they did not want him. They first put Mr. Riley on the stand and he told how this matter of tenders and so forth was absolutely fair. When Mr. Greenway came on, they discovered that their fairy tales about secluded and darkened chambers and locked doors were even more creations of the imagination than one would have supposed, and that at all times in that department there was no secrecy and that there was always two persons present when the tenders were opened. When they heard Mr. Greenway's evidence, the courage of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and others began to ooze out and they wanted to close the investigation. They knew what Mr. Turriff was going to say and they were anxious to avoid hearing him. If we are to have any practical illustration of the glorious principle of fair play, it is up to the men who in this House slandered the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) by these insinuations regarding private chambers and locked doors, with which they flooded the press of this country some three months ago, to stand up in this House and declare that their impressions were wrong and the statements they made utterly unfounded.

Then my hon. friend in connection with limit 1031 told a story about a Mr. Mooney coming from Edmonton, and a cheque for $25,000 and a $6,000 cheque. Why there were never such cheques at all. My hon. friend from St. Antoine wants to give the impression that there was somehing terribly wrong. Mark you, he said Mr. Burrows first sent a cheque for $17,000. Look, he said, at the similarity of the tenders, look at the fact that Mr. Ross' tender was $17,010, and that Mr. Burrows cheque was $17,575, just enough to beat Mr. Ross. Then Mr. Burrows gives the $14,000 cheque because McDonald brothers came in and tendered at $31,161 and Burrows had to bid higher. So he gave the $14,000 cheque and in support of that story the hon. gentleman gave his yarn about Moroney coming down from Edmonton. My hon. friend would like people to believe that, but unfortunately when he got fooling around the envelope, it was shown that the two first tenders were received in the department fifteen minutes after eleven on the 31st December, and that this tender of McDonald brothers of $31,161 did not get in until twenty minutes later. Not only that but Mr. Finnie the manager of the Ottawa Bank came before the committee with the cheques, and the cheques on their face showed that they were issued the day before the tenders were put in, so that it was absolutely an illusion to suppose that the second cheque was put in to be added to the first in order that the amount of Mr. Burrows' tender might exceed that of McDonald brothers. That was in regard to timber limit 1031. I could take you to 1022, 1122 and 1147, where my hon. friend built better than he knew and in his anxiety to hunt all around among envelopes produced the evidence that was his undoing, so far as his theories were concerned.

Then we have this question of close bidding. We had thirteen timber limits before us. In two of those Mr. Burrows was not the highest tenderer and did not get them, so we need not worry about them. In nine of these timber limits he was the highest and he got them, and how much do you suppose he was higher than the people who were next to him in all these competitions? In those nine cases he paid $5,134 more than the total amount of the next lowest tenderers. That is a pretty substantial amount for a man to pay, and I think the argument of the close bidding is rather far-fetched. What will my hon. friend think of this case, for instance? A timber limit, range 10, lot 21, was sold by the Ontario government on February 11, 1907. The tenderers on that occasion were as follows :

Name.	Logs, per 1,000 feet.	Board, pine, per 1,000 feet.
Foss	$10 52	$35 00
Morgan Lumber Company	10 00	25 00
George Gordon	9 00	40 00
Michigan Land and Lumber Company	9 85	30 00
Burton	9 27	27 00
Shannon	9 10	35 00
Thessalon Lumber Company	8 80	1 50
Gilles	8 26	2 00
Perry Lumber Company	8 20	2 00
McCool	6 00	3 00
McFadden	7 76	2 00

The result of the above tenders was not announced till the following day. The Foss Lumber Company, Bay City, Michigan, was the successful tenderer. The Michigan Land and Lumber Company and the Morgan Lumber Company are one and the same, S. O. Fisher, of West Bay City, Michigan, being vice-president and general manager of the Morgan Lumber Company and president and general manager of the Michigan Land and Lumber Company.

The pine on Franklin Island, Georgian bay, was sold by the Ontario government by tender, September 3, to McGibbon, of Penetanguishene, Ontario, who bid $12.26 per 1,000 feet, the next tender was $12.12

per thousand, and followed by another for $12.06 per 1,000. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should go up there and bring all his great powers of introspection and all his paraphernalia to bear on these cases, and tell us what the Whitney government do when bidding is close.

My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) is worried about the Imperial Pulp Company. We have heard many innuendoes and suggestions in reference to that. The suggestion that Governor McMillan was a member of the company and his alleged connection with it was discussed. There has never been any mystery about this company. We had full evidence in respect to it before the committee, and in the records of parliament for 1903, on the very first page of the report of the Secretary of State, there is a statement showing the incorporation of the company, the original shareholders and directors, all of them being in Toronto, and no attempt being made at secrecy. The mind that is so crooked and warped as to be able to draw some wrong intent from the association together of two men like Mr. Burrows and Governor McMillan, who has so long borne an honoured name in Manitoba, has reached a depth where he is entitled to the sympathy of any hon. gentleman. What mystery was there about the connection of these gentlemen with the company? Do the opposition expect Governor McMillan and Mr. Burrows to go around the country with a sign out: saying we are members of the Imperial Pulp Company; or do they expect them to do business as any ordinary business people would do, with an office? Where was the secrecy and mystery, except in the minds of the men who wanted to conjure up evil and could not attribute to decent men in this country the ordinary methods of doing business? They regarded it as suspicious that the tenders were signed by R. R. P. How is any tender by a company to be signed except by the secretary, or the company through the secretary, and when these gentlemen had the opportunity of bringing Mr. R. R. Pattinson before the committee they did not bring him, but were content to go around heralding these miserable innuendoes, these subversions of every principle of fair-play, as they are doing outside this House and, in a somewhat timid way, in this House to-night.

During this whole discussion not one man has been produced to show that he was unfairly treated in the tendering. It was open to my hon. friends to have brought before the committee any man to be found between Montreal and Vancouver who had any evidence that would indicate that the Department of the Interior had acted wrongly or unfairly in regard to the awarding of these timber limits. But no such person existed except in the wild imagination of my hon. friends, who had built up this fabric of suspicion which is falling and crumbling to pieces.

There has not been one actual case of land sales at the enormous prices quoted by these hon. gentlemen up and down the country, they are mere figments of the imagination. These gentlemen have taken the exaggerated descriptions to be found in the real estate offices in Winnipeg which might be found in reference to any property in boom times. In a distant province like Nova Scotia they quote these as if they were fair values and endeavour to lead our people to the belief that there have been actual transactions at these figures. There has been an absolute and complete failure of all these insinuations that have been made in regard to this matter.

Then we have the use of the photographs of the tenders by my hon. friend from St. Antoine. It is insinuated that because a man writes off a document informally, whether because he is illiterate or busy, it is suggested there is something improper. I have dealt with the question of whether there can be any inference or wrong-doing on that account and, in view of all that has occurred, I venture to say that the conduct of (Mr. Ames) in the use of these photographic documents is such that he knows that it can only convey to the mind of the man who has not studied this question an entirely erroneous impression of the true facts of the case.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is it permissible for the hon. gentleman to say that I know I am conveying an erroneous impression?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will see, of course, that this is an insinuation that is not proper.

Mr. E. M, MACDONALD. I think I can say that my hon. friend, if he does not konw, is reckless whether he knows or not.

Mr. AMES. Is that proper?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think a statement that the hon. member might be reckless might be in order.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am sure that all reasonable men will agree that there should be a limit to this particular policy that has been introduced into the politics of this country, a novelty, it would seem, introduced under the peculiar conditions that have been developed within recent times. I have never heard such an unworthy and unjust interpretation put upon evidence as was given this afternoon. No man who wanted to be judicial, who wanted to be fair to his fellow man would try to establish the conclusion sought to be established here from the evidence that is before us. If I were counsel in such a case as this, I would go

before any fair-minded jury in this country, confident that the verdict would be that no case had been made out that was worthy the attention of any reasonable man. So far as the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) and other members of this House are concerned, honourable men who have been recklessly maligned by people who go up and down this country loudly announcing the principle of fair-play and the exemplification of the doctrine of the golden rule, I have never known a more unfair and unjust attack than these that we have heard made in this case.

Both in policy and practice the course of this government on this subject has been amply justified. The Minister of the Interior anticipated the opposition by months in regard to the changes in the regulations as made necessary by the changed conditions, which fact is carefully suppressed. Why the west was found by the Liberal party——

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is always ready to say 'hear, hear.' I would call his attention to the fact which he knows full well that the west was a pretty poor place when it was taken in hand by the present government. There were but few people there. And now the people are coming in in such numbers that we are making a new province every 365 days that go to make up a year. With the increasing population you have a change of conditions which makes a change of methods necessary. The Minister of the Interior has anticipated these conditions and any improvement that hon. members opposite have been able to suggest was made a part of the government working policy before it was discussed in the House by these gentlemen.

It seems to me that in the name of everything that is fair and decent, in the name of fair play and the golden rule, this policy of innuendo, insinuation and misrepresentation ought to cease. Men of all parties should come to a realization that we cannot advance in Canada unless we are prepared to treat our brethren though differing in politics as entitled to fair play, unless we realize that in dealing with public questions we must deal with them as men, and, I hope, as gentlemen. If we do this, Canada will be better off, parliament will be better off, and some hon. members of this House will be free of the consciousness which I am sure now rests on some of them, they have not practised what they preach.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention to my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald). If I were to analyse his speech briefly, I would say that a fair proportion of it consisted of abuse of my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). that another portion of it was made up of eulogy of my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) and that the rest of it was made up of a discussion of what happened in Nova Scotia and a statement concerning timber limits that are two thousand miles away—statements somewhat resembling these limits in that they appear to be two thousand miles away from the facts.

Now, I hate to keep the House here for a couple of hours to follow my hon. friend through his extraordinary speech. I can well understand why the Liberal party put up that hon. gentleman whenever they get into a corner. I will give him credit for making the best defence possible of one of the worst cases that have ever come to the attention of this country. As my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has been looking for a new minister, I do not understand why he does not reward quite the ablest man sitting behind him in this respect.

It will not do for my hon. friend to talk about insinuation and innuendo. What he had presented by the hon. member for St. Antoine was a clear, precise statement of facts taken from the public records and conceded by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) himself. The only innuendo —if such it can be called—in the whole case as presented by the hon. member for St. Antoine was that, after detailing each of nineteen different cases of extraordinary bidding on the part of Mr. Burrows and nine on the part of the Imperial Pulp Company, he asked the question: Was that accident or was it design? I am at a loss to understand the English language if that be innuendo or insinuation. He had a perfect right to state the facts as they appear in the records—he had the duty resting upon him as a member of parliament to do so. And we should have had a fair defence from the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald). But, instead of that, we have been treated to a tirade of abuse and to an argument relating to matters not before the House at the present moment. We have not heard an answer of any kind whatsoever to the statement of facts presented by my hon. friend from St. Antoine.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) takes a great deal of credit to himself because, as he says, changes have been made lately by the Minister of the Interior and that government must change their methods with changing circumstances. I am glad indeed that the Minister of the Interior, even within the past few months, has had the good sense to make changes in the regulations. But I beg to advise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) that the regulations were criticised by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) before the

changes were made, and, no doubt, the objections then taken led to these changes. It was well known to hon. members opposite that a rotten state of affairs existed and had existed in the Department of the Interior. It has been a matter of attack for the last three years. It was a matter of small moment indeed that after practically all the best timber lands reasonably convenient and accessible to the population of the west for the next twenty years had been practically given away the Minister of the Interior should see that it was right to change these regulations.

But I want to go back a little in this matter. I think we are entitled to a little better statement of the position of matters in dealing with the question. In 1897 the First Minister took into his cabinet the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). Now, that gentleman had been in the west for twenty-five years. He was intimately associated with the growth of the west. There was no one better acquainted with western affairs, according to his own statement and that of his friends, than the hon. member for Brandon. I am sorry he is not here to-night, because I do not wish to say anything about an hon. member when he is not present to hear me. When he took charge of the Department of the Interior he was fully acquainted with the condition of affairs in the west. The hon. gentleman stated to-night that the Liberals ten years ago discovered the west. That was in 1897 when the member for Brandon was Minister of the Interior. Well, when I hear a Liberal like the hon. member for Pictou making a statement of that kind, and when I think of the years in which the Liberal party fought against the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which really opened up that western country, it seems to me that he is losing his sense of humor. Then it is claimed for the member for Brandon that he not only discovered the west, but populated it. Well, this inevitably calls to one's mind the famous North Atlantic Trading Company and the Leopold scheme and the methods that were adopted by the government to bring emigrants into this country. It recalls to our mind the reward which was given to Mr. Preston for doing the dirty work of the Liberal party by appointing him agent general in London. In 1900 another general election took place. The member for Brandon had then been in power for about three years, and had, so to speak, got his feet in the saddle. He had become master of the situation. He had got orders in council passed so that instead of matters having to go before the council he became the practical dictator of the Department of the Interior and could do as he pleased. From 1900 to 1904 we have an extraordinary history of scandals which took place in that department, and who do we find as profiting therefrom? Why, the particular personal friends and following of the ex-Minister of the Interior. We find Mr. McGregor, we find Mr. Hitchcock, we find these and other gentlemen getting thousands of acres of land by an irrevocable lease. I will not go into the details, but I will say that there has been no such record in any department of the administration of this country so disgraceful as the record of the Department of the Interior under the management of the hon. member for Brandon. After the election of 1900, when he became master of the situation, he got rid of the old and tried officials of the department who might stand in his way and we find Mr. Smart as Deputy Minister of the Interior, a certain delightful personage whose record stinks in the nostrils of the people of this country in consequence of his connection with the North Atlantic Trading Company. The mystery of that company is not solved yet. Then what happened? Mr. Smart is the gentleman who got tired in the year 1902 of opening tenders and he called in the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) to do that work. Now, does the hon. member for East Assiniboia ask what is the practice of the department in that regard? Not at all. He does not ask and he does not know, and he swears under oath that although he opened tenders in the way he described he was not concerned to know how it was done before. Well, the ex-Minister of the Interior in 1900 saw the population coming into the west from the United States and from the old country. The fame of the west had gone abroad, and he claimed for himself the credit of the influx of population. He knew that the Canadian Northern Railway was being built through that country ; he was well informed of the needs of the people and the question of timber limits, and one of the matters which I propose to take up is the fact that, although he had full knowledge of the circumstances, he not only did not change the conditions, as the present minister did two months ago, but if he had acted as an honest man, if he had a feeling of the trust reposed in him by the people and the duty which he owed to them, he would have changed these conditions in 1900 and would not have allowed the alienation of the public lands to grafters as the evidence has disclosed has been going on.

Now, I want to deal with some of the extraordinary statements of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). The hon. gentleman told us that there was not a tittle of evidence before this House that there had been a sale of any timber limits of any value. Well, Sir, I would have thought that out of common courtesy the hon. member for Pictou, knowing Mr. Rhodes, the Conservative candidate in Amherst, knowing Rhodes, Currie & Co. to be the biggest car builders in this country, would have been willing to concede that Mr. Rhodes had told the truth when, over his own sig-

nature, he had said that the Ruby Lake Lumber Company had bought a limit for $100,000. He denied apparently the truthfulness of that statement of Mr. Rhodes. We have the absolute admission of the hon. member for Dauphin that he got $80,000 for his and Fraser's share of the limits 1048 and 1049. We know that as a matter of fact they paid between them the sum of $6,000. Hon. gentlemen sitting here to-night must have felt great pain when they heard the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) describing how much money he was paying to the people of this country in timber dues. He actually paid 50 cents a thousand for sawn lumber; if he had been living in Ontario he would have paid $2 a thousand. He says that he paid out $35,000 in dues and if he had charged for his time and interest and other losses he would not have made $35,000 clear. I would like to know how many gentlemen there are in this chamber who would not be glad to pay some one else $35,000 if they could make anything like $35,000 clear by doing so. I think we need shed no more tears about this hon. gentleman when we reflect that with this $80,000 he got more money by $36,000 than the total of all these limits cost him. He says that the total money he expended was $58,000. But he and his brother Fraser make a profit on one transaction of $80,000.

Mr. BURROWS. I never said I got $80,000.

Mr. BRISTOL. I said he and his brother Fraser.

Mr. BURROWS. He is no brother of mine.

Mr. BRISTOL. I think he is a brother in this transaction. If you will allow me to make use of this term in a colloquial sense. We do you honour in associating you with him. The hon. member for Pictou, speaking of No. 1031, refers to the cheques of Mr. Finnie and he says that these cheques were both drawn on December 30. There is only one way to contradict a gentleman of that character and that is to read the evidence. I am free to say that Mr. Finnie's evidence was not as clear as one might expect but perhaps we can get at the facts. I propose to quote from pages 80, 81, 87, 88 and 89.

Q. Is there anything to show on these cheques to you, Mr. Finnie, the order in which they were made out?—A. The entry shows that they were made out, $17,575 in the first place, immediately followed the next entry by $14,000.

Page 81:

Q. Is there anything in your books to show the order in which the cheques were made out?—A. Yes, one entry follows the other.

Mr. BRISTOL

Page 87:

Mr. REID. These two cheques were issued one on the 30th and the other on the 31st December, and the ledger will show when they were issued, because the ledger-keeper marks on his ledger, '30th December so much' and '31st December so much.' That is what the book will show; these cheques show there is a possibility that one of the cheques has been altered.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Suppose it does show that? It will show this, that Mr. Finnie, of the Bank of Ottawa, issued to Mr. Burrows a cheque dated 30th December, that is the only thing this committee is interested in, as to when the cheque was issued doesn't make any difference.

By Mr. Barker:

Q. I think there is a reason here why we should see these books. You say both cheques are dated 30th December, 1902?—A. Yes.

Q. I see they are both accepted by your bank on the 31st December, 1902?—A. They are, yes.

Q. And one of these cheques was first written '31st December, 1902,' will you look at it?—A. I know what you refer to, there is a slight mark there, that is not a '1,' it is not an alteration.

Q. It is distinct '31.' Now if it had been the other way I would understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me see what it is.

By Mr. Barker:

Q. Is not that an alteration?—A. No, Sir, these cheques were written at the same time.

Q. I dare say. Will you explain why there was first written '31'?—A. I do not think it was ever written '31.'

Q. Do you mean to say this '31' is not written distinctly?—A. There was no alteration afterwards.

Q. I do not say it was; it may have been done at the time?—A. It was done at the time, yes.

Q. How is it that the larger cheque seems to have been dated '31' and then the '0' put in afterwards?—A. I can't explain it at all.

Q. That is the date it was accepted?—A. They were both accepted on the 31st, both charged in the ledger on the 31st and both provided for on the 31st.

By Mr. Ames:

Q. Were they written on the same day that they were——?—A. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Finnie has stated they were written on the day they were accepted.

By Mr. Macdonald (Pictou):

Q. Were they written on the date they purport to be dated?—A. Yes.

Mr. AMES. I understood him to say they were dated on the day they were accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. He answered before you finished your question.

By Mr. Ames:

Q. Did you see them after they were finished?—A. I wrote them myself.

Q. Did you write them on the same day they were accepted?—A. I believe I did, yes.

Q. How do you account for the fact that they were dated on the 30th and stamped on the 31st?—A. I believe that '30' is simply an error in dating.

The final statement that Mr. Finnie makes on the matter is that these cheques were both written on the 31st and not one the

30th as stated by the hon. member for Pictou.

Q. In your belief you think they were written on the morning of the 31st?—A. I am disposed to think so.

By Mr. Macdonald (Pictou):

Q. Have you any recollection of having made a mistake on that date in the writing of these cheques?—A. No I have no distinct recollection about it.

Page 89:

By Mr. Bristol:

Q. A moment ago you told Mr. Ames that you wrote them on the 31st?—A. Not quite.

Q. Do you want to change that now?—A. Well, I may have written them on the 31st, yes.

Q. You may have written them on the 31st?—A. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If one cheque was written on the 30th and another on the 31st, it makes a lot of difference. I think it is most important.

The CHAIRMAN. He says he did not do that.

Mr. BARKER. He did not say he did not do it.

By Mr. Bristol:

Q. The cheques were both written and accepted on the same date, is that not right?—A. Yes.

That is the correct statement as regards these cheques. I am not here to say that this matter was vital or material, but I simply wished to point out, as I propose to continue to do, how impossible it seems to be for the hon. member for Pictou to quote any hon. gentleman correctly.

Now, I want to place on record, because I am really taking the speech of the hon. member for Pictou, the exact position, as I understand it, of the timber limit proposition. In the first place, the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) obtained 534 square miles in his own name, then he obtained with Cowan and Moore 250 square miles and the Imperial Pulp Company got 483 square miles. Fraser obtained the second choice or 1,048 and 1,049, 250 and 120 square miles. And so the statement was made that the Burows-Fraser combination had got 1,637 square miles. That was the statement, as I understand, that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, made and at the time that it was made, he believed it to be correct, but we find now that instead of Mr. Burrows getting 534 square miles he only got, when the timber was selected, 433 square miles. The Imperial Pulp Company only got 320 square miles, so that together they got 753 square miles. Mr. Fraser has still 120 square miles, making a total of 873 that the Burrows-Fraser combination got. But, there were 500 square miles, 250 of which went to Mr. Burrows and 250 to Mr. Fraser, a half interest in which has been sold by them for $80,000, making a total of 1,373 square miles that the Burrows-Fraser group obtained.

My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) has been criticised for stating that Mr. Burrows was a speculator. My hon. friend has never failed to state that Mr. Burrows owned and operated 109 square miles of timber as a lumberman but that these other limits were of a speculative character and that in the nature of things for a period of 10, 15 or 20 years, they would continue to be of a purely speculative character. For the hon. member for Pictou to go into hysterics over the alleged statement of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, because he had actually described Mr. Burrows as a speculator seems to me as ludicrous as some other things which were said by the hon. member for Pictou. There was another matter that seemed to give him an awful pain. I suppose that this speech has been made to-night for use in Nova Scotia. I cannot understand it being used for any other purpose because it had nothing to do with matters in question.

Mr. BENNETT. It will be of no use in the Northwest.

Mr. BRISTOL. It will be of no use in the Northwest, because they know the facts there. I do not know that it could even be used in Nova Scotia. But, as I was saying, it seemed to worry my hon. friend, that my hon. friend from St. Antoine should say that under the existing timber regulations the holders of these speculative timber limits had practically a perpetual title. I have never heard that contradicted by any one. I have heard the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) get up in this House and defend it as sound policy that it was so. But, the real essential point, in my humble judgment, of this transaction is that you will find that the Imperial Pulp Company, that T. A. Burrows, that the Cowan-Moore-Burrows syndicate and the Fraser syndicate had acquired a large proportion of these very valuable limits particularly 1048 and 1049, 500 miles of speculative limits selected out of 7,000 square miles, that they had obtained these most valuable concessions under the old regulations which were not nearly so favourable, which, of necessity, would require them to pay much less for the limits, which would, of necessity, lessen competition, and shortly after they obtained these valuable concessions, in April, 1903, this regulation was passed which made these licenses practically perpetual. Among the other things that the minister did for his friends after they acquired these limits, was that he turned a yearly license into a practically irrevocable lease. I want to put on record section 3 of the timber regulations in effect on July 1, 1898, which reads as folows:

When a licensee has complied with all the conditions herein set forth in his license and the regulations, and where no portion of the timber berth is required for settlement or other public purpose, of which the Minister of

the Interior is to be the judge, the license may be renewed for another year, subject to such revision of the annual rental and royalty to be paid therefor as may be fixed by the Governor in Council.

That was the regulation under which these limits were bought. Now, the following is the regulation passed on the 14th of April 1903, and published in the 'Gazette' on the 16th of June, 1903, in substitution of the section which I have just read :

So long as the licensee complies with the conditions of his license and of the regulations, he shall be entitled to a renewal of his license from year to year while merchantable timber remains upon the area licensed. When a substantial portion of the said area has been denuded of timber the minister may dispose of the same under sale or settlement regulations provided that no such disposition shall be made of land immediately contiguous to merchantable standing timber, or in such a way as to endanger destruction thereof by fire.

And so these leases which were before that period yearly licenses became, so long as there was merchantable timber, licenses which they had the right to demand the renewal of from the government. On the 23rd of July, 1906, the Privy Council passed the following :

Therefore the Governor in Council in order to make the intention clear, is pleased to order that the said section 3 shall be and the same is hereby amended by adding to the first sentence thereof immediately after the words 'the area licensed' the following 'provided, however, that such renewal shall be granted subject to any changes which may have been made in the regulations increasing or altering the rental or dues to be paid or otherwise varying the terms and conditions under which licenses are granted.'

I am told that the following year this regulation, which changed the terms of the bargain under which these people bought, was actually inserted in the licenses granted to timber licensees without their attention being called to the fact. I am further advised that since the attention of the licensees has been called to the fact, they have made strong objections to the government for pretending to change the terms on which they purchased and to charge any timber dues or royalties which the government may think proper. See the confiscatory effect that such a clause would have. A man pays a reasonable bonus for a timber limit and he has the right to hold it so long as there is merchantable timber upon it, and then the government assumes to say that instead of paying fifty cents per thousand they may charge him $10 or $20 or any sum they like. That is practically confiscation of these limits and I am told that the licensees have entered strong objection to it. It would, of course, have been perfectly proper at the time their revocable license was being granted to have inserted such a provision, and if the government exercised proper forethought they would have inserted it, but after they had got the licensees' money and the matter had gone on for two or three years it was practically confiscation to attempt to change the contract in the manner I have indicated. So far as the Burrows-Fraser group is concerned they got the benefit of this particular transaction in that they have their yearly license turned into a practically perpetual lease.

There was another thing that afforded me considerable amusement and that was the hysteria which the member for Dauphin and the member for Pictou exhibited about poor Mr. Burrows not being called as a witness. Well, that is a most pitiable thing when you come to think it over. Our right to investigate in the committee was to find out whether the annual payments for rental made paid in respect to certain leases were correct or not. If I were to read to the right hon. gentleman the long arguments which my hon. friend from Pictou put forth in the committee to show that the chairman had no right to allow any question outside of that particular fact, even my right hon. friend's sense of the ludicrous would be aroused at the contention of the hon. member from Pictou to-night. You understand that these bonuses were paid in 1902, 1903, and 1904, and that consequently there were no bonuses in the Public Accounts but only the rental for these properties. We had endeavoured to obtain the original documents in the House and the member for Pictou seems to forget that we worked for two weeks over that before we got these documents. We thought if we went to the Public Accounts Committee we would get some light but we were met at once by the objections set forth by the hon. members from Lunenburg and Pictou, and set forth ad nauseam that we could not get evidence on anything beyond the payment of the rental itself. My hon. friend from St. Antoine asked if there had been licenses granted in respect to which this payment was made and when that lease was produced he asked to see the lease that came before it and so we got back to the original lease. Then after another fight we were allowed to see the original tender and as some tenders had no amounts stated in them and as the cheque formed part of the tender we were permitted to look at these cheques. But we were not permitted to look at any of the other tenders. We were not allowed to call Mr. McDonald as to his tender or method of tendering. Our rights were confined as I have stated, and yet we have the member for Pictou telling us to-night in the most delicious way that we had all the investigation we wanted and that we got more than we bargained for. Then we got to the point when we wanted Mr. Finnie as a witness. My hon. friend from Pictou who was counsel for the defence in this particular matter naturally wanted us to call Mr. Burrows and Mr.

Turriff ; it was their idea that we should call the defence before we had the case properly laid and we were not allowed to lay the case properly for the obvious reason that the scope of the inquiry would not permit it. And so these hon. gentlemen were anxious to place the defence on record in full without our having the case for the prosecution properly presented. There were many interesting facts we would have liked to bring out from the other tenders but we were told this could not be done. I quote from the evidence on that point.

Will you kindly take cognisance of that return, which is the return brought down to the House on March 12, 1906, sessional paper No. 39, and see whether the item there corresponds with the advertisements—will you kindly read that item——

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Do you rule that an order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not suppose you will be justified in going into the other tenders.

That was the ruling of the chairman, and it was perfectly proper under the circumstances, because the matter before the committee was the question of these payments and the other tenders had absolutely nothing whatever to do with them. So that when my hon. friend talks about our having had full scope to investigate, he is simply romancing, because it was absolutely impossible for us to make the full investigation we would have made, even if permitted a proper inquiry. But we had to drag out what little bits of evidence we could, with our hon. friends continually objecting, and calling on us to put the culprits in the box and let them do the talking.

My hon. friend from Pictou seemed to make a great point about our not having put Mr. Burrows on the stand. Well, I do not see that there was anything to prevent my hon. friend calling Mr. Burrows, if he wanted to put him under oath. If there is one man more than another who has declaimed in loud tones about the hon. member for Dauphin not having been called, it is the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). But what did he do ? He called on Mr. Burrows' solicitor, Mr. Fraser. He made a great fuss because we did not propose to put in Mr. Burrows' solicitor for the defence, and so he called Mr. Fraser himself. And what then did he do ? He had the audacity to ask Mr. Fraser to give under oath his reasons why other lumbermen did certain things. He took good care not to call Mr. Burrows and ask him why he did certain things in certain ways ; and there are pertinent questions I would like to put to the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) if, instead of coming under the shelter of the House, where we have to accept his statements, he had come before the committee. There we could have cross-examined him, but it is much simpler and much safer for him to come and make his statement here where he cannot be contradicted. But even if he had appeared before the committee, we had no right to controvert his evidence in any way, because we could not get beyond the scope of the inquiry which was whether the rentals paid to the Department of the Interior by Perkins, Fraser & Co., in connection with the timber agencies at Edmonton and Calgary were correct. And the man who would not let us get away from that was the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). Yet he is the hon. gentleman who cries out so loudly here : Why did you not call Burrows ? My hon. friend from Pictou called Mr. Fraser but not Mr. Burrows. They also called Miss Munro and Mr. Turriff. But poor Burrows they would not call, and consequently they are now waxing eloquent over the grievance that the opposition did not call him. I would not however like my hon. friend from Pictou to run away with the idea that we did not tell him he was the right one to do the calling. At page 92, you will see that we were not getting the information we were entitled to get. We were asking about certain cheques, and the chairman, ruling on the objection raised by the hon. member for Pictou, said :

I think that the cheques ought to be identified before the witness is asked that question and if you require corroboration—I understand that Mr. Burrows is to be called to produce these cheques.

Did the chairman understand that from us? Not at all. We never subpœnaed Mr. Burrows, and one of the theories on which the chairman ruled, was that we could not ask Mr. Finnie about certain cheques entered in his books until we had the original cheques produced. I replied as follows :

If my hon. friend calls Mr. Burrows that is another matter, but we still want further information from Mr. Finnie.

I knew that if Mr. Burrows was to be called, he was coming as witness on behalf of the government and it was for the government to call him. My hon. friend was told so by me and he was told so by the chairman of the commission. What happened further ? After this inquiry was closed, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) came back to the committee and with the aid of the servile majority he has there, he got the inquiry reopened and held it open two weeks or more for the purpose of calling further evidence, but he never called a solitary witness. What then was the object of reopening the inquiry ? It was to prevent the subject being debated in this House when it was fresh in the minds of the people and to postpone the debate until the public had lost sight of it. He did not call Mr. Burrows. He got scared. He thought it safer to get up here and ask : Why did you not call him ?

My hon. friend spoke of Mr. Pattinson. I may simply say that we had the information from Mr. Fraser that Burrows was practically the Imperial Lumber Company, that Sir Daniel McMillan was the president and Mr. Pattinson the secretary. We did call Mr. Pattinson, but he begged off a month or more on account of his wife's illness. And as we were anxious to get the matter before the House, we did not think it worth while to postpone the debate in order that we might ask Mr. Pattinson if Burrows was not practically the Imperial Pulp Company.

But there is a little mystery still left. My hon. friend talked a great deal about the Imperial Pulp Company. He said that anybody could find out of whom they were composed. They were simply a legal firm in Toronto. Think of that. Nothing hidden. A lot of information which he gave us. An hon. gentleman wrote to this legal firm and asked who were the Imperial Pulp Company, but they declined to give any information. They said they were the solicitors. The hon. member for Pictou says we ought to have known long ago who was in this matter. Why, Mr. Fraser, the solicitor for the company, who for five years had been putting up money for the company as their agent, swore that he did not know who were the directors. While they were not secretive, he said, they were certainly not communicative. All he could tell was that Sir Daniel McMillan was the president, that Mr. Pattinson was the secretary, and that Mr. Burrows was connected with it. But although the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) has been giving this House a long statement of several hours, he has failed to solve the mystery as to who constitute the other half of the Imperial Pulp Company. It is impossible to find it out in the records of the company. My hon. friend may say that this is immaterial, but as they have made a point of the fact, I call their attention that after they have given these names, we do not know where half the company reside, and some people think it resides among some gentlemen on the other side of the House who should not have any business there.

The hon. member for Pictou said that my hon. friend from St. Antoine had stated to the chairman that his reason for wanting to see the original lease was to check the acreage or something of that kind, and that he misled the chairman in reference to that matter. My hon. friend from St. Antoine asked him in a manly way to point it out, but the hon. gentleman did not do it. I think that, in justice to my hon. friend it was only fair to him that the hon. member for Pictou should have pointed it out if he could. But I wish to call your attention to the evidence, page 16, where this matter is under discussion as to the hon. member's reason for wanting to see the lease.

Mr. BRISTOL.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Is my friend, Mr. Ames, alleging that in the case of berth No. 1122 there is any incorrect receipt by the government or that a less amount was paid than ought to have been paid in 1906?

Mr. AMES. I am asking for similar information.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Why are you going behind the account in 1906?

Mr. AMES. For the purpose of obtaining information in the public interest and on my reputation as a member of parliament.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). For nothing else, is it?

Mr. AMES. In the public interest, I think that is sufficient.

Here is another of these extraordinary mis-statements made by the hon. member for Pictou which I have a right to correct because it absolutely misrepresents the position of the hon. member for St. Antoine who, in the public interest, was endeavouring to get such information as the chairman of the committee would permit him.

Now, perhaps it would be wise, in view of the repeated statements of my hon. friend from Pictou, that we could have had a full investigation, to read some of the observations of the chairman and of the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) in reference to this matter. I refer to page 10 of the evidence :

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Has this any reference to the question before the committee ? I would like to ask whether the envelope it came in has anything whatever to do with the question now before the committee, the question that has been referred to the committee by the House whether the amount paid was correct. My friend, Mr. Ames, started out in a very guileless way to say that he wanted to prove whether this amount was correct or not in accordance with the lease.

That is the limit of the investigation and of the rights he wished to give us. But when it suited his purpose, there was no limit to the questions he was allowed to ask and did ask in reference to matters quite extraneous—for instance, what changes were made in the regulations in 1907. What had that to do with the correctness of the rental? I only mention that by the way, to show not only the unfairness but the inconsistency of the hon. member for Pictou.

My friend, Mr. Ames, started out in a very guileless way to say that he wanted to prove whether this amount was correct or not in accordance with the lease. In the goodness of your heart, Mr. Chairman, you allowed him to go outside the reference and to deal with other matters that have nothing at all to do with it. I submit that the question as to what kind of an envelope the offer was contained or that it was in blue ink or red ink, whether it was open or not, anything of that kind, has nothing whatever to do with the account of 1906.

Mr. AMES. I think that the envelope has an important bearing upon the case. It was only the covering of the tender.

And it goes on, at page 55-56 :

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I was going to say that I do not intend asking any questions as to what took place between solicitor and client. Mr. Fraser misapprehended the object of my question.

Mr. BRISTOL. Mr. Fraser has, of course, made certain payments on behalf of clients, and his clients, he says, have given him leave to give certain information here. Now, if my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) desires to go into the whole question of the timber limits which were held by the Imperial Company and by Mr. T. A. Burrows and all matters connected with it, there is nothing that would suit us better so long as it is understood we are to be allowed to follow it up and to investigate it as fully as we can before the committee.

That is our position. Yet the hon. gentleman says we did not want inquiry. These hon. gentlemen wanted an inquiry so far as it suited them, but we wanted a full inquiry :

But I do not want Mr. Fraser to be allowed to make what I would say, and very properly say, was a statement for the Imperal Pulp Company, a statement for the defence, without us having the very fullest possible opportunity to cross-examine and call witnesses on the other side.

Then the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) switches round.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). This has arisen from a misunderstanding of the object in asking the question. By consent of the committee, Mr. Ames has been allowed to go back to the tender, the chairman laying down certain limitations with regard to the examination upon them.

You see the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) takes the position that we could not look at anything but the original tender.

I am simply showing Mr. Fraser tenders which were shown to Mr. Campbell, they are in his handwriting, apparently, and I am going to ask him about it.

Now, I want to emphasize that, because on that occasion and on every occasion we declared that we want investigation; we wanted to be allowed to call witnesses and to cross-examine them as to these tenders and their correctness and whether there has been fraud or not. And yet, in spite of what the hon. gentleman said in the committee, he has the effrontery, the brazen effrontery, to stand up and say that we had all the investigation we wanted and could have had the fullest inquiry. I do not happen to possess the same command of the English language as my hon. friend—I mean the same picturesque part of it—but if I had I would use some of his own words to treat the question under discussion. Now at page 60 we have this question by Mr. Macdonald :

Q. Well, now, perhaps you would just tell in detail, in so far as it is possible for you to do so, the circumstances in connection with the putting up of this berth for tender, and these two tenders that are here.

Listen to that.

Mr. BRISTOL. Mr. Chairman, there is happening now just what we outlined would happen all along—counsel for people who have got timber berths is now asked to make a statement before this committee not in relation to any payments he has made, or the legality of any tender, but an ex parte defence on behalf of the people who have obtained these berths. We have no objection to that provided we are going to be able to call all the witnesses we desire in regard to this transaction. What is going on now is virtually what we have asked for in the House, and that is an investigation into these tenders and we are only too glad to have this investigation go on, but we want to be permitted the fullest rights of cross-examination in regard to this witness and the other witnesses.

And what do you suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) said? Did he say, 'Certainly'? Not at all:

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I was asking this witness a question in regard to a certain phase of the question, but if my friends object——

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think you ought to go beyond what has already been brought out; that is the tenders that have already been put in.

Then the witness interrupts.

WITNESS. I have not been subpœnaed for that purpose. I have not qualified myself for this examination.

Mr. BENNETT. We are simply asking the chairman if he will allow a cross-examination afterwards.

Mr. AMES. We are simply asking that the same privilege be accorded to both sides. There may not be the slightest objection, but we are simply calling attention to the fact in the fullest confidence in your fairness, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want the inquiry to be widened; as far as I am concerned, I do not think we are here to try everything that is brought up in the House. My idea in going into the tenders the other day was that they might throw some light upon the question of the ground rent, which is the question we are investigating here, and no other question than the ground rent, but we found that the tenders will not throw any light upon the amount of the ground rent which is uniform, they deal only with the bonus. I do not think we are here to investigate the amount of tenders. That was in the Auditor General's Report of three or four years ago and is not referred to us at all. I think what ought to be done is to deal with the tenders only so far as they affect the question of ground rents. This matter has gone a little further, referring to two or three cheques being put in or items of that sort; I think that is as far as we have gone. The witness ought to be allowed to speak of it, but I do not think we should extend the investigation any further.

And yet the hon. member from Pictou has the effrontery to say that we had the fullest possible investigation, and could have examined witnesses and done everything we pleased. The ex-Minister of the Interior was fond of saying, in answer to criticisms: Why, I did just as the Conservatives did. That has really been the policy of the Liberal party since they assumed office. If we had a good policy they were willing to take it, but if we had committed sins they were willing to commit greater sins of the same kind, and say: You did it and we do the same. It was a species of Chinese imitation. The ex-minister and the member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) said that they found certain regulations which were put in force in 1894 and they were continued until 1907. Here we have changed conditions which should have been recognized by this business administration in 1906. The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) knew the west and was alive to the conditions of settlement, he boasted of his knowledge of the timber situation. He knew that in 1902, towards the end of the year, timber was scarce. But I find in reference to timber berth 1031, which was dealt with in December, 1902, and which embraced 118¼ square miles, this letter, which I think proper to bring to the attention of the House. It is a letter from Mr. A. E. Harris, C.T.A., dated December 4, 1902, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior:

Department of the Interior,
Dominion Lands Office,
Edmonton, Alberta, December 4, 1902.

Sir,—Re notice of tenders being called for timber berths. Would you be kind enough to have forwarded to this office at least fifty copies of each notice when the tenders are called.

I may say owing to the great demand for timber and in order that the department may receive the highest bids possible I have made out a list of thirty-five different individuals and firms to whom a copy of each notice is sent when received here.

The list will increase in the future. In regard to tenders for berth No. 1031, there were just sufficient notices sent, being about forty in all, four of which are on hand at present. There are quite a few inquiries regarding the sketch map to be furnished this office in connection with this notice of tender. As yet this map has not come to hand. Would you kindly have same forwarded as soon as possible.

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) A. E. HARRIS,
C.T.A.

The Secretary, Department of Interior,
Ottawa.

There are two things there of importance. First, he calls the attention of the department to the great demand for timber; and, secondly, to the fact that the sketch map, which would enable any one to find out where the timber was, did not accompany the notice. The length of notice was forty-eight days from Ottawa to Ottawa, and this was in mid-winter.

We have, first of all, a letter of December 27, to the secretary of the Department of the Interior from Messrs. Crafts and Lees, reading as follows:

Edmonton, Alberta, December 2, 1902.

Secretary Department of Interior,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Regarding a block of 118¼ square miles of timber on the Saskatchewan river advertised for tender on 31st instant, advertisement says it is in eleven blocks, must tenders be on each block separately or on the whole. Also will a tender on one or more of the blocks be considered without tendering on the whole of them. An early reply will oblige.

Yours respectfully,
CRAFTS & LEE.

There is another letter of great importance from W. S. Dwinnell, dated December 26, 1902, as follows:

Minneapolis, Minnesota, December 26, 1902.

To the Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—On the 10th instant, I was advised by the Dominion Lands agent at Edmonton that berth No. 1031, district of Alberta, comprising 118¼ square miles, would be offered for sale on the 31st instant. I am already the owner of some timber in the vicinity of this berth and am desirous of making a substantial bid upon it in case there is sufficient timber to warrant it. I have been endeavouring to secure information which would enable me to act intelligently, but have not had sufficient time to do so. I would ask to have this sale postponed for thirty or sixty days, preferably the latter, to the end that I may complete an examination and make a substantial bid for the property. I am satisfied that the interests of the Dominion government would be subserved thereby, and that a much larger bid would be received than if the sale took place at this time. This tract, comprising as it does 118 square miles, is so extensive that the time given under the notice is altogether insufficient to permit any one to make proper examination thereof. It seems to me that when so large a tract is offered for sale a much longer time should be given than if the tract covered but a few square miles. I trust I may be advised at an early date of the postponement.

Respectfully yours,
W. S. DWINNELL.

Thus the department had specific knowledge at the time of the disposal of 1031 that there was great demand for timber and that a great deal more time should be given. We had a speech not long ago from the ex-Minister of the Interior, in which he said he received no letter in relation to this. He may not have received those letters, but I suppose there is some one in the department who is responsible. We have another limit, 1048, and if the Minister of the Interior did not get two letters, he got a telegram, which is more apt to call the at-

tention of an hon. gentleman to such a matter. I have here a telegram of February 23, 1903, signed by the mayor of West Prince Albert. It is as follows :

Canadian Pacific Railway Comany's Telegraph,
West Prince Albert, N.W.T.,
February 23, 1903.

Hon. Clifford Sifton,
Ottawa.

People of Prince Albert protest against sale of timber berths north of river timber limits passing into hands of speculators to the detriment of settlers.

(Sgd.) J. F. ANSTULL,
Mayor.

On February 22 he received a telegram from the president of the board of trade, as follows :

Canadian Pacific Railway Comany's Telegraph,
West Prince Albert, N.W.T.,
February 22, 1903.

Hon. Clifford Sifton,
Minister of Interior,
Ottawa.

Am forwarding you to-day resolution passed by board of trade *re* timber limits to be tendered for on March 7.

(Sgd. J. H. WILSON,
President Board of Trade.

Here is the resolution referred to :

Prince Albert, February 23, 1902.

At a meeting of the Prince Albert Board of Trade held to-day the following resolution was unanimously passed:

It has been brought to our attention that in terms of the notice, dated Ottawa, January 28, tenders are called for a license to cut timber on Dominion lands in the district of Saskatchewan on the following described berths.

Berth No. 1048, comprising 250 square miles. Berth No. 1049 also comprising 250 square miles.

We consider that in the interest of the town of Prince Albert and the country at large the area tendered for is too large, as few have sufficient capital to tender for such a large block and respectfully suggest that these berths be withdrawn and new tenders called for in blocks of fifty square miles and that the time for receiving same be extended for six months to enable lumbermen to examine limits for themselves.

We also further suggest that action be taken with a view of amending the present Act governing the sale of timber berths.

Sgd.) JOHN H. WILSON,
President Board of Trade.

Here is this wonderful ex-Minister of the Interior, this Napoleon of the West, this man of gigantic intellect, this man who made the west—the others only discovered it—with these facts before him, with notice that the regulations should be changed, with a request from responsible people like the mayor of the town and the board of trade, saying that a resolution had been passed asking that these 500 square miles be not offered in this way, but that the sale be postponed for six months and that it should be in small lots. Why, he has his office boy write a letter to say that they don't see any reason for changing it at the present time. Here is the letter, dated the 13th of March :

In reply we beg to say that as these berths appear to be advertised in the ordinary manner, it was not thought advisable to make any change.

And this is a Reform government ! Now, Mr. Speaker, if there had been nothing else in this whole transaction, I say we have a right to condemn the ex-Minister of the Interior and the administration on the fact that away back in 1902, with the facts before him as shown to-night by telegrams and this resolution of the board of trade, he made no investigation, he did not postpone the sale. What happened then ? Why, Mr. Burrows did not have the effrontery to-night to deny the statement of my hon. friend from St. Antoine that it was his pull with the ex-Minister of the Interior that got him these limits. He made a great many other denials, but he did not have the effrontery to make that one. What we say is this, that the ex-minister thought that under the name of William Cowan it would all be hushed up and nobody would know, and it was not until we got Mr. Fraser in the Public Accounts Committee that we knew for the first time that William Cowan's name was used by him under Mr. Burrow's instructions, and that Mr. Burrows provided the $5,000 cheque, and he never saw William Cowan. So here we have the hon. member for Dauphin sitting around with his $5,000 cheque, and we have the door closed against the possibility of bids by any other people, and we have 500 square miles of timber limits going under these circumstances to the brother-in-law of the ex-Minister of the Interior alias William Cowan, and Fraser as his satellite. The hon. member for Dauphin says he has no interest in 1049. I am bound to accept his statement. But in looking at the records we find this receipt :

September 11, 1905.

Received from Mr. Theo. A. Burrows, of Grandview, Manitoba, for John McBain, the sum of $1,250, in payment of one year's rent of timber berth No. 1049 to the 1st of May, 1906, and interest to 7th instant with the exception of $22.000 charged for interest.

(Sgd.) G. U. RYLEY,
Chief Clerk Timber, Mines and Crown Lands Branch, per Frans Loyer, bookkeeper.

Well, the hon. member for Dauphin may be a philanthropist, I dare say he is ; but when he says that he had no interest direct or indirect in this limit, I am astonished at the way he spends his money, and I am surprised that he has so much of it. He did say that he acted as agent for the sale of this property ; but I never yet have been able to discover an agent who was kind enough to pay the rent on the property as to which he was merely agent for the sale.

Apparently the relations between the Burrows and Fraser syndicate—I beg pardon, I mean the Burrows and Fraser group, are a little more intimate than the member for Dauphin has informed us to-night. I affirm that if there was nothing else shown on the records than the facts as they appear to-night, we have a right to an investigation as to that 500 square miles of timber, to find out from the ex-minister why he thought it was all right to go on in the ordinary way, and his brother-in-law sitting around here with a cheque for $5,000, which was slipped in under the name of William Cowan. Those are facts from which the people of this country will draw their own inferences. The hon. member for Pictou says that my hon. friend from St. Antoine is making insinuations; on the contrary I think that my hon. friend from St. Antoine has made the fairest and most reasonable statement that any man possibly could make on the records that are before this parliament. It will be for the people to judge whether the reckless assertions of the hon. member for Pictou are to be relied on in preference to the reasonable and well founded statements made by my hon. friend from St. Antoine on the records before this House. Now I want to emphasize this point. The ex-Minister of the Interior gets up and says that nobody made any objections. In the first place, he was there to do his work. He tells us that he is a great man, all his friends tell us that he is a man of great ability. He may be a very able man, but if so, how much greater was his responsibility when, although the mayor and board of trade of the town brought the facts before him in 1902 and asked that the timber regulations should be changed, yet this reform and business administration did not make any change until 1907. But what happens in the meantime? The brother-in-law of the ex-minister is found possessed to-day of some 500 square miles of timber limits, part of which was obtained in the manner I have described. Now if the minister knows that it is practically impossible for anybody to examine those limits except the particular man who has asked them to be put up if he prevents anybody else from examining them, if he so hedges around the regulations and tries to work them that of necessity the limits must fall into the hands of the particular person who happens to be his brother-in-law, it is as great an act of fraud against the people of this country as if there was some shuffling with cheques.

Now there is another thing that is rather amusing. The hon. member for Dauphin said he went over to the department and asked them to make up a list for him. Well, it is a great thing to stand well with the administration. When the hon. member for St. Antoine went over to the department to look at an original document, he had to get out of the office. If you are the member for Dauphin, or the member for East Assiniboia, you will have all the departmental clerks working for you, you can have all the information the department has got, all this information which the hon. member for Dauphin was so anxious to give us to show that he paid $112 a square mile on the whole for the timber limits, and the Imperial Pulp Company had paid a certain amount, and somebody else had paid a little more. Now the price paid for a timber limit naturally depends as to whether you applied and got first choice, as Mr. Burrows, or William Cowan did in connection with 1048 and paid $5,000 therefor, or whether you paid for the second choice as Fraser did, who paid $1,000. As the hon. member for Dauphin did not want anything but the very best he paid more. But even if it was, he only paid apparently for 537 square miles the sum of $58,000. But he also went to a good deal of trouble to show that there were two or three cheques used in some other instances, and he spoke in a mysterious way as to some British Columbia lumber company having paid three cheques through Wyld and Osler. While I do not know anything about the facts connected with the matter I do say that if as a result of the investigation of the department they were only able to find, outside of the Imperial Pulp Company and Mr. Burrows, three cases where there had been more than one cheque, then we have established the contention that the three cheque proposition or the two cheque proposition was the invention of Mr. Burrows or the Imperial Pulp Company.

The suggestion was made that because a Conservative firm inclosed two or three cheques in one case a matter of that kind should not be criticised. You can always get a firm of lawyers to send in a certain number of cheques or to draw up tenders. Mr. Fraser drew up certain tenders but he handed them to Mr. Burrows and Mr. Burrows put in a certain number of cheques. We have not Wyld and Osler here, but Wyld and Osler could have acted in the same way although there is no evidence of it, Wyld and Osler could have written out a tender and another gentleman could have put in as many cheques as he thought proper. Yet, you have a great effort on the part of the department to show that what was done was usual and ordinary instead of being unusual and extraordinary.

Mr. TURRIFF. It was customary in dozens and dozens of cases when tenders were put in to inclose several cheques.

Mr. BRISTOL. I am going to come to that in time. I have the hon. gentleman's evidence. I think I might as well deal with the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) now. That hon. gentleman

and the hon. member for Dauphin are naturally, under the present circumstances, in the centre of the stage to a large extent. I do not suppose that if they had been guilty of any wroing-doing they would be likely to get up and admit it. It would not occur to you that any man would do that. The only thing you have on the one side is circumstantial evidence and what you have on the other side is the statement of the hon. gentleman and he has denied absolutely, directly or indirectly, any wrong doing. I suppose, that as he has gone into the box as a witness it is only fair to a certain extent to criticise his evidence. There was one thing that the hon. member for East Assiniboia was anxious to establish, in so far as I can understand his evidence, and it was that there was no change under his regime in the opening of tenders from the system which had prevailed previously. I am not going to read his evidence on that point, but I think it is a fair statement of it. I want to show you how the tenders were opened before and how they were opened during the regime of the hon. member for East Assiniboia. From 1882 to 1892 the evidence given at pages 27 and 28, shows that they were opened by two responsible persons. What I mean is that there were two people charged with the responsibility of opening these tenders. It was not an individual responsibility as it was in the case of the land commissioner who had the absolute right to do as he pleased in the matter, but there were two people charged with the duty of opening these tenders and that is the whole distinction between the two cases. At page 27 Mr. Ryley is giving evidence:

Q. How long had that been the custom in the department?—A. Well, since the summer of 1902.

Q. Previous to that, the tenders were opened by a committee of three, of whom you were one, were they not?—A. No.

Q. Were you not, in former years, one of the three who opened the tenders?—A. Two.

Q. The tenders were always opened in the presence of two or three?—A. Two.

Q. The tenders were always opened previously in the presence of two. Who were those two?—A. The deputy minister and myself, and in his absence the secretary of the department and myself.

Q. Who would they be?—A. Mr. James A. Smart, who was the deputy for some years, and Mr. P. G. Keyes, secretary of the department.

That went on from 1882 to 1902. I do not think that the hon. member for East Assiniboia showed a great deal of courage in trying to hide himself behind a stenographer. I never like to see a man trying to shield himself behind a lady. We will see what the hon. gentleman said with reference to that lady. The young lady said she was present in the office; she stated quite frankly, that she was there as stenographer and that she had no other duties to perform. At page 122 Mr. Turriff gives evidence upon this point:

By Mr. Alcorn:

Q. Did you have Miss Munro there because you considered it necessary to have more than one person present?—A. No.

Q. She was there simply to take stenographic notes?—A. She was there as my stenographer. I did not consider then that it was necessary to have anybody else, no.

Q. Then she was there simply as your stenographer to take notes?—A. She was there as one of the officials of the department to take notes.

Q. For what purpose or reason?—A. I do not know that I had any purpose in view, she was doing that particular work, keeping track of the tenders and brought them in to be opened and kept the memorandum of the amount of the tenders.

Q. She was doing her part, what was her part?—A. Taking a memorandum of the different tenders.

Q. As stenographer?—A. As an officer of the department or stenographer, put it any way you like.

Then, to show you what the hon. gentleman's view was as to what had taken place before, I will quote from page 118:

By Mr. Bergeron:

Q. That was a new feature when you opened tenders, it had not been done before by any person in that position as I understand it?—A. As I understood from Mr. Ryley's evidence tenders were opened, prior to my time, by two officials of the department, and after I took hold they were opened just the same by two officials of the department.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, the moral obtuseness which the hon. gentleman displayed in his evidence with respect to certain matters. He seems to think that when a lady acting as a stenographer was present in his office and when there were two gentlemen charged with the joint responsibility of opening tenders it was one and the same thing. Well, if that is the view of the hon. gentleman, all I can say is that I am afraid that the hon. gentleman's view is somewhat distorted and incorrect. Now, there was another matter. I have read evidence to-night, with reference to the advertisement for timber limits 1048 and 1049. I asked the hon. member for East Assiniboia if any good public purpose was served by not extending the advertisement and he said: No, there was not. But, he was so eager to defend this class of advertisement that he stated that on several occasions he thought that limits had been sold for more than they were worth because there was not time for people to examine them. It seems to me extraordinary that any official of the government should take the position that they wanted to give such short notice so that in matters of this kind they could defraud the public because they could not by any possibility properly examine the

limits in the west. To give that as a reason in defence of the ex-Minister of the Interior in view of the protest of the mayor and Board of Trade of Prince Albert with reference to the time allowed for the examination of these 500 square miles seems to me certainly an extraordinary perversion of justice. My hon. friend was anxious to show that the method of tendering adopted by Mr. Burrows and by the Imperial Pulp Company was quite usual, and his evidence is as follows:

Q. Some of the tenders received in connection with these timber berths did not state the amount of the bonus offered?—A. Some of them did not.

Q. You have noticed that, was it a common thing?—A. Yes, a good many did not.

Q. A great many did not?—A. No, a good many did not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, among all these that were produced I am not aware of more than three which did not state the amount of the bonus and yet my hon. friend tells us that in a good many instances they did not.

Q. Have you from casually going through the files noticed tenders put into the department that did not state the bonus offered prior to your going into the department?—A. I do not remember.

Q. Did the tenderers always have a certified cheque or cash or both?—A. Sometimes one, sometimes the other and sometimes both.

Q. It was not an unusual thing to have the monies in cash and cheque?—A. No.

Among all these cases there is only one case where there was cash and cheque and yet my hon. friend says it is not unusual.

Q. It was not then an unusual thing to have cash accompany the tender?

I am not aware except in the two instances where the Imperial Pulp Company put in typewritten tenders and in ink was written $1,000 and in red ink was written $2,500, that any case occurred where the money was in cash. And yet we are told by this hon. gentleman that it was not unusual. And so we have the statement of this hon. gentleman, we have the statement of the hon. member for Dauphin, and we have had the statement of the solicitor, Mr. Fraser, and instead of asking Mr. Burrows why he put in double bids, and two or three cheques, and wrote tenders without stating the amount, and wrote tenders without even mentioning the cheque, we have the solicitor called to give under oath reasons that Mr. Burrows alone had in his own mind. And yet these gentlemen opposite speak of the fullness and fairness of this so-called investigation. Another humorous thing in connection with this is in respect to 1018 and 1019. We have had a good deal of explanation from Mr. Burrows, but we have not had any in respect to these two.

In this case what do we find? We find the member for Dauphin putting in a tender and supplying a cheque to Mr. Nolan to put in another tender in the same transaction. Did Mr. Burrows know there was no tender? What was his idea in putting in a fake bid himself as if he were beaten, and as if Mr. Nolan apparently got these limits? But Mr. Nolan inside of twenty-four hours executed an assignment of these limits to the Imperial Pulp Company. What was the object of the Imperial Pulp Company using other names? We have not had any explanation of that, but perhaps I may give one. I do not think that my hon. friends from Dauphin and East Assiniboia are quite as popular to-day as they were a year ago because during the last three months the people of this country have got on to the fact of who it is that were getting the timber limits. Up to the present time it was shrouded in mystery except as regards those limits obtained in his own name by Mr. Burrows, but latterly he was getting limits in Nolan's name. The Imperial Pulp Company only bid nine times and the last four bids out of nine were put in the name of others outside the pulp company. The Imperial Pulp Company itself was not sufficient to shroud Mr. Burrows and his associates and so they resorted to Mr. Nolan and Mr. Fraser, the solicitor.

I venture to think that as an opposition we have done all that it was possible for us to do in respect to this matter. We have got all the original documents we were permitted to get at; we have obtained all the facts that these documents would throw light upon ; we have examined to the extent to which we were permitted the public accounts in respect to this matter. But, Mr. Speaker, we were prevented both in connection with Mr. Finnie and by the narrowness of the investigation to get at the facts. We wanted in connection with Mr. Finnie to find out whether on the 7th of March when there were five cheques out apparently in Mr. Burrows' name, these five cheques had been charged up in the bank on that date against Mr. Burrows and the order in which they were charged up. That was a perfectly fair and proper question, but my hon. friend from Pictou who says he was anxious to give the fullest possible investigation objected, and the chair sustained the objection and Mr. Burrows was going to be called. But Mr. Burrows never was called and there never was the slightest intention of calling him and for the very obvious reason that they intended to let him make a statement here instead of where he could be cross-examined. I venture to think in view of the facts we have before us; in view of the clear and absolutely uncontradicted statements which my hon. friend from St. Antoine has made in reference to this matter; in view of the extraordinary success of the bidding of the hon. member for Dauphin ;

in view of the still more extraordinary success of the Imperial Pulp Company in bidding; in view of the fact that Messrs. McDonald and others who apparently bid against Mr. Burrows only succeeded fourteen times out of thirty bids, and paid three and a half times as much as the next highest bidder for the limits they obtained while Mr. Burrows only paid 6 per cent higher; in view of such an extraordinary set of circumstances as has been shown here, I believe it would be only proper and fair in the interests of the people that an investigation should be granted now, and if the right hon. gentleman does not grant an investigation the time will come when the people of Canada will have their rights in this matter and when there will be an investigation and when restitution will be made to the country.

House divided on the amendment (Mr Lake).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Monk,
Osler,
Owen,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—46.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brown,
Burrows,
Calvert,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Copp,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Fielding,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Graham,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
LeBlanc,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McColl,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (York, C.),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Pugsley,
Reid (Restigouche),
Robitaille,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Zimmerman.—91

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Galliher,	Stanfield,
Smith (Oxford),	MacLaren,
Kennedy,	Foster,
Lemieux,	Haggart,
Oliver,	Northrup,
Carney,	Elson,
Gordon,	Macdonell,
Savoie,	Paquet,
Emmerson,	Maclean (York, S.),
Dyment,	Seagram,
McCool,	Fowler,
Brodeur,	Leonard,
Bickerdike,	Ganong,
Tobin,	Morin,
Sifton,	Pringle,
Guthrie,	Clare,
Hall,	Smith (Wentworth),
Adamson,	Marshall,
Caldwell,	Lalor,
Wright (Renfrew),	Perley,
Ratz,	Beattie,
Conmee,	Boyce,
Finlay,	White,
Grant,	Lewis,
Law,	Thompson,
Bureau.	Forget

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for East Hastings and L'Islet have not voted.

Mr. PAQUET. I have paired with the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Ross). Otherwise, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have paired with the Minister of the Interior or I would have voted for the amendment.

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

Progress reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Supply, Mounted Police, Civil Service, Railways and other like matters.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.32 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 20, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal) presented the fourth report of the committee appointed to supervise the official debates of the House, as follows :—

The select standing committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of this House, during the present session, beg leave to present the following as their fourth report. Your committee recommend that E. Charlier, who has been employed in the capacity of proofreader on the staff of translators of debates, be appointed as translator at a salary of $2,000 per annum, and that Rodolphe Girard be appointed to replace the former as proofreader at a salary of $1,500 per annum.

Mr. GERVAIS moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING. Is that the one my hon. friend called my attention to to-day ?

Mr. GERVAIS. No.

Motion agreed to.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—GUARANTEED BONDS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 171) respecting the government guaranteed bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific. He said : The first purpose of this Bill is to authorize the Grand Trunk Pacific to pledge the bonds guaranteed by the government as security for the raising of money. The earliest legislation undoubtedly contemplated that the company should have the power to pledge the bonds as well as sell them. It would seem, however, that the machinery provided is inadequate and it is necessary to specifically give the company the power to pledge the bonds. If the market were deemed unfavourable to press the sale of the bonds, the company might raise money by pledging the bonds as collateral security. The second purpose of the Bill is due to certain judicial decisions given in England to the effect that when a bond is pledged in the way contemplated by this Bill, it is deemed to have been issued and the power of the company to sell it ceases. Consequently when the bonds given as collateral security are restored to the possession of the company the company would not have the legal right to sell them. To remove all possible doubt, we propose to declare that the pledging of the bonds will not interfere with the right of the company to sell them at a later stage. The same difficulty will probably come up in connection with other companies and it may be necessary to pass general legislation upon the subject. In the meantime, as we are dealing with this particular case, we ask that the company be given the power to pledge the bonds as security in order to raise money and that this shall not interfere with their right to sell the same bonds when the company again obtain possession of them. The third purpose of the Bill is intended to facilitate the operations of the company in the construction of the railway. To avoid delays which, it has been found by experience, sometimes happen, and enable the company to make prompt payment for work done, it is proposed that we give them a letter of credit, practically as we do now in connection with our own departments, authorizing the company to expend a limited sum, not exceeding at any time the sum of one million dollars. That letter of credit is to be dealt with in the same way as a letter of credit under our ordinary financial operations. The expenditure must of necessity be used for the purpose authorized by the Transcontinental Railway Act. At regular intervals, say at the end of each month, the chief engineer must examine these expenditures and if they all fall under the Act and are such as he can certify to, he will certify accordingly. If it be found that, under this letter of credit, the company have used the proceeds thus obtained, or any part thereof, for any purposes not entirely within the meaning of the Act, then the sum so used must instantly be made good by a deposit in the bank to the credit of the same fund from which they were withdrawn. Before any letter of credit shall be issued, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which is the parent company, must enter into an agreement to make good any money which may be expended in the unauthorized way to which I have referred. These are the three purposes of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the Finance Minister if he does not think this

is one of the Bills which should be introduced by way of resolution.

Mr. FIELDING. At one time I was inclined to think as does my hon. friend, but I took advice on that point. It is not the money of the Consolidated Fund of Canada but money which belongs to the Grand Trunk Pacific, but inasmuch as it is raised on the credit of the government of Canada it is placed in a special account to the credit of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General and can only be drawn upon on certificates of the government engineer. The government therefore supervise the money very properly, but it is not a part of the consolidated fund. However, even if it were a part of the consolidated fund, this Bill does not create any new obligation in any way ; it simply gives directions as to the manner in which the fund already created shall be distributed. It does not create a new obligation or add to any former obligation of the government.

Mr. SPROULE. Does it not give power to raise money ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it does not give power to raise money in the sense in which the word is used by my hon. friend ; the power to raise money has already been given by the granting of power to issue the bonds. This is a power to take the bonds to the bank, and to say : We do not find it expedient owing to circumstances to sell these bonds at present but we will leave them here as collateral. That is a power which all railways have under the General Railway Act, but for the special reasons in this case it is necessary to introduce this Bill. There is nothing unusual in the Bill, I have had it looked into and I do not think it is necessary to adopt the suggestion that has been made.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the credit is based on money already in the funds.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so, and only on the money derived from these bonds. It is not a letter of credit on the consolidated fund at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not an advance.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, no.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—JUDGE CASSELS INVESTIGATION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount per day is being paid to Messrs. Watson and Perron, as counsel for the prosecution of the inquiry before Judge Cassels?

2. Are they now at work, and will their work be continued during the time the court is adjourned?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. Mr. Watson is to be paid a retaining fee dependant upon the extent of the inquiry and $100 a day with necessary out of pocket expenses.

No arrangement has yet been made with Mr. Perron as to the amount of his fees.

2. The government is not informed whether counsel are now at work, but it is inevitable that considerable work will have to be done at times when the commissioner is not sitting for the actual hearing of evidence.

WHARF AT POINTE-AUX-TREMBLES.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What was the date fixed, in 1904, by the Department of Public Works for the reception of tenders for the construction of a wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, county of Portneuf?

2. What is the date of the contract of Dusseault & Pageau for the construction of that wharf?

3. In virtue of their contract what length of time was given them to construct that wharf?

4. As Dusseault & Pageau were not able to construct the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles on the date specified in the contract, what was the date fixed by the Department of Public Works for the completion of the construction of that wharf?

5. On what date was the notice to that effect given to Dusseault & Pageau?

6. Were there any complaints against the contractors, Dusseault & Pageau, in regard to the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles? If so, by whom, what was the nature of such complaints, and were they written or verbal?

7. At what date did Dusseault & Pageau suspend their work?

8. What are the names, Christian names and residences of the engineer and inspector who had the superintendence of the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles?

9. Did the engineer make any report against the work done by Dusseault & Pageau?

10. What is the estimated amount of the material that Dusseault & Pageau had upon the ground when they suspended work?

11. What is the amount estimated by the engineer for the work done by Dusseault & Pageau when they suspended work?

12. What amount was paid on account of their contract to Dusseault & Pageau, and what is the date of each such payment?

13. Was anything paid to Dusseault & Pageau, or to any other persons, in connection with the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, since the suspending of the work? If so, to whom, at what dates and what amounts?

14. Was anything done in connection with the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles since Dusseault & Pageau suspended work?

15. Before receiving the contract for the

wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, had Dusseault & Pageau performed any other contracts for the Department of Public Works? If so, what were those contracts?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). My hon. friend will see that this question is a very lengthy one. All I can say is that all the papers connected with it and which are necessary to enable the answer to be made are with the Public Accounts Committee upon the motion of the hon. gentleman who has placed the question on the Order Paper. If the hon. gentleman will ask the committee to return the papers I will have much pleasure in having an answer prepared.

Mr. TAYLOR. Stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question will stand.

DREDGING AT FORT WILLIAM.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What amount was paid to the Great Lakes Dredging Company, for work done at Fort William or Mission river for rock and other material, respectively, during last year?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

For rock	$ 4,094 00
For other material	257,146 29
Allowance for extra haul	48,465 35
	$309,705 64

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether it is proposed to go into motions again this session, but I notice that there are some very important pieces of information called for by motions for returns. It might be possible to run through the unopposed motions at some time and get them off the paper.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall be happy to look at it.

SUPPLY—STANSTEAD ELECTION PAPERS.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before you leave the chair, I would like to bring to the attention of the House very briefly the circumstances attending the loss or destruction of the papers connected with the Stanstead election of 1908. I thought the matter of sufficient importance to justify me in procuring a copy of the evidence which is too long to read to the House, but the facts in which I shall bring to the attention of members. In the first place it would appear that the present Clerk of the Crown in Chancery received a letter from the solicitor of the petitioner on the 23rd of April, 1908, inquiring who was the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at that date and asking that information for the purpose of serving a subpœna upon him in order that he might produce papers relative to the by-election in Stanstead in 1908, which was then under consideration upon the proceedings already taken in the court. It would appear that that letter was answered by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 24th of April and that before answering the letter, the purport of which does not appear from the evidence, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery made search in his office and discovered that the papers referred to, that is the papers relating to the by-election of 1908, were missing and that in the box or place where he might have expected to find them he found instead the papers relating to the Stanstead general election of 1904. It does not appear that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery made any communication whetever of this very important fact to the solicitor of the petitioner, and I gather from what has been said by the right hon. the Prime Minister that he was consulted upon the subject by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery immediately after the loss of the papers was discovered.

I would not have brought the matter up for the purpose of making the observation I am about to make, but I think it is pertinent to make it in this connection. It would seem to me to be the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery—and it would have been proper for the Prime Minister to have advised the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of that duty—to acquaint at once the solicitor of the petitioner with the fact that public documents of this country, properly required for the purposes of a trial which would determine the right to a seat in this House, could not be found and were either destroyed or stolen or made away with in some manner. It is perfectly obvious to any hon. gentleman in this House who realizes the importance of this matter, that that should have been done. To prove the election properly under such conditions it would be necessary to have certain searches made and certain inquiries carried on in order that secondary evidence of that which would be properly proved by the best evidence, might be admitted by the judge presiding at the inquiry. If it had happened that the judge presiding at that inquiry had not granted an adjournment, very serious consequences might have followed the failure of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to adopt the course which I have suggested as a proper one for him to adopt. As a matter of fact, the counsel for the petitioner with whom I have conversed on this subject, states to me that he did not know until the witness actually went upon the stand and gave his evidence, that the papers would not be forthcoming ; and although he made

inquiries from Mr. Foley after his arrival at Sherbrooke, as to the production of the papers, he was unable to obtain any information upon that subject.

Now the facts seem to be these : in the first place, let me say at once that whatever suspicion, if there be any suspicion, may attach to the loss of these papers—and I am not suggesting any suspicion at the present moment—the late Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, Mr. Lamothe, is absolutely above any suspicion whatever, either as to his character or his ability. All who knew that gentleman realize that the proper discharge of his duties of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was his chief consideration, and no one would for a moment suppose that he would be concerned in any way, either directly or indirectly in any act at all improper in connection with these papers or any others. His assistants and clerks I believe to be equally reliable and faithful. It appears that Mr. Lamothe fell ill in March, and that during the month of March he suffered more or less from the disorder which eventually carried him off. It appears further that the papers relating to the Stanstead by-election had been received on the 5th day of February by registered mail from the returning officer ; and also that a man by the name of L'Heureux came to the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 8th or 10th of February in order to ascertain if any papers in that office were ready to be taken away and burned. I should perhaps state in this connection that it is the practice, in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery as in other departments of government, to give to this man, who has some contract or mandate for that purpose, the papers which are useless and which it is desired to get out of the way. He came on the 8th or 10th of February, but the evidence is not very plain, so far as I can understand it, whether he actually took away some papers at that time, but it is probable that he did so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Who is L'Heureux ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. L'Heureux is a carter or a man of that class, who is employed in the various departments of the government, and in this building I think, to come and take away the papers that are put aside as waste and useless. I understand that he takes them away and destroys them in a furnace. It appears that L'Heureux went to the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery about the 8th or 10th of February, and it would appear probable that he did take away some papers on that occasion. But it is to be remembered that the papers relating to the Stanstead election had been received in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery only three days before. The papers are kept in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in pigeon holes, each one having a door which is fastened by a key, and I believe that one or two keys fit practically nearly all the locks on these pigeon holes.

Mr. Lamothe was last in his office on the 1st day of April, 1908, and he died on the 8th day of April. He was subpœnaed to attend the hearing of the preliminary objections apparently for the 6th day of April, 1908. I gather that by inference rather than by direct statement. It would appear that the hearing was adjourned in consequence of his illness to the 6th day of May. At all events he was subpœnaed on the 1st day of April, and that was the day on which he last attended in his office. Mr. Chadwick, a clerk in the office, declares in his testimony that he saw the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery get the papers ready after receiving the subpoena on the 1st day of April. He is not sure as to the date, and he says further in his evidence that in the ordinary course Mr. Lamothe would have done this about two days after receiving the subpoena. He seems to be confident however that he saw him get the papers ready for the purpose of taking them to the hearing of the preliminary objections. If that is correct, and I think it is, Mr. Lamothe must have done that on the 1st day of April, the very day on which he received the subpœna, because he was not in his office after that date.

Mr. Foley was appointed Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 21st day of April. During the interim there was no person specially charged with the duties of the office, except in so far as Mr. Chadwick and the young lady stenographer who was employed in the office, might be considered as invested with any mandate to discharge such duties. Mr. Foley, the present Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, attended at the preliminary objections on the 6th day of May, when he made known for the first time the fact that the papers were missing. He says that after receiving his subpœna to attend the hearing he immediately proceeded to look for the papers, and he then discovered the box bearing the label 'Stanstead by-election, 1908,' and he proceeded to get those papers ready to take with him in attending the court in obedience to the subpœna; and happening by accident to look into one of the envelopes, he discovered that these papers were really the papers for the general election of 1904, and not for the by-election of 1908. He discovered, however, in the box, along with the other documents, the stamp used for the purpose of the by-election of 1908, but he did not discover the stamp used for the election of 1904. The stamp of course does not accompany the copy of the deposition which I have, but an impression had been

forwarded. It is just a stamp containing the words 'Returning officer, Stanstead, 1908.' I will not weary the House with reading any portion of the evidence giving Mr. Foley's explanation of the presence of that stamp. I could not follow very clearly the explanation, and I am inclined to think that there has been some mistake on the part of the stenographer in taking down the evidence. That of course very often occurs. For example, on the top of page 4, he gives the following answer :

Did you make search yourself?—A. Yes, Sir, I made most diligent search myself and also my deputy Mr. Chadwick whom I called in at once. And we both made all possible search for the papers, but could find nothing else. Mr. Chadwick afterwards went to Mr. Lamothe's house and made search there without avail. The only evidence I could find of the 1908 election in the box, is the little stamp that I have here (witness produced a rubber stamp). I suppose that was on account of the box being placed on one end, this remained on the bottom.

It is the last sentence of the testimony which I have just read that I do not understand. It does not afford to me, at least, an adequate explanation of how it was that although all the other papers relating to the Stanstead election of 1908 disappeared, this rubber stamp was found in the box where these papers should also have been found. So much for the circumstances of the case.

Mr. BENNETT. Would it not have been thrown in outside of the envelope ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether or not the evidence gives us any information in regard to that. I made some inquiry and I understand that the stamp might come back in a bag with other papers or it might come with another parcel. I do not feel that too much importance should be attached to the fact that the stamp was found in the box. But, it is a singular circumstance that every other paper which should have been found in the box had disappeared and that the stamp of 1908 was found there while the stamp of 1904 was not found there. The matter with which I am chiefly concerned, in bringing this subject to the attention of the House, is this : the evidence disloses that a great many persons have access to the office, persons employed in the building who require to visit the different rooms for any purpose, all these possess keys to this room. For example, the engineers and other persons requiring to do any work in the different rooms of this building possess keys. The messengers of the House possess keys. I am not making reference to these persons with the slightest idea of casting suspicion upon them, but simply in connection with another circumstances which is of the gravest possible nature and it is that a great many keys are available for this room and any person who can obtain access to this room, can, by using two or three keys, of the most ordinary description, find eventually a key which will open every one of these boxes and expose to that person public documents which may affect the seats of half a dozen members of this House. I have made inquiry on the subject heretofore and I understand that the officials of the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery have been asking for two years that they should be provided with steel file cases which would make these papers absolutely secure. These file cases would be provided with locks which would not be susceptible to being opened by such ordinary means as those I have indicated.

We do not know what may be the result of the loss or destruction in the present case. I do not desire to make any comment upon the Stanstead election. I did not rise for the purpose of doing it, but let us assume an election in which there were not only genuine ballots but ballots fraudulent upon their face such as we discovered upon examination of the ballots of the West Huron and Brockville elections ; does not my hon. friend the Prime Minister, does not every member of this House, realize how absolutely essential it may be to the interests of persons concerned in such frauds that the ballot papers in that particular case should be destroyed, and should not be forthcoming when they were called for upon the preliminary inquiry or any other inquiry ? That emphasizes the absolute necessity of providing the clerk of the Crown in Chancery with proper steel cases secured by proper locks in order that public documents of this character which may be required in the courts of the country may be preserved and in order that parliament may be properly and regularly constituted. As I have said here I understand that has been the urgent wish of the officials in that department during the past two years and such a wish has been expressed on several occasions, to the proper authorities who have, up to the present time, absolutely disregarded it. Then, there is another suggestion that I would like to make to the government, that there should be some departmental inquiry or investigation, or an investigation by the House, if necessary—the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is attached to what department ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He is attached to the House of Commons.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He is not attached to any particular department ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. When Mr. Lamothe was in office the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was attached to the Department of the Privy Council and had been for some years, but it was suggested that he should be attached to the House of Commons to which he properly belongs

and when we appointed a successor, Mr. Foley, we transferred him to the staff of the House of Commons.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I recollect that the right hon. Prime Minister announced that owing to the suggestion made by the Civil Service Commission that change had been made. It would seem very desirable that Mr. Speaker should make some investigation into this matter if it were not thought worthy of the attention of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I would be inclined to think that an inquiry should be prosecuted at once. It is not for me to say how serious under the present circumstances may be the loss of these ballots. It is represented to me that the loss may be a very serious one in prosecuting the inquiry which it was proposed to carry on by the proceedings in the courts. I am not at the present time attaching blame to any of the officials. I have not the material upon which I could be justified in imputing blame to any official, and I should require circumstances of a very cogent nature before I would propose to cast that blame. But, there are two things which are absolutely certain. In the first place, Mr. Lamothe was not only a most conscientious officer, but he was a most careful and diligent officer in the discharge of his duties. One finds it difficult therefore to believe that on the 8th or 10th of February last, three days after he had received the papers relating to the by-election in Stanstead, he should have sent these papers away to be destroyed, making the mistake of believing that they were papers which had come to him in connection with the general election of 1904. I find it very difficult to bring myself to the conclusion that there was any such mistake as that and yet it is the only explanation which has been vouchsafed up to the present time. In the second place, I desire to call attention once more to the urgent, thorough necessity of providing the officials of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with such steel cases, or other appliances of a like character, as will place suspicion of any wrong doing in connection with a matter of this kind absolutely beyond question. At the present time we have this condition of affairs: The papers have been lost, a certain explanation has been given and that explanation depends upon the most remarkable negligence and inadvertence on the part of a very capable, reliable, diligent and conscientious officer. If we do not accept that explanation then we simply require to conjecture some other and it is impossible to conjecture any other without at the same time casting suspicion which ought not to be cast without adequate and grave reasons. It surley is undesirable that the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery should be accessible to so many persons and that it should not be provided with the means of keeping these papers absolutely safe and secure. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I thought it nothing more than my duty to bring the matter to the attention of the government in the earnest hope that immediate steps will be taken so that an occurrence of this kind cannot possibly come again to the attention of the House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend has paid to the late Mr. Lamothe a tribute of which he was altogether worthy; no more faithful officer ever lived. I may say also that to Mr. Chadwick, the other clerk in the office, the most unqualified commendation can be given.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Chadwick is also a most honourable and painstaking officer. Mr. Foley, the present Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, is also a very excellent officer but of course he had nothing to do with this. The office of the council of the Crown in Chancery is in this building and Mr. Foley before his appointment was working in the Privy Council office in the eastern block. It is difficult to account for such an accident. but having given it consideration since it was brought to my attention I must say the conclusion I have arrived at is that the papers disappeared before the death of Mr. Lamothe. I do not care to enter into this further than to say that I believe it was the result of an accident and nothing else. I think everybody admits that. My hon. friend has stated that Mr. Lamothe and Mr. Chadwick of late years have repeatedly made applications for these steel cases. These applications would necessarily come to me first and if Mr. Lamothe did make such an application I must say that I do not remember it. If a requisition of that kind should come to me, after having discussed it with the officers I would send it immediately to the Department of Public Works. But I have no recollection of having received such an application although it is quite possible it may have been made. As to the suggestion that the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is accessible to several people, I think that applies to every office in the departments, for the charwomen must go there every morning and other people must of necessity have access.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course that is absolutely necessary and I was not objecting to it. I merely mentioned it to show the necessity for providing these steel file cases so that those who go into the office could not get at the papers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery properly belongs to this House and there is no reason at all why it should be attached to

any department of the government. When the commission reported that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery should be on the staff of the House of Commons it seemed to be perfectly reasonable, and when we appointed a successor to Mr. Lamothe we put him at once on the staff of this House and he is now under the jurisdiction of Mr. Speaker and not under the President of the Privy Council as was formerly the case. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is the custodian of the archives connected with elections to this House and he therefore holds a very important position. I welcome the suggestion that we should have an investigation so that attention may be given to the advisability of taking extra precautions for the keeping of these records. If it be the wish of my hon. friends opposite I should be quite willing to consent to the appointment of a special committee to investigate the whole question. I may say that the matter was brought to my attention for the first time shortly after Mr. Foley assumed office. He came to my room in the House of Commons, on what date I do not remember further than it was Friday afternoon and he had been summoned to appear at the trial on the following Tuesday. I advised Mr. Foley to at once report to the Speaker of the House and to get from the Printing Bureau a list of the electors so that if the solicitor for the petitioners wanted secondary evidence, that might facilitate the proceedings. I repeat that we are only too happy to have any further investigation as to the cause of the accident, if the cause can be found, and with a view of guarding against as far as possible any such accident taking place in future.

Mr. FOSTER. This matter has been known for some time; is it true that up to the present no special investigation has been made?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No special investigation has been made and I do not see what special investigation could be made. Nobody blames Mr. Lamothe and everybody must come to the conclusion that it was merely an accident. If there was any reason to suppose that there had been dishonest design in the destruction of these ballots the case would be different, but I cannot see for what purpose anybody would destroy these ballots.

Mr. FOSTER. The purpose is very evident.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not evident at all. As I understand it the controversy in the courts is simply as to a matter of form and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was summoned to give the usual formal evidence as to the holding of the election. These papers having been destroyed it is not difficult at all to make secondary evidence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. FOSTER. If the process is to eventuate in anything, the case would come to trial and then the ballots would be important, and the ballots have gone.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I have been informed, the preliminary objection has been taken in the trial that the returning officer did not initial or certify the lists which were delivered to the deputy returning officers, and if that be the point it can be determined by secondary evidence. As a fact I understand the returning officer admits he did not sign these papers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister is quite right that secondary evidence could be produced and it would be foolish for any one to suppose that the petition would be absolutely defeated by destroying the ballots. But the importance of the ballots does not cease there, because if certain fraudulent acts have been committed at certain polls the production of the ballots would be an important feature.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am informed by the counsel for the petitioner that he regards the ballots as very important evidence for his client.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the first intimation I have of that.

Mr. FOSTER. The really important point is that it is possible for ballots to be destroyed in any way, thus rendering the restitution of his rights to an aggrieved candidate practically impossible. Surely it is important that such an occurrence should be inquired into. The gravity of the whole thing, I think, is in that. Granted that Mr. Lamothe was not to blame—and in that opinion I agree heartily with the Prime Minister and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition—the ballots have disappeared. It is just as fair to suppose that Mr. Lamothe did not by accident destroy the ballots or allow them to be destroyed, as it is to suppose that he may have committed an error unwittingly and thereby the ballots have gone. It is just as easy, and I think much more natural, to suppose that a third party has been able to intervene, and for some purpose or other to do away with the ballots. I would rather suppose that than that Mr. Lamothe, a very careful officer, who has been in that office for a long while, could have allowed the ballots to have been taken away in mistake for those of 1904; and it is to me a little startling that the Prime Minister seems to have thought that it was quite well enough to let the matter slip along and to make no investigation of it at all, but only now is willing to take the suggestion that has been made. It seems to me that such a thing ought immediately to have been put in the hands of the Dominion police. They work by

clues, and might have been able to discover whether or not some third party had intervened and had made away with the ballots. That is a supposition that is quite plain to be taken.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My opinion and my information is that there was nobody to blame, but that it was an accident; but I concur in the suggestion of my hon. friend that the matter should be investigated by a special committee of this House with the view of ascertaining the cause and what precautions may be taken to prevent similar accidents in the future.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). As the right hon. leader of the House has explained, it is only recently that the officer has been transferred to the jurisdiction of the House of Commons. I am aware that since that transfer has been made, Mr. Speaker has communicated with Mr. Foley, now the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and has requested him to make suggestions as to what improvements he would wish to have made for the better care of the documents, in the way of improved accommodation or otherwise. No doubt, if there has been any laxity, the necessary arrangements will be speedily made for the better care of the documents in the future. Mr. Speaker has already taken action for that purpose.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The peculiarly regrettable feature of the matter seems to be this. We have had twice in the history of Canada the destruction of ballots and papers that were supposed to be necessary and valuable for determining the result of a contest in the courts over elections, once in Toronto, and once here; and is it not strange that the papers in both cases disappeared apparently at the very time they were most needed, and that the history of the loss appears to have been exactly the same in both cases—they were destroyed by accident? In the West Elgin case the ballots were burned, as it was said to be the custom to burn the ballot papers after they were several years old; and those which had come in recently got mixed with the old ones. Does it look natural or reasonable, that any business man charged with the responsibility of keeping the papers relating to an election of three or four years ago would allow them to get mixed up with the papers relating to an election of only a month ago? It does not seem to me to be natural or probable or reasonable. Therefore, while not desiring to say too much on this matter, I cannot refrain from the suspicion that there is fault somewhere, and that the act was the result of design rather than of accident. In both cases the papers were destroyed just when an election contest was going on in the courts, and when the destruction of the papers would serve the interests of the same political party, once in the province and once in the Dominion. Another strange coincidence is that an important member of the cabinet was the confidential adviser of the party in Ontario at the time that this happened there, and when the fact came out the same explanation was given that is given to-day in this instance. This shows either that great minds run in the same channel or that it was really and purely a coincidence. Another feature that seems to be interesting is the fact that when the matter was brought to the attention of the government, they made no effort to ascertain the cause of it. The destruction of these papers might result in keeping a member improperly sitting in this House for the remainder of the term, or they might put him out of the House by disclosing irregularities or devices that in law would be very serious punishable offences. But the destruction of the papers destroyed all that. The very fact that these weighty consequences were involved, and that it is very desirable that all public officers should be above suspicion with regard to the faithful and careful discharge of their duties, should have led to a most searching inquiry at the earliest possible moment so as to satisfy all that it was purely and simply an accident and nothing else. If that had been done, the incident would have ended there; but the indifference of the government with regard to it in itself creates the suspicion that they did not think it worth while to have an inquiry made until some one brought it to the attention of the House, and then they say if the House desires they will have an inquiry. If such a thing had happened with the other party, either in this House or in Ontario. I venture to think that not a moment's delay would have occurred before a most searching inquiry would have taken place to ascertain what was the real history of the destruction of these important papers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow I will move that this matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or, if hon. gentlemen prefer, to a select committee.

THE PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. LORENZO ROBITAILLE (Quebec). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Agriculture to certain reports in the newspapers. It is stated in the 'Star' of Monday, the 18th May, that at a meeting held at Knowlton on Saturday, the 16th, the Hon. Sydney Fisher, Minister of Agriculture, declared that 'provincial politics must go hand in hand with federal politics, for both are destined to work for the good of the country.' In the 'Herald' of May 18 it is stated:

Hon. Mr. Fisher congratulated Mr. Vilas on his record at Quebec, and on the evident approval of the electors of Brome. There was, he said, an intimate connection between the politics of the province and the politics of the Dominion, because each was destined to conduct the country in the same paths of progress and prosperity.

The 'Free Press' of May 15, giving a report of the meeting at the Russell House, reports the speech of the Hon. Mr. Graham thus :

He (Hon. A. G. Mackay) stood for the same Liberalism as did the federal party, and the Dominion leaders were behind him.

The 'Evening Journal' of the 15th May reports the same hon. gentleman thus :

I want to say that as a member of the federal government I believe in and support Mr. Mackay as the leader in Ontario.

I would ask the hon. gentlemen if they are reported correctly. Also, I would appreciate the courtesy if the right hon. leader of this House would say whether he approves of provincial issues being identified with federal politics ?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). All I have to say is that I am a supporter of the Hon. A. G. Mackay in the province of Ontario and am proud of it. I do not propose to go into a discussion of political issue. Mr. Mackay is well able to do that himself. If he were holding a meeting to-morrow, and if I could get away, I would be on the platform behind him or beside him.

THE QUEBEC TERCENTENARY—MOBILIZATION OF MILITIA.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Before you leave the chair. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be permitted to make a few remarks regarding the abandonment by this government, to a great extent, of the military demonstration at the Quebec tercentenary. The present attitude of the government is an abandonment of the intended mobilization of the militia of Canada at that celebration. The matter is one, in my opinion, of very great, if not of immediate, public importance. The people of Canada have been led to believe by the government that at least fifty per cent of the Canadian militia, besides the permanent force, would be mobilized at Quebec on the occasion of the tercentenary celebration. When the Minister of Militia was passing some of his estimates, as far back as the 27th March last, the question came up and he then said, as far as I was then able to understand, that the government had made certain arrangements with regard to this matter. On that occasion hon. gentlemen on this side who spoke supported the proposition, and the House was unanimous in its approval of the course then outlined by the hon. minister to abandon the rural camps in the summer and have only one camp or mobilization of our militia on the Plains of Abraham or thereabouts at Quebec. On that occasion the government made a contract with this House and the people and the militia of this country that that proposal would be carried out. But we are now told something entirely different. We are told, if we are told anything definite, that it is proposed to abandon the position then taken for the reason that the transportation companies are unable or unwilling to convey the militia at a time when they have to convey such a large concourse of people as will necessarily go to Quebec. As early as 27th March last, the Minister of Militia, who ought to have been aware of the attitude of the transportation companies, said, as appears on page 5748 of 'Hansard':

The department appreciate the importance of this matter of transportation, and the very first thing we did was to address letters to all the transportation companies to ascertain what kind of accommodation they will be able to give us. The answers are coming in now.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. That was as far back as the 27th March last, and it was not until the 13th May that this House was startled by the announcement of the Minister of Militia of the practical abandonment of this proposition. The government appointed a commission, and the members of that commission were appointed by the right hon. gentleman himself previous to the announcement of the Minister of Militia, and into the hands of that commission was committed the programme for the celebration at Quebec. It seemed to me that that was a matter which the government should not have delegated in that way. It seems to me that the duties were such as they should have performed themselves, and that they were in a better position to deal with these matters and the transportation companies than would be the commission. Be that as it may, the government appointed this commission, composed of very able men, and this commission mapped out a programme, which they published throughout Canada and the neighbouring republic and in fact the whole world. That programme consisted of four features. One was the mobilization of our military, which was practically Canada's only contribution to the event. Then there was to be a display of the British fleet, and I believe France and the United States were also asked to send warships to participate in that naval display, and then there was to be a grand pageant during eight or nine days depicting various scenes in the early history of this country, and in the end there was to be a display of fireworks and an illumination. The commission, on the faith of the government's attitude, and no doubt carrying out their instructions,

proceeded upon the basis that there was to be a mobilization of the army of Canada. That was something to be desired and which had not heretofore taken place in our history. The people were to be treated to a display of Canada's national army, mobilized to the extent of some 20,000 or 25,000 men. It was largely on that basis that the attraction of the celebration was based. That was to be the great attraction, as far as we are concerned in Canada. The British people were to contribute their quota towards the entertainment, and there is no reason to suppose that they will not carry out their engagement. The commission, having made these tentative arrangements, proceeded to Quebec. I am informed that they went there in company with the officials of the Militia Council. At all events these officials went to Quebec and viewed the property where it was proposed to locate the camp, and in a general way mapped out arrangements for the accommodation of these men and for the carrying out of the military features. Let me say in passing that there can be no excuse for withdrawing the military mobilization scheme because of the lack of accommodation at Quebec, because the soldiers would in no way trespass upon the accommodation of civilians.

They would be provided with accommodation by the Department of Militia, entirely independent of the civilian quarters of the city so that they would not in any way interfere with the citizens. The commission proceeded upon that basis, so I am informed, and had interviews with the transportation companies who, while not anxious to undertake this matter, were ready to transport these troops and carry out the arrangement as intended, but in view of the expected congestion of traffic on the occasion, they asked to be allowed to take the troops down two days earlier and remove them from Quebec two days earlier than was otherwise intended. Even if the transportation companies were allowed to have their way, surely that was ground on which they could have been meet. If the abandonment of this whole matter hinged upon the presence of the troops there two days earlier than the people would arrive and their withdrawal two days earlier than the people would leave, surely that is a flimsy reason for the abandonment. Whether the transportation companies were right or wrong, if this arrangement could have been made to bring the troops there as I said two days earlier, it was surely worth while meeting them in that matter. The people were informed that these troops would be present, various contributions poured into the fund for this purpose, the province of Ontario contributed, I think, $100,000 and the province of Quebec $100,000, and there were other contributions from private persons, some in England and some in Canada. It seems to me that one feature of the programme on which these contributions were based was this military display. Why has it been abandoned? What sufficient reason is there for the abandonment? The military of this country were given to understand that they could have this opportunity of meeting in a joint camp. The citizen soldiery of the province of Ontario, and especially of Toronto, have looked forward to this, many of them have made their arrangements for the summer accordingly. the regiments have filled up to complete strength, and this is due in no small measure to the opportunity they expected would be afforded them in participating in this manœuvre and going to Quebec. Is the government going to break faith with the people and with the military of this country? Surely some way can be found by which the original arrangement can be carried out. It seems altogether a flimsy excuse to say that the transportation companies must have their way in this matter and not carry these troops. The Minister of Militia would naturally be expected to know before he announced his scheme to the country whether or not the military could be entrained and properly handled. He said in this House on a subsequent occasion that the Militia Department could mobilize and handle twice that number of troops in 48 hours at a central point like Quebec where a number of railways centre. The commission have made their arrangements, the public have made their arrangements and now we are practically told that with the exception of the permanent force there is to be no military demonstration. That I think is not an unfair meaning to take from the remarks of the Minister of Militia who has said in the House :

> A considerable portion of the permanent force will be sent to Quebec. What other portions will be sent I cannot say, but as soon as it is decided I shall be prepared to make an announcement to the House.

The impression has got abroad in this country that there is an abandonment of the whole military feature, except perhaps that it will be taken part in by the permanent force. If there is to be a renewal of this arrangement let it be announced at once. The time is approaching when the celebration is to be held. 25,000 men cannot get away on an hour's notice, and it seems to me the government have not kept faith with the militia or with the people of Canada or with this House. The railways, of course, expect a large concourse of people and the number who will attend is largely due, I believe, to the expected appearance of the military. When it is found that the military are not to appear it seems to me that Canada is practically abandoning all the portion that she was to contribute to that display. It is my opinion that the attendance will fall off in proportion. None of us want to see this cele-

bration a fizzle, we all want to see a large number of people there, but certainly if the plans at present contemplated by the government are pursued, there will be a great reduction in the number of people who will go there. If the government do not intend to abandon it they should, at the earliest possible moment, make an announcement to the country of what they intend to do so that people would know what part the military are to play in this celebration.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I wish to reassure my hon. friend at the outset that there has been no abandonment of anything. There has been a change of plans, although at the time this matter was first mentioned in the House, on the voting of certain supplies to the militia, to which my hon. friend has referred, I was very careful to say :

The plans have not yet been completed, in fact, they have scarcely been begun. It is the present idea that it would be desirable that a portion of the vote for the annual drill should be used in the transportation and mobilization of a considerable number of the militia at Quebec where they will be under canvass under the usual conditions of camp, and the duties ordinarily performed in camps of instruction will be discharged there, and of course the troops will take part in the review to be held at Quebec in connection with the celebration. I do not know how many days that will take, but whatever the cost will be it will be charged up against the vote for the annual drill and the officers of my department think that this will be a very valuable experience.

And so on. There was nothing definite and 'abandon' is altogether too strong a term.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was announced afterwards that it was expected that 40,000 or 50,000 would be taken, or 50 per cent of the militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I said that 50 per cent of the active militia, the rural militia, would be taken, which would be about 20,000. The fact is that there will be a mobilization of a certain number of the militia of Canada at Quebec on this occasion, nobody has thought of abandoning that idea. I stated in the House the other day that it had been found impossible, on account of the difficulties connected with transportation, to mobilize such a large number as was at first thought of, some thirty odd thousand, and I stated that would have interfered with one of the chief objects we have in view, namely, the bringing together at Quebec of a very large number of people from all over this continent, who will have to be brought there by the railways. After going into the thing carefully, the Quarter-Master General, who has charge of matters of transportaion, found that it would be very difficult indeed to carry out this mobilization.

Mr. MACDONELL.

It would be full of risk, because accidents might arise in transporting guns, horses and all the paraphernalia attending a large camp, which would seriously interfere with the transportation facilities by which the people who expect to go to Quebec could alone be carried there. The other day I stated in the House fully the reasons why we had reluctantly given up the idea of a large camp which would practically include nearly the whole of the militia of Canada, but I said at the same time that there would be a force mobilized at Quebec. I do not suppose, Mr. Speaker, that there is any special advantage in making a military demonstration of great power and force at Quebec on that occasion. It does not seem to me that it is at all necessary. What I think we want is a fair representation of the militia of Canada, and that we expect to have, that, I think, is all that is necessary. I could go on and enlarge upon the subject, but I think I have said enough to satisfy any reasonable man. I am perfectly certain that I will be able to satisfy the militia of this country that we are doing what is in the interest of the militia itself. My hon. friend has stated that the militia regiments are all full now, beyond their normal strength even. Well, has it come to this, Mr. Speaker, that in order to have the regiments of the militia of Canada up to the full strength, it is necessary to provide some picnic such as they would expect to have on this visit to Quebec ? I have a higher opinion of the militia of Canada than that. I think they will be in full strength, and will attend to their duties at the camps this year just as well as they have ever done. I may say to my hon. friend that I have had many communications from different parts of Canada expressing pleasure at the fact that we have given up the idea of mobilizing the whole militia of the country at Quebec.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I would like the hon. minister to announce to the House what his programme is, and let the people know what the military features are going to be.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Precisely, and that is what I propose to do as soon as it is convenient. I said the other day when this question was brought up :

It is not correct to say that the troops are not going to the tercentenary. It is a fact, however, that the annual camps of instruction will be held as usual throughout the Dominion this year, instead of being held at one common point at or near the city of Quebec, as was proposed. The annual drill of the city regiments will also take place as usual this year. The reason of the change in the programme, which programme I announced briefly to the House three or four weeks ago, is chiefly due to the difficulty of transportation. It will be understood, I am sure, that one of the principal things to keep in mind

in connection with this tercentenary celebration is to bring together the largest number possible of people to Quebec to witness the ceremonies. Some time ago the chairman of the commission called my attention to the fact that the transportation lines, the railways and steamboats, must be left free as far as possible to bring the people to Quebec and take them home again, and he thought it proper to ask the Militia Department to agree not to move any troops on a certain number of days before the celebration began and a certain number of days afterwards. It will be readily understood that such an arrangement would hamper the railway transportation lines very much. An earnest effort was made to see whether the difficulty could be overcome, but it was found it could only be partially overcome. It was therefore thought better that the camps should be held at the usual places of holding camps. As to the statement that has been made that the headquarters of the militia were unable to cope with the mobilization of 25,000 or 30,000 troops at a central point like Quebec, the story is absolutely without foundation, and is entirely absurd.

Then I went on to say that as soon as it was determined what number of troops would go to Quebec, I would make an announcement. I said that the Militia Department would be prepared to co-operate with the Battlefields Commission in every way in its power ; so it will be, and I hope before many days to be able to make an announcement to the House on that subject.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). On the 27th of March I had the honour to ask the minister a question when this matter first came up, as will be seen on page 5741. I quite coincide with the opinion of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) that the minister has considerably changed front since that matter was first brought to his attention in the House. I asked the minister if the statement was correct which I had seen, that 60 per cent of the militia regiments would be taken to Quebec.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is the percentage stated correct, 60 per cent?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 50 per cent.

Here was an answer in distinct terms as to the number that were likely to go. Now the department seems to have retired from the position they took up at that time. At that time the matter appeared to be under the charge of the Militia Department entirely, and we were given to understand that it would be handled by the headquarters staff altogether. Now, if we are correctly informed, there has been a change, and the matter is to be handed over to the Quebec Battlefields Commission, because we see it stated in the papers that the Quebec Battlefields Commission are to select what regiments shall go to Quebec and what regiments shall not go.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would ask my hon. friend to observe what I have said, not what the papers have said. I am not responsible for what the newspapers have said.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I hear what the minister says now, and I am not sure that he has always stated the same.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I read what I stated.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have the very best information that that is not what took place the other day when a certain number of colonels and commanders of regiments appeared before the minister. What went out to the public at that time was practically what the member for South Toronto has said, that the Militia Department had entirely retired from the position they had taken of making a big military demonstration at Quebec, and that is the impression that prevails in all sections of the country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Entirely erroneous.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I was told by more than one military man that the terms decided upon were such that it would be impossible for them to go, and the surrender of their pay and the difficulties that have been placed in their way would make it a financial impossibility for the regiments to go under the conditions named. Now if that is the case, it appears evident that Canada is to take a very little part in this great demonstration. If this demonstration means anything, it means a celebration of a military character, it is a military demonstration. We have fleets coming from Great Britain. No doubt if they hear on the other side that our militia are not going to take any part, that we have no fleet except the ice-breaker 'Montcalm,' and a few other disabled vessels, they will conclude, that we are practically out of it. Now we are told that even this military demonstration of which we expected so much, is going to be curtailed to such an extent that perhaps 3,000, or 4,000, or 5,000 may assemble. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a great and keen disappointment, not only to the militia, but to the citizens of Canada who look upon this as a great national occasion, an occasion when the patriotism of the people should be stirred, and when, if they were unable on account of financial or other reasons to go to Quebec themselves, they would take a keen interest in watching what was going on there, recognizing that we were celebrating the third centenary of an event which is very notable in Canadian history. I say it is to be deplored that the Militia Department are going back on what was expected of them. Whether it is going to be handled by the Battlefields Commission or the Militia Department, I think that the 50 per cent named in the

first place is not too great. The agreement was practically unanimous, as my hon. friend from South Toronto has said, no opposition developed on this side of the House.

Personally, I supported it very strongly as did several other gentlemen and I sincerely regret, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has apparently become comparatively lukewarm with regard to what was to be a great feature of the occasion. He told me, in reply to a question at the time, that the question of transportation was already engaging the attention of the department and that answers were coming in at that very time. Transportation could be easily managed if taken hold of in time. The river is open, there are plenty of first-class boats to be obtained and practically the whole western peninsula of Ontario could be served by the water route much more expeditiously and cheaply than in any other way. I believe that information has already been received by some gentlemen who have made inquiry that large boats can be obtained at a comparatively small cost for the transportation of the men and then they will feed them at the same price that the railway companies will charge for transportation alone. That is a statement that I received the other day from a gentleman who is thoroughly conversant with the question. If the railway and transportation companies of this country cannot take charge of the transportation of all these men, the United States alongside, I believe have intimated that they will allow the troops to pass through their territory if the request is made. I do not know that that is official, but at any rate I have it on good authority that some of the American railway companies have stated that they will see to it, if necessary, that troops are transported more cheaply in first-class cars than can be done by the Militia Department in box cars on this side. In that case why could we not send one, two, three, four or five regiments through the United States? It might appear humiliating that we had to avail ourselves of American transportation for such an event but still it would be worth while making the attempt. I trust that such offers will be received by the minister in the spirit in which they are conceived. The people are desirous of having a splendid demonstration on that occasion and they want to show what the Canadian militia system is. There has never been an opportunity in modern times when the minister and the department had such a chance of distinguishing themselves as they have on this occasion. To hand it over to the Battlefields Commission and to load them up with something that they do not want would be to make an unnecessarily large addition to their other duties and with the very expensive staff that we have in the Militia Department at Ottawa we should be able to place in the city of Quebec, 20,000 or 25,000 troops without seriously interfering with the ordinary traffic of the country. I think it can be done. I think that I am voicing the desire of the people and of the militia and when a great national occasion of this kind occurs and when we have an opportunity to show what the Canadian militia is and what our transportation facilities are it would be a pity if we should not take advantage of the occasion. There will be some large ships from across the water at Quebec. I understand the French Republic is going to be represented officially, the British government will be represented, the Prince of Wales will be there, an impression will be made that will be carried all over the world and if we fail to do what is expected of us I think we will do an injury to the country and an injury to the militia system of which we all to-day have every reason to be proud. I trust that the minister will give this his earnest and most serious consideration and that within a very few days he will come down with a statement that will be more satisfactory to the House and the country in regard to this tercentenary celebration that we are holding in the city of Quebec in the latter part of July.

Mr. H. A. WARD (Durham). If my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) will permit me, I desire to say that I think a mistake was made by the department in issuing orders to the regimental commanders with reference to the tercentenary until the arrangements were absolutely conclusive as to the transport of the troops. I do not think my hon. friend quite realizes the amount of disappointment that has ensued among the rural corps at any rate in consequence of the change of plan affecting them in going to the tercentenary. The orders issued to the commanding officers were to have fifty per cent of their respective commands in readiness.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, there were no orders issued at all.

Mr. WARD. These were from the district officers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Inquiries were sent to see what could be done. No general orders were issued whatever.

Mr. WARD. I think the minister is making a mistake in regard to that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I looked it up to-day because I knew this was coming up.

Mr. WARD. I will have to produce the orders to convince the minister. But, certain papers were issued—we will not call them orders for the present—advising the commanding officers to have fifty per cent of their respective commands in readiness

to go to Quebec. Another order, or another paper, came out a day or two afterwards requesting the commanding officers to say to their respective commands that they hoped they would understand that they might have to be transported in box cars. Surely, if it were not the intention to take them to Quebec it would not be necessary for the commanding officers of regiments to advise their officers and men that this was proposed to be done.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is entirely a mistake. Certain inquiries were made, and, owing to the difficulty at the very outset as to this question of transportation, it was thought wise to ask the commanding officers of the regiments, through the regular channel, whether, in the event of there being a difficulty about transportation, they would be willing to go in box cars. They were to have their option. If they did not choose to go that way they need not go. It was thought wise to point out at the outset the difficulties that there would be and that there would be a possibility of the accommodation not being such as we would like to give them. There were no orders ; it was simply an inquiry.

Mr. WARD. Unfortunately I have not the papers here. I accept the statement of the minister, as I am bound to do, and I am perfectly certain he would not say that unless he was sure he was correct. At a later stage, I will have an opportunity of showing him the particular papers that I refer to. But, that is beside the question. What I wish to state, in so far as the rural regiments are concerned, is that I know, as a matter of fact, a number of regiments in our district have been drilling for the last three weeks in anticipation of going to Quebec. There is no doubt about that ; I have seen them myself. It is a matter of keen disappointment to these men in the rural districts that they are not to take part in the celebration. I believe that it would be a good idea in the educative sense. There are thousands of young men in the rural districts who will never have an opportunity of seeing Quebec and I am sure the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would like the members of the militia force to visit Quebec upon that occasion. We all take the greatest possible interest in the old city with its historical and other associations. It is a disappointment to these men in the rural districts because they will never have another opportunity such as this to visit the old city associated as it is with the history of the country. There is another thing that I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to and it is that in a pecuniary sense a good many of the officers are suffering. I happen to know that uniforms have been ordered by officers expecting to go, and which will have to be accepted notwithstanding the fact that these officers may not go to Quebec. There are many things that the minister should consider. If there is any possibility of a change with regard to the rural regiments taking part in the celebration I trust the Minister of Militia will seriously consider the carrying out of the plan as at first proposed.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). I understand the Minister of Militia has stated that that the Battlefields Commission are to make a selection from the different city corps.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I never said that.

Mr. PORTER. I have been informed that it was the intention to hand over the selection of the different corps to the Battlefields Commission.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There has been no arrangement of the kind.

Mr. PORTER. There is a feeling of great disappointment among the volunteers in the district which I represent that they are not to be permitted to join in the celebration. They are chagrined that they are not to be allowed to exhibit their proficiency and their military spirit which they have so well demonstrated on many occasions in the defence of their country. They feel their services to the country in the past have been such as to entitle them to be selected for duty at Quebec, if any city corps is to be selected. I speak more particularly in reference to the 15th Argyle Light Infantry.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is a good regiment.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). The officers and men of the 37th Battalion of Haldimand have been expecting to go to the historic city of Quebec, and they will be greatly disappointed if the Militia Department decides that they are not to go. I impress upon the minister that in selecting the troops for Quebec he should not forget the rural battalions. I fear the city battalions get too much attention to the detriment of the rural battalions. I call the minister's attention to the fact that in the 37th Battalion there is a company comprised entirely of Six Nation Indians and I believe they would be a very attractive feature of the celebration.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. LALOR. I trust the Minister of Militia will provide for a strong representation of the 27th Batalion at the Tercentinary celebration.

Motion agreed to, House went into Committee of Supply.

Office of the Comptroller. of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police—

Salaries, $14,762.50; contingencies, $900.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is a decrease of $1,912 in this appropriation as compared with last year. The accountant, Mr. Fisher, was retired on the first of January, and his work has been taken by the chief clerk, Mr. Fortescue, with a member of the mounted police from the Northwest to assist in the details. One clerk has been transferred to the Department of the Interior and his work is now being done by a sergeant of the police. Mr. R. M. Gallwey, who had a salary of $1,457, died and his work is performed by a junior at a smaller salary. The promotion of Mr. Duplessis from second to first-class does not give him an increase of salary until January, 1909. The promotion of Mr. Wilfrid Gravel from junior to senior second means an increase of $250. The others are statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a diminution of one clerk.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Is he to be replaced?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not intended to replace him.

Pay of force..	$300,000
Subsistence, forage, fuel and light, clothing, buildings, repairs and renewals, horses, dogs, arms and ammunition, medical stores, billeting, transport, water service, stationery and contingencies..	450,000
	750,000

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In this estimate we ask provision for 700 men; 500 in Alberta and Saskatchewan, 100 in what is now the Northwest Territories, and 100 in the Yukon. We are gradually reducing the force in the Yukon. I think we have only eighty-two men there now and henceforward we intend to make no distinction between those in the Yukon and the rest of the force except as to pay.

Mr. BERGERON. What men have you in Manitoba?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have no men in Manitoba except one or two who form a cordon on the boundary to protect the revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. How are the one hundred men distributed in the Northwest Territories?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At Churchill there are eight or ten men, at Fullerton an island on the west shore of the Hudson bay, five men; at Fort Macpherson, at the mouth of the Mackenzie river, four or five men; at Herschel island, four or five men. There are men on the Peace river, at Stone lake and other places. I have here a map, showing the distribution of the force, which I will lay on the table. We have a patrol from Winnipeg to Fort Churchill to assert our authority on the Hudson bay. Some years ago we commenced to assert our authority both on the Hudson bay and on the Arctic ocean at Herschel island, because we found that American whalers were going there without authority. Since the police have taken possession and asserted our authority, the American whalers have taken licenses from us and have paid customs duties, and our authority is no longer disputed. At first these American whalers were inclined to demur, and I think they made some complaint at Washington; but of late years we have had no trouble. We have a patrol from Winnipeg to Fort Churchill and a patrol from Dawson to Herschel island, so that at present our jurisdiction is fully established.

Mr. FOSTER. The mounted police who have asserted the sovereignty of Canada on those exposed portions of Hudson bay, are the permanent emblems of authority; they are always there, and they have force as well as appearance. The Prime Minister has said that although at first the American whalers were a little obstreperous and did not wish to take out licenses and pay customs duties, yet now everything is peaceably acknowledged and our sovereignty in those portions of the northwest and northeast is permanently established. If that be so, what is the use of sending Captain Bernier on an expedition this year and next year at an expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars? I am not finding fault with this in any party sense or wish to make party capital. I am simply asking the Prime Minister seriously to consider whether or not this should be allowed to go on under the plea of protecting the sovereignty of Canada where absolutely nobody questions it. The United States has not raised a cavil with reference to our authority. These American whalers take out their licenses and pay their customs dues to the Mounted Police, who are the customs officers. Is not that sufficient? If it costs a good deal, the country is quite willing to pay the necessary cost. Why should it be duplicated by sending Captain Bernier on a useless expedition to the north?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Captain Bernier goes much farther north than the points I have mentioned. He goes to the Strait of Behring, to Baffin's bay and to much other territory over which we claim jurisdiction, which at present is of very little use perhaps, but the value of which we do not know and which may develop.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is trying to take it away from you?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Possession is nine points of the law. If we had sent the Mounted Police twenty years ago into the Yukon Territory, we would have to-day more territory than we have. The great

mistake we made was not in attaching sufficient importance to our country. The Americans have been much shrewder in that respect. I do not know whether my hon. friend has seen the last map of the northern country that has been issued at Washington, which shows that the Americans are taking possession of and claiming everything in sight. I do not think they are entitled to it, however.

Mr. BERGERON. That does not give them the right to it, because they take possession of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They got Skagway by means of possession. If we had taken possession of it in time they would never have had it.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the way we lost Alaska?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have not lost Alaska, because it belonged to the Russians and was ceded by them to the United States. But there was a disputed territory between the United States and Canada, and if we had taken earlier the precaution which we have now taken, of sending men into the country to take possession of it, we would have had Skagway to-day. In the last map issued at Washington, I think by the War Department, there are various islands in the north with American names attached to them, conveying the impression that these lands belong to the United States. Captain Bernier goes north in order to put the British flag and assert our authority on this territory, which we claim as ours. If my hon. friend reflects, I think he will agree that it is proper that we should take this precaution. My hon. friend asks who will take away this territory from us. If we had not asserted our sovereignty on Hudson bay four years ago, as we did, white men, attracted by gold or the discovery of the country, would probably have gone in and we would probably have found the Americans disputing our jurisdiction on Hudson bay. But by taking the precaution of asserting our jurisdiction we have reached a point where our authority is no longer disputed. My hon. friend asked why it is now necessary to assert authority since it is recognized and why we should maintain these posts?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not finding any fault with the Hudson bay posts. I think we ought to keep them, and according as people flow in the greater is the reason why we should keep them. But I object to this indeterminate charge and this expenditure of Captain Bernier in islands where there is no settlement and never will be any.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. How is my hon. friend sure that there will be no settlement in these northern islands? I understand there are most valuable coal deposits in some of them, and it will be well for us to keep possession of them.

Mr. FOSTER. But we are in possession and there is no question of giving them up.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, but there is question of somebody else taking possession of them. If we want to assert our jurisdiction in our own country, we must be all the time vigilant. Vigilance is the price, not only of liberty but of security as well. I am making no complaint of our American friends, but they are very enterprising, and if they find anything in any place where there is nobody, they are apt to take possession. For that reason the expenditure connected with the expedition of Captain Bernier is well warranted. On consideration my hon. friend will come to the conclusion that it is better to spend money in those high latitudes and maintain our jurisdiction.

Mr. FOSTER. Whatever is necessary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is necessary. If my hon. friend says we are spending too much that is another question, but we can all agree that it is necessary we should spend something in order to maintain our jurisdiction in these waters, no matter what the cost may be.

Mr. AMES. With what rifle are the Mounted Police now armed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Lee-Metford and Winchester.

Mr. BERGERON. I see that the department buys many things from Revellion Bros. at Edmonton. Is that done by tender?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have already explained on former occasions that about seventy-five per cent of the expenditure on the police force is done by contract. Twenty-five per cent is done in the locality where the expenditure is made, but all the large contracts are by tender.

Mr. BERGERON. Were the purchases from Revellion Bros. by tender?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some of them.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to distribution of men in the territories, has each squad its own officer?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Colonel Perry is the commissioner stationed at Regina. There are some posts of more or less importance at Calgary, Fort Saskatchewan, Fort McLeod and elsewhere, where there may be ten or twelve or five men. There are a number of posts scattered all over the country in which there are only two and sometimes only one man. They are all subject to some other direction.

Mr. FOSTER. Commissioner Perry is chief of all the Mounted Police, including those outside Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the general instructions go through him to all the others, and each of the officers in isolated posts is in supreme command while he is there ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. We are paying for 500 mounted policemen in the two provinces we have created, how long are we to provide these two provinces with mounted policemen ? How long before they are to undertake their own policeing ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have an arrangement with them for five years and they pay us $75,000 each year.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion is that of the whole expenditure in these two provinces ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. One-third.

Mr. BERGERON. How many men in the mounted police ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Six hundred and eighty.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood my right hon. friend to say that there are fifty in the Yukon and it is intended to cut down that force ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the repairs they were making in Regina yet finished ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are going on all the time. This year we put up some new buildings in Regina. The work is done by the men themselves.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not see anything in the Auditor General's Report covering this work. I found one of the buildings at Regina in a very bad state, and the government were replacing the wooden foundations by stone. I found every other building in first-class condition. I think the works were stopped for some reason or other, and I do not see anything about them in the Auditor General's Report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is all done.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it found as easy to recruit new members as formerly and are the new recruits as good a class as the old ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is very difficult to get men and still more difficult to keep them, owing to the prosperity of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Is our force deteriorating ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it is as good to-day as it ever was.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to draw attention to the murder of a policeman at Crows Nest Pass some time ago. The policeman's name was Lewis and he was murdered in the town of Frank. The government have offered a reward of $200 for the capture of the assassin. It seems to me that the government might well offer a reward of $500 or even $1,000. I think some steps should be taken to give a decent reward for the securing of a murderer. It is very important that the police should maintain their standard for enforcing law and order. Along the western border and perhaps in the Crow's Nest Pass there are a number of pretty bad characters, but the police have always maintained law and order in a highly creditable way. When a man is murdered in the discharge of his duties I think the government should not be backward in the granting of reward for the capture of the murderer. A year ago I said in the House that I believed the mounted police were not paid sufficiently in that country. The Prime Minister has stated that it is very hard to keep good men in the service. That must be the case where ordinary labourers are getting $30 to $50 a month with board while the mounted police get only $15 to $25 per month. I believe it would be better if we had a smaller number of men who were better paid, particularly men of long service, because one good man of considerable experience in that country is worth two or three new men not accustomed to the conditions there.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A reward of $200 has been offered for the capture of the murderer referred to. We could not have done better as under a standing order the police have power to do that without referring to us but they could not go beyond that amount.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it is only an act of justice to say one word in favour of the mounted police as it is to-day. I am generally pretty hard upon the government and sometimes on my right hon. friend under other circumstances, but I have seen in the west that these men are really a credit to the country. They are well dressed, well kept, well disciplined, and their conduct is splendid. I have had the pleasure of visiting some of the mounted police posts and I found everything in perfect order, in fact their barracks I fancy were equal to anything that you would find in the regular army in England. I consider the force to be very useful. I remember in the old times when my right hon. friend and his friends were on this side they criticised the Conservative government for having the mounted police in the Northwest. One Liberal who is now a senator was very severe on that score. I was of the opinion then that we needed the police and I am still of that opinion. I think the maintenance of that force has a salutory effect in that immense country, their presence does much to uphold the peace and tranquility of the west.

As to the question raised by my hon. friend of the pay of the force I have nothing to do with that. I leave that to the generosity of the Prime Minister, but I would point out that the ordinary man who would receive $40 to $50 a month in that country is not the same kind of man as those who are employed in the police. The mounted police are real soldiers, and many of them quite exceptional men. Their life is a special life and they seem to be perfectly happy. None of those I met made any complaint about pay, and I am sure that many of them would rather work in the force for $15 or $25 than outside for $40 or $50 a month. I believe they must be well taken care of and well fed and that their lodgings must be kept in perfect condition. On the whole I must congratulate my right hon. friend and his department. Neither in reading the Auditor General's Report nor in travelling in the Northwest do we find a word of graft in that department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to say to my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) that the question of increasing the pay of the police has been brought to my attention more than once, but on the whole we have not yet seen the advisability of changing the present rate which was established some years ago. There is a great deal, of course, in what was said by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). The life of the police is a special career. the men are paid from 60 cents to $1 a day, according to a certain scale. They are provided at the end of thirty years with a pension. If a man engages at the age of twenty, then at the age of forty, while still a young man, he can withdraw from the force with a pension and, knowing the country, if he wishes to go into other business he is well equipped to do so. There are a certain number of men who like the life, they are paid a certain amount, they are fed and clothed; they become accustomed to the life and do not care so much for the money because they know they will not be left destitute in their old age, and that they can count on the bounty of the government. On the whole I think they are satisfied. During the twelve years I have been in charge I have not heard a complaint from the force with regard to that. They are too well disciplined of course to send me a complaint even if they thought they had reasonable ground of complaint, but I would have heard from the comptroller of the force if there had been any grievance in that respect.

Mr. LAKE. Where is the recruiting taking place now?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have no special place of recruiting. Recruiting takes place in Ottawa, but the officers are authorized to take men. We have received applications from all parts of the British empire, but of late years, when we were not increasing the force, we have not thought of taking any from outside of Canada as there was no necessity for doing so.

Mr. FOSTER. What percentage of the personnel of the force change each year from causes other than death?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The comptroller is not ready to give a definite answer but he thinks about 15 per cent to 20 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that percentage increasing gradually?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not observed that it has increased of late.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a change in the nature of the offences with which they have chiefly to deal, and what is the chief offence now against which the mounted police have to act? I suppose that, with the increase of population, cattle stealing and horse stealing have been reduced to a minimum.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At page 6 of the report of the mounted police we find a comparative statement of offences for the years 1900-1907. The figures are :

1907	5,685
1906	4,256
1905	3,767
1904	3,465
1903	2,613
1902	1,520
1901	1,250
1900	936

The most numerous offences last year were:

Offences against—	
The person	729
The property	877
Public order	66
Religion and morals	2,208
Indian Act	336
Provincial statutes and Northwest Territories ordinances	1,308

There is nothing further in these statistics that I can see that would not apply equally to any other province.

Pensions payable to Mounted Police, Prince Albert Volunteers and Police Scouts, on account of rebellion of 1885, $2,400.53.

Mr. FOSTER. How many pensioners are there on that list?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are 10 persons still remaining on the list.

To compensate members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police for injuries received while in the discharge of duty, $3,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are about 30 of these receiving compensation for injuries received while in the discharge of their duties.

Mr. FOSTER. What board establishes the amount?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A medical board first, and then an officers' board.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount is paid at present in pensions to the Mounted Police?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The amount last year was $5,666, and the amount estimated for this year is $5,601.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the number on the pension list altogether?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Sixty.

Department of Militia and Defence—salaries, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $63,500; contingencies, $12,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is a net increase of $3,450, of which $1,050 is due to 21 statutory increases at $50 each. There is provision for four additional first-class clerks, $2,000. That is not an actual increase, because these clerks have been working for some time in the department and they are now made permanent.

Mr. FOSTER. Where were they taken from?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They were connected with the stores, I think. I am not absolutely certain. They were supernumeraries. They were not permanent but they have now been appointed and they have passed the examination.

Mr. FOSTER. What salaries are they getting ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Four third-class clerks ; $2,000 for the four.

Mr. FOSTER. Were they appointed at the same salaries they were receiving in their former service ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, some of them at even less, I think. They do not mind that because they prefer to have permanent employment.

Mr. FOSTER. They go out from the stores department and then the vacancies in the stores department are filled ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. So that makes an addition to the whole service ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I am told not.

Mr. FOSTER. It must be so if you have filled the old vacancies and you are making four additions here.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps I am wrong in saying the stores department. There is always a certain number of extra clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you filling the vacancies made by the appointment of extra clerks ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any extraordinary increases amongst all these clerks ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I think there are none. There are 21 statutory increases.

Mr. BERGERON. I see that a new order has been passed by which so many officers are to be made full colonels. What is the reason for that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the order is based on a continuous service of 25 years. The idea is to reward men who have served most of their lives in the active militia by giving them a higher rank for long, continuous and meritorious service.

Mr. BERGERON. I remember that under the old administration there were only five or six colonels.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The recent militia law gave power to appoint a colonel and even a major-general under certain conditions.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it true that the other day in opening the House in New Brunswick, as stated in the press—I thought it was a mistake—there were five colonels, ten majors, fifteen lieutenants and one private for the escort of the Governor.

Mr. DANIEL. And a general.

Mr. BERGERON. And a general.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I could not give my hon. friend any information on that but I will look it up.

Post Office Department—salaries, $366,531.25.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). There is an increase of $6,468.50 made up as follows : 187 statutory increases of $50 each, making $9,350 ; 5 increases of $78 ; 1 increase of $40 ; 1 increase of $10 ; 8 additional junior 2nd class clerkships at $800.

Mr. BERGERON. That would make more than $6,000. There must be some reduction somewhere else.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a difference between the salaries of certain clerkships which became vacant and the salaries of the officers appointed or promoted to vacancies of $11,372, making an increase of, as compared with last year, of $6,468.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the matter with the man who inspects the boots ? I see that under the head of contingencies there is the following item :

Clerical and other assistance, including $50 a year to pay W. Cooch for inspecting letter carriers' boots, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This man has been employed in the department for several years. We have to provide the boots for the letter carriers and Mr. Cooch, who has been em-

ployed as a packer and sorter since 1882 and who is an old shoemaker and well qualified for the work, inspects the boots.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that all these boots are brought here ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We call for tenders in the different cities and if the prices are found to be acceptable we give an order. The boots are brought here and distributed.

Mr. BERGERON. If these boots are made in Toronto or Montreal why should they be sent here and sent back again either to Montreal or Toronto ? The expense would be a great deal more than the salary and travelling expenses of a man sent out to inspect them.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are sent by mail cars and it does not cost the department a cent. It is for the better administration of the department. We have to look after the uniforms in the same way. The uniforms are made in this city but last year they were made in Toronto and sent here. We have nearly 600 or 700 letter carriers and we have to test the boots and clothing. Sometimes we have complaints. This year we had a complaint about our suits and if we did not have the contractors in Ottawa under our own eye probably the complaints would be more numerous, but in consequence of having the clothing made in Ottawa and tested here we avoid a good deal of criticism.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister make a statement as to the irregularities in the post office service in western Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I saw it stated in the Toronto 'Globe' and the Toronto 'World' recently that robberies to the amount of $12,000 had been committed in the Winnipeg post office, but our inspector has reported that this statement is not true. Sometime ago a young man in the Winnipeg post office misappropriated $900, pleaded guilty, and his father refunded the amount and the boy went away. One of the British mail bags disappeared from a station between Montreal and Winnipeg some time ago and we expect to locate the culprit. Fortunately the money orders contained in some of the letters could not be cashed and duplicates are available for those who are properly entitled to them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What action was taken with regard to the young man in Winnipeg who was convicted and whose father refunded the money ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I should not have said that the boy pleaded guilty. He was strongly suspected however and the father paid the money that was missing. We surround the services with every safeguard, and in comparison with the enormous number of money letters and the great number of employees in the service all over the country the offences have been comparatively few in recent years. When a man is found guilty he is sent to the penitentiary. In a recent case in Montreal a man was arrested, brought before the police magistrate, and sentenced to three years in the course of twenty-four hours.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand that the minister has appointed inspectors to some of the outside districts ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. When the amendment to the Post Office Act is passed I intend to appoint a financial superintendent, not an inspector. The expansion of the postal service especially in the west gives our local inspectors as much work as they can do in other directions and the book-keeping is so complicated that we must have a special man to instruct the different postmasters. It is my intention to appoint Mr. Johnston, a reliable officer who has been thirty-five years in the service. He is now chief accountant at Ottawa and he will select his clerks specially adapted for the work in the large post offices. They will follow his instructions and so we will have uniformity throughout the Dominion.

Mr. BERGERON. Is he a very good accountant ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, he is quite an authority. He has been asked by one or two other departments to help them.

Mr. BERGERON. Why did you not send him to the Marine Department ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He was probably too busy in our own department.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There are a number of matters I wish to call attention to in connection with the Post Office Department, but as I do not wish to delay the proceedings now I shall avail of another opportunity.

Mr. BERGERON. How many male employees are provided for in this item.

Mr. LEMIEUX. 400.

Mr. BERGERON. And how many ladies.

Mr. LEMIEUX. About 100. The ladies are specially proficient in certain work and young men would not accept the salaries paid for such work.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the minister read the Report of the Civil Service Commission on that subject ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. The report is that the employment of ladies prevented young men from going through the lower grades and obtaining the higher positions.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Some people criticise the employment of ladies in the departments, but I found the ladies there and as they

are rendering very good service I do not think I should displace them. My individual opinion is that I would rather have university trained young men in the service, but it is very difficult to get young men speaking both languages which is a useful accomplishment in our department which deals with all the provinces in the Dominion. The ladies are employed in typewriting and shorthand writing, and young men who have had a university course will not spend their lives at that occupation. For such duties, I am bound to say, the young ladies in our department give very faithful and efficient service.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want to be understood as opposing the employment of these young ladies. They probably perform their duties as well as young men would perform them and at much lower salaries. But I was very much impressed with the statement in the report of the Civil Service Commission that in the different departments young men are not being trained for the higher positions, as would be the case if they commenced at the bottom of the ladder. That is the point I wanted my hon. friend to explain. Could my hon. friend say how long his department has employed young ladies?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think for about twenty years. We have some young ladies, still young, who entered the department twenty years ago. My hon. friend will remember that ten or fifteen years ago a general movement began on the part of banks and other large financial institutions for the employment of young ladies in large city offices. With regard to the young ladies in the department, I repeat that I have no reason to complain, although of late I have declined to accept the services of any more ladies. I think we have reached the high-water mark; we have about a hundred in the department, and I think that is enough. The reason why we have of late years employed so many ladies in the department is not to the credit of the young men, because it is quite difficult to find young men who are willing to pass the civil service examination, while the young ladies are, as a rule, both more willing and more successful than the young men in these examinations. We need young men in the service, but young men want to be employed without passing the examination. When we cannot find the young men, we take the young ladies.

Mr. BERGERON. I am surprised to hear my hon. friend say that he cannot find young men. I was under the impression that there were thousands of young men who had passed the civil service examination waiting for positions.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is true, some of them have passed the civil service examinations, but they do not wish to enter the service unless they get $1,000 at once, whereas the law provides that they must begin with $450 and go up the ladder with an increase of $50 a year. An ordinary labourer comes into the department at $1.25 per day, and can go up to $2.25 per day; but when he passes the civil service examination, he must, according to the law, fall back to $450 a year.

Mr. BARR. Does my hon. friend say that the young ladies in the different departments are equal to the occasion and in every way as efficient as men?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Perhaps I should have qualified the statement I made. The young ladies in the department fulfil their duties quite creditably in the special class of employment in which they are engaged. It is principally routine work, but they do it well. There are classes of employment in the department which I would not give to ladies, because I do not think, generally speaking, they would be proficient in them.

Mr. BARR. Would they not be capable of going up to the top of the department?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My predecessor, Sir William Mulock, established a regulation under which examinations are held every year in the various branches at Ottawa and in the larger city offices, to test the way in which the employees are performing their duties; and on the results of those examinations we promote the officials. As I have stated, the young ladies cannot go above a certain grade.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the scale of salaries, and how far can they go?

Mr. LEMIEUX. As a general rule, they commence at $500 and go up to $700; but we have two or three ladies in the department who have reached a higher salary.

Mr. BERGERON. I imagine that in all the departments in Ottawa there must be about a thousand young ladies employed. I do not understand why the ladies, if they pass the examination, could not climb to the top of the department—why one of these young ladies who have been there for twenty or twenty-five years should not be Deputy Postmaster General. I am considering what ought to be done in the future and am not saying anything about those employed. I am simply talking of the principle in the matter. Who is it that gave the model for the uniforms of the letter-carriers? I do not think anything could be invented that could look worse. If it can be changed without a damage to the constitution of the country, it ought to be.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The present uniform was adopted many years ago. I had first thought that I should be somewhat of a reformer in that direction. I wanted to change the hats, for instance, but I found many objections.

Mr. BERGERON. From the contractors?

Mr. LEMIEUX. From the men themselves. The helmets are used in the British army in southern climates, and our letter-carriers, during certain weeks of the summer, are in many sections exposed to very high temperature and they find the helmet quite a protection. I wanted to substitute straw hats, but they said to me that, while they were of that opinion in the beginning, they found by experience that the helmet was the best headgear. The uniform is not a bad one. It is not as heavy as it looks. Last year when I visited the Toronto post office and saw the men sorting the letters and going out to deliver them, I had some of the uniforms weighed and found they were very light. A good deal of the appearance depends on the men themselves. They ought to keep neat and tidy, and it is my intention later on to give something more to the men just to teach them to be a little neater and tidier in their wearing apparel. They should have creased trousers and clean shining boots.

Mr. BERGERON. Have they only one uniform?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They have a winter one and a summer one and they have oilcloth coats.

Mr. BERGERON. What cities are entitled to letter-carriers?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Last year I made new regulations. Cities whose population is 12,000 and whose revenue is $20,000 are entitled to letter carriers. I may tell my hon. friend that some cities which are entitled to letter delivery object to the system because it prevents the men, and especially the ladies, from going out to the post office and stopping at the shops en route.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like my hon. friend to inquire from Valleyfield whether they would like to have letter carriers or not. Valleyfield has the population and the revenue as well.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The population, according to the information given me by my hon. friend is there, and I shall inquire as to the revenue.

Mr. MONK. How are the boots purchased?

Mr. LEMIEUX. By contract after public tender.

Mr. MONK. Are they purchased wholesale?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are not purchased indiscriminately. We have a contract and the boots are made to order after measurements are taken.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. With what firm?

Mr. LEMIEUX. With Lecompte in Montreal.

Mr. MONK. He is not a manufacturer.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is a large shoemaker.

Mr. BERGERON. He has a retail store and is a shoemaker as well.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, he has a large store on St. Catherine street, and he has besides a large establishment where he employs many men.

Mr. BERGERON. If he is the lowest tenderer he is entitled to the contract. I know the man, and if he undertakes a contract he will carry it out.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Each carrier goes to Lecompte and has his measure taken and the boots are made to order.

Mr. MONK. What is the price.

Mr. LEMIEUX. $4.75.

Mr. BERGERON. How many letter carriers in Montreal?

Mr. LEMIEUX. 380 in round numbers.

Mr. BARR. Is there a contract let in each city by tender or is this contract for the whole Dominion?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, in each large city we give a contract to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BARR. How long does it continue?

Mr. LEMIEUX. For a year.

Mr. BENNETT. I am surprised that the minister, in the face of the Auditor General's Report, would say that all these boots are purchased in Montreal. When Sir Wm. Mulock was Postmaster General he resorted to one of the pettiest jobs of patronage and gave to Aurora in his riding the patronage of the whole department. The minister says these boots are purchased by contract in Montreal. Do the facts bear that out? Let me show by the schedule what is purchased in Aurora, simply to give the benefit of the patronage to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) in whose constituency that town is situated.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What volume ?

Mr. BENNETT. Volume 2 of the Auditor General's Report, page S—54. I presume that if the present Postmaster General will stand for it, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) will be quite willing to continue the precedent set by the former Postmaster General who represented his riding. Here are the items :

J. Fleury & Sons, Aurora: newspaper and parcel receptacles, 50 at $25; street letter boxes, 23 at $15.25, 293 at $10.60; sundry repairs, $12.84, $4,719.39.

McDonald, B. H., Aurora, inspecting letter boxes, &c., July to December, 1906, 153 at 25 cents, $38.25.

Willis, Wm., & Son, Aurora: leather leggings, 100 pairs at $1.25; letter carriers' waist

belts, 100 at 75 cents; sheepskin washers, 3½ gross, $4.20, $204.20.

Watson, Wm., Aurora: letter carriers' boots, 46 pairs at $4.50, $207.

Watson, Wm., Aurora, letter carriers' boots, 13 pairs at $4.50, $58.50.

Boots for letter carriers at $4.50 per pair: Charles Tilley & Son, Toronto, 69 pairs, $310.50; Wm. Watson, Aurora, 80 pairs, $360, $670.50.

Watson, Wm., Aurora, letter carriers' boots, 35 pairs at $4.50, $157.50.

Boots for letter carriers at $4.50 per pair; A. Lecompte, $4.50; P. Turcotte, $148.50; Wm. Watson, $243, $841.50.

Charles Tilley & Sons, Toronto, letter carriers' boots, 51 pairs at $4.50, $229.50.

Charles Tilley & Sons, Toronto, letter carriers' boots, 53 pairs at $4.50, $238.50.

I picked these out at haphazard, but practically all of these, which amount to quite a sum in the aggregate, were purchased at the little village of Aurora. Letter boxes, newspaper boxes, lock boxes, &c., which we see all over the Dominion are purchased there, none are bought by public competition; all must be bought at the foundry of Mr. Fleury, a political henchman of hon. gentlemen opposite, president of the Liberal association in that riding. Why should these not be bought by public competition? The Postmaster General says they are purchased by public competition, but there could be no competition with this gentleman who is a dealer apparently in the town of Aurora. I do not blame the Minister of Justice for it, because it was commenced by his predecessor, the ex-Postmaster General; it was petty patronage and it seems absurd that you have to go from Toronto to Aurora to purchase boots because it is in the riding of a minister of the Crown.

On that same page S—62 I find another item; of a purchase in Toronto of boots for letter-carriers:

Charles Tilley & Sons, Toronto, 69 pairs, $310.50.

In addition to these items we have all the mail bags carted up to North York for repairs.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are repaired in Ottawa and all the large cities. There are three or four different parties in Ottawa repairing mail bags.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems odd they should have to be carted from Toronto or up to North York.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Aurora is a stone's throw from Toronto.

Mr. BENNETT. Not by any means. In order to make the patronage as useful as possible, a fair amount of this work is thrown into Newmarket. It is all a question of patronage on the same lines as the giving to the Office Specialty Company at Newmarket, $350,000 worth of business in the last few years. Passing the Supreme Court building this last week one can see thrown out on the waste heap splendid hardwood and clear pine cases with drawers and bronze handles, with letters on them, thrown out of the departments in order that the Office Specialty Company of Newmarket could make sales to the department.

Mr. BERGERON. What are they doing with that?

Mr. BENNETT. Smashing it up for firewood. Why cannot the minister buy letter-carriers' boots in Toronto or Montreal?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not see what objection there is to distributing here and there throughout the country what my hon. friend calls patronage, which is simply what is needed for the department. I take issue with the hon. gentleman's statements. I am informed that in every case the price paid was the result of tenders asked. Take, for instance, the case of Tilley & Son, Toronto, to whom reference has been made and who sold boots at $4.50 per pair. That is the price paid in Montreal and every one knows it is not an exaggerated price. There is nothing here to show the department has paid an excessive price. Is there any reason why we should concentrate, or to use a new expression, Bovrilize the patronage in one city? If tenders are asked what objection is there to some of the work being done in Aurora or Newmarket.

Mr. BENNETT. Who were the competitors for the supplying of these goods for Hamilton, Kingston and Montreal besides Watson of Aurora, and what were the respective rates at which they tendered?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not give off-hand the competitors, but I may say that the lowest price was accepted in each case.

Mr. BARR. Were they advertised in the newspapers?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would my hon. friend approve of my hon. friend spending $200 or $300 to advertise for tenders in the case, for instance, of this item of $211 for forty-seven pairs of shoes?

Mr. BARR. Then it is simply the favoured few, those on the patronage list?

Mr. LEMIEUX. When reliable firms are called upon to tender and when the price is fair as this price is, $4.50——

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Does my hon. friend consider Tilley & Son, of Toronto, a large wholesale house? I think their principal business is dealing in shoe findings. I know the firm, it is a small place. Is it true that the men leave their measures and have the shoes made to order?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, the measures are taken and sent to the makers. I know that is the case in regard to the uniforms which

are made here in Ottawa. The firm making them do not establish a branch in each city where we have a letter-carrier service, but they send their cutter to each city and he takes the measurements of each man; the uniform is then made to order here where they have their establishment. The same thing applies to the shoes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. And you are paying retail prices for all your shoes and getting no better shoes than you can buy ready made? Forty years ago you could get better shoes made to order.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We do not buy ready-made.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not care whether you do or not. You can get as good shoes ready-made as to order, if you pay the price. I have been dealing in shoes for forty years. We used to make many shoes to order. we would keep ten to twelve men busy, but now you can get a much nicer shoe ready-made than you can get made to order. I venture to say that not one in ten of the members of this House have shoes made to order now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Are you sure of that?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is my experience in my part of the country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend wears American shoes?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not wear American shoes. Geo. T. Slater, the Slater Company and McCready & Company are leading houses where you can get as good shoes as in the United States and cheaper than in the United States. You can go to the wholesale manufacturers and get them made at different widths. You can get a narrow width or a middle width, five or six different widths so as to fit any foot. I see that these boots are being bought in the same way as goods have been bought for the Marine and Fisheries Department, that is at retail. No one will say a word against Tilley & Sons, who are a very respectable firm and who no doubt will furnish a first-class shoe. But the chances are that they take the orders and get some wholesale men to furnish them, and you are paying middlemen's profits.

Mr. BENNETT. On S—54 there is an item, J. Fleury's Sons, Aurora, newspapers and parcel receptacles, and so forth, $4,719.39. Was there any competition in that line, or are they handed over to the president of the North York Liberal Association?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, there is competition.

Mr. BENNETT. When the minister comes to his estimates again, will he bring down the names of all those who competed for these articles?

Mr. BERGERON. With regard to the items of S—64, my hon. friend from Lennox and Addington (Mr. Wilson) says that these goods were not made in Victoria where they were distributed. I see that goods of this class are made in many places. For instance H. Leger, Ottawa: letter carriers' boots, 25 pair at $4.50. J. W. Wright, Ottawa, letter carriers' boots, 26 pair at $4.50. It strikes me that it would be better to allow shoemakers who want to get orders the privilege of tendering.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is the price too high?

Mr. BERGERON. I am not a shoemaker, I do not know. It seems to me that if tenders were sent all over Canada, for instance, to the Mr. McCready firm in Montreal, one of the largest firms in Canada in this line of goods, you might probably get boots for $3 which you are paying here $4.50; you could get them cheaper on account of buying a large quantity at the same time. Then the country would save $1.50 each pair on boots. It seems to me that the department should look at the subject from an economical point of view. I see also that uniforms are bought in the same way.

Uniforms for letter carriers: blue melton trousers, 27 pair at $3; blue melton tunics, 16 pair at $5.45; overcoats, 10 at $6.30; pea jackets, 6 at $6.30.

But there is no name given to show who they were purchased from. On page S—62 I find another case of a purchase without any name being given.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are all purchased from the men who have the contract. The uniforms to which my hon. friend refers as having been bought without any name being given, are all bought from Noel & Chevrier, who have the contract for uniforms for the whole Dominion. It sometimes happens that letter carriers are appointed over and above the number that were specified when the contract was given, and of course these have to be supplied afterwards. But they are supplied at the same price as the other uniforms and the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. BERGERON. At the Ottawa post office I find another item:

Uniforms for letter carriers: blue melton trousers, 38 pairs at $3; blue melton tunics, 18 at $5.45; overcoats, 9 at $6.30; pea jackets, 9 at $6.30.

Turning over to the Montreal post office I find:

Uniforms for letter carriers: blue melton trousers, 15 pairs at $3.25; 137 pairs at $3; serge overcoats, 22 at $6.30; pea jackets, 15 at $6.75 and 59 at $6.30.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will explain why orders are given sometimes for different numbers. The uniforms are not all delivered at one specified period of the year. For in-

stance, a man comes into the service at the beginning of the summer and gets a uniform. If he comes into the service in the middle of the summer he will get his second uniform only at the middle of the summer. We cannot apply the same rule as to the delivery of trousers and shoes to every man, because they do not all enter the service at the same time.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it would be better to supply them all under one contract.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is only one contract, and that contract was awarded to the lowest tenderers, Noel & Chevrier. There were five or six tenderers in all. Now some men will enter the service at the end of a season, they will get their summer uniform. The next year they cannot expect another uniform at the beginning of the summer because they have not used long enough the uniform supplied them in the previous summer. That accounts for the difference in the delivery of uniforms. You will see that at one place 100 uniforms are delivered, at another place 30, at another place 35 and so on. This does not prove that there is more than one contractor, it proves that the uniforms are delivered at different times.

Mr. PORTER. The Post Office Department appears to be not quite so generous in dispensing credit where credit belongs, as it is in dispensing patronage to political friends. I had occasion, during the canvass of the election in 1904, to visit a section of the riding I have the honour to represent, which was not served by a post office, and in which there was a very considerable settlement. I saw at once the necessity of some provision being made for these people, and while I was in the vicinity I drew up a petition which was largely signed. The petition was headed by the Rev. Father McInenney, who was parish priest at that particular point. This was Bell's Rapids, in the county of Hastings. I presented that petition to the department here, and urged the necessity of establishing a post office at that point. Nothing was done for some considerable time, and I repeatedly wrote to the department urging upon them again and again the necessity of having these appointments made. Finally I received a letter from the then Postmaster General on the 19th of April, in which he says :

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter expressing the hope that the department might establish a post office at Bell Rapids. In reply I have to state that some time ago on the application of Mr. Henry Pringle, of Belleville——

I ask the Postmaster General to note that.

—instructions were given to establish a post office at Bell's Rapids and the inspector reports that the office went into operation on the 1st instant.

I was of course surprised at being informed by the Postmaster General that the post office had been established upon the recommendation of Mr. Henry Pringle. I can quite understand that the government would not give me any credit for being instrumental in having a post office established in my riding, although such is the fact. Shortly after I received this letter Sir Wm. Mulock went to England and I had not an opportunity of calling his attention to the matter. He was succeeded in the office by Mr. Aylesworth and the following questions and replies were put and answered in the House :

BELL'S RAPIDS POST OFFICE.

Mr. PORTER asked:

1. When was the post office known as Bell's Rapids established?

2. Who is the postmaster?

3. Upon whose recommendation was such office established, and such postmaster appointed, and when?

4. Were there any other recommendations or applications for establishment of such post office? If so, by whom, and when?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). Bell's Rapids post office was established on April 1, 1905, with John Hicks as postmaster, on the application of the Rev. Father McInerney, of Maynooth, the report of an inspector, and the recommendation of Mr. Henry Pringle, of Belleville.

Here we have the statement repeated that the post office was established on the recommendation of Mr. Henry Pringle. When Mr. Aylesworth gave this answer in the House I immediately telegraphed to a newspaper reporter at Belleville asking him to see Mr. Pringle to ascertain whether the statement made by Mr. Aylesworth, and in the letter of Sir Wm. Mulock, was in accordance with the fact. The reporter saw Mr. Pringle and he telegraphed me on the 3rd of May :

Pringle says he knows of no such office. If he ever had any communication with the government he cannot recall it.

The reporter also made a declaration in connection with the matter in which he says :

I am personally acquainted with Henry Pringle, of the city of Belleville, in the county of Hastings.

On the 3rd day of May, 1905, I had an interview with the said Henry Pringle in Belleville when I asked him if he knew where Bell's Rapids post office was or whether there was such a post office in this county to which he answered: 'I know of no such post office.' I then said: 'Have you ever had any communication with the Post Office Department about such office?' To which he replied: 'I cannot recall any, I don't think I did.'

Without explanation it would seem remarkable that Sir Wm. Mulock should

write me as he did and that Mr. Aylesworth should corroborate his statement giving credit to Mr. Henry Pringle, of Belleville, in view of the fact that Mr. Pringle did not even know there was such a post office in the world. I have stated that I considered that this government was more generous in bestowing patronage upon its political friends than in giving credit to a member of this House who might be entitled to it for acting in the public interest, and my statement is based on the fact that in the election of 1904 I was opposed by a man whose name is well known not only in this House but throughout the country, Mr. Byron O. Lott. Mr. Byron O. Lott, as the defeated Liberal candidate, would be entitled to the patronage of this riding.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Where is he now.

Mr. PORTER. Had Mr. Byron O. Lott been still residing in the west riding of Hastings, the answer of the Postmaster General would have been that the post office was established on the recommendation of Byron O. Lott, but Byron O. Lott then and now is sojourning in the United States to escape criminal prosectution for his connection with the bogus ballot boxes. The government could not, therefore, give the credit to Mr. Lott, and being determined not to give the credit to me they looked somewhere else. One would have thought they would have selected the local Liberal member for that district, but he also has been discredited and so they left the riding of North Hastings where this post office is located and went to West Hastings and there selected the defeated Liberal candidate in the legislature and gave him the credit for establishing this post office at Bells Rapids. I hope the day is past for that manner of establishing post offices and bestowing the credit for establishing them. I do not attribute any of this to the present Postmaster General, but I do hope that the course pursued by Sir Wm. Mulock and repeated by Mr. Aylesworth will not be adopted by the present Postmaster General in his administration and that he will give credit where credit is due.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House adjourns I wish to say that according to arrangements made the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) will bring up the Ross rifle question on going into Supply. Will the House be moved into Committee of Supply?

Mr. FIELDING. We will take Supply to-morrow and we will proceed with the Post Office vote generally, to be followed by the Customs vote generally, and if there is sufficient time by the Railway vote generally.

At six o'clock, House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, May 21, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PETITION IN BEHALF OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE (Montmagny). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition addressed to the honourable ministers and members of this House and which reads as follows:

To the Honourable Minister and
Members of the House of Commons.
Considering that the French and English languages are on the same footing, especially in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, he is reading the petition.

Mr. SPEAKER. Do I understand that the hon. member is reading the petition? That is not customary.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am stating the object of the petition.

Considering that, in fact, the public utilities, the companies and their employees do neglect to use the French language to the great annoyance and detriment of the majority of the citizens in many cases.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Nobody has called me to order.

Considering that the expostulations and the complaints often expressed by the newspapers about this said condition of things have been ineffective.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. What is the point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member, I understand, is reading the petition, and that is not in order.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am not reading the petition, but stating the object of the petition.

Considering, in fine, that to remedy the evil an appeal to the courtesy of the companies will not suffice, but that a law must be added to it by which they will be bound.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman says he is not reading the petition.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). He says that——

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am not. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) understands that.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am glad. That is something new in the House.

The undersigned do ask that:

1. In the province of Quebec the railway companies. . . . .

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TALBOT. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the acceptance of your ruling to be a sham? We want to see some respect shown for this House. I do not care from what part of the country the hon. member (Mr. Armand Lavergne) comes, he should show respect for the authority of the chair and for the courtesy due to hon. members.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) wishes to show respect for the rules of debate of this House, he should not rise when another member is speaking without that member's permission.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Armand Lavergne) will please state shortly the object of the petition.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. That is what I am going to do. The petition follows and I am stating the object of it.

1. In the province of Quebec the railway companies, the street railway, telegraph and telephone companies and the public utilities be bound to use the French and English languages in all their relations with the public.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I was simply reading the motives of the petition. This petition bears the signatures of 433,845 French and English Canadians.

Mr. TALBOT (Bellechasse). (Translation.) How many children in that number?

Mr. LAVERGNE. (Translation.) It has been signed by people who have all reached the age of reason, which I could not say my hon. friend from Bellechasse has reached. I moved that this petition be laid on the table of the House.

I desire to present a petition signed by 433,845 Canadians of French and English speech, asking that, in the province of Quebec, public utilities shall be required to put the French and English languages on the same footing in their transactions with the public.

STANSTEAD ELECTION PAPERS.

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

That the committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to make inquiry into the loss from the office of the clerk of the Crown in Chancery of certain papers relating to the recent election in the electoral division of Stanstead; and that for this purpose the committee be authorized to send for persons and papers.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). The committee, being a general committee of this House, already has that power.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is what I understand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That might be omitted, perhaps.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. WILLIAM JACKSON asked:

1. What amount did the Montreal harbour commissioners spend for the cleaning, sweeping and watering of Montreal wharfs for the season of navigation, 1907, and was the work done by contract or day work?
2. Have they asked tenders for this work for the coming season of navigation, 1908? If so, how many tenders have been received, what is the name of each tenderer, and the amount of each tender?
3. Was the contract given out? If not, for what reasons?
4. What is the salary of each commissioner?
5. Are they supposed to give all their time to the commission? If so, is the government aware that the three commissioners still give most of their time to their respective businesses?
6. Is any one of the commissioners a relative to Mr. Peter Lyall, the contractor for the new wharf sheds?
7. What amount was paid by the Montreal harbour commissioners to said Peter Lyall & Sons, contractors, for extra work since the formation of the new board, and what was the nature of this extra work?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The following answers have been prepared by the Harbour Commissioners:—

1. In view of the fact that the commissioners may in the future call for tenders for cleaning, sweeping and watering the wharfs, it is not considered advisable to make public the cost in 1907. The work was done by day work.
2. Yes, tenders were asked for this work for 1908 and four tenders were received. It is the rule of the board not to give out the prices quoted in tenders or names of tenderers.
3. No tender was accepted as the commissioners now have a well organized cleaning department equipped with the necessary plant to carry on the work, and are of the opinion that they are in a position to carry out the work at a less cost than the lowest tender received.
4. The salaries are fixed by order in council and are payable out of harbour revenue. The president's salary being $7,000 per annum and the other two commissioners $5,000 each per annum.

5. They are not supposed to give their whole time to the commission. They give the time necessary for the proper administration of the trust and meet daily.

6. No.

7. The amount paid to Peter Lyall & Sons for extra work since the formation of the new board, was $56,134.19. Of this amount, $25,000 was for the laying of the concrete floors in winter so as to make five sheds available on the opening of navigation, 1907, the expenditure being authorized by order in council. The balance, $31,134.19, was for sundry extras, for changes in towers and galleries of the conveyor system, for cutting the overhang to make provision for a railway track along the front of the sheds, increasing the height of doors and sundry minor changes, all decided and authorized by the former board of commissioners to meet the views of the shipping companies. Since the new board of commissioners have been conducting the work, not a dollar of extra work has been authorized or claimed.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES AND REFUNDS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What advances for travelling expenses have been charged to the ice-breaking steamers' vote for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908, at what dates and to whom issued?

2. What refunds have been made to date by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Mr. Wiallard on account of travelling expense advances made since January 1, 1907?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Advances issued to R. A. Wiallard:—

July 2, 1907	$1,000
July 30	1,000
September 3	1,000
September 5	500
	$3,500
Less amount credited to this vote from the amount voted for negotiation of French treaty	2,500
	$1,000

C. Dugald, for salary, living and travelling expenses :—

September 6, 1907	$ 243 33
February 17, 1908	250 00
March 25, 1908	500 00
October 30, 1907	2,433 33

2. Refunds by minister:—$877.94, $307. This last amount was refund of an account paid in error by the department. Refund by Mr. Wiallard, $45.30.

The advances above-mentioned as having been made to Mr. Wiallard, on the 30th July, the 3rd and 5th September, 1907, and amounting to $2,500, were expended by the minister in connection with the negotiation of the French treaty and when the money for the negotiation of the French treaty was voted by parliament in the further supplementary estimates 1907-8, and available, the ice-breaking steamer vote was credited with the said sum.

PAYMENTS TO K. FALCONER.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What sums have been paid to K. Falconer since September, 1907, and at what dates?

2. What is the total cost of the services rendered up to date?

3. Was Falconer's full claim allowed, and is the account finally settled?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. September 10, 1907 $ 177 71
   September 10 74 01
   October 1 1,000 00
   November 2 124 00

2. The total cost of the services rendered is $42,315.89. Out of this amount $6.816.34 is still held by the department.

3. The account is not finally settled.

WHARF AT ST. JOSEPH, ONTARIO.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Were tenders asked for building a wharf at St. Joseph, Ontario? If so, when were tenders asked, and in what papers were the advertisements placed?

2. Does the government intend repairing the wharf? If so, when will operations commence?

3. What part of the original wharf is now intact?

4. Were plans and specifications prepared before commencing operations?

5. If tenders were not asked for, what reasons does the government give for not requesting same?

6. What amount of material, plant, tools, &c., did Mr. Corry receive from the Department of Public Works, as appears in Mr. Gray's letter of June 3, 1904, and what amount did Mr. Corry pay the department for same?

7. Did Mr. Corry complete his contract to the satisfaction of the department, did he receive payment for same, and in what condition did he leave the pier?

8. What is the date of the contract between this government and Mr. Corry?

9. If this contract has not been carried out, what reasons does the government give for not compelling Mr. Corry to carry out the contract of completing the work?

10. What amount of money has been paid H. F. Lamb, engineer in charge of St. Joseph wharf for his services in inspecting said wharf?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. No.

2. Wharf is now being repaired.

3. The cribwork portion.

4. Yes.

5. I am unable to state accurately the reasons which made it, in the judgment of the then minister, better to do the work by day's labour.

6. The contractor, as appears from letter of resident engineer Gray to the chief engineer, of May 19, 1904, was to have the use of the materials, &c., on hand.

7. 8. and 9. Mr. Corry agreed to complete the work for $3,957. He was paid $3,950.50, on July 16, 1904, on the certificate of the resident engineer, Mr. Gray, now deceased. At or about the time of the alleged completion of the work, part of it was washed away by a storm. I have called upon Mr. Corry for payment of $1,500, the amount required to rebuild the portion so washed away, and the department is retaining this amount out of rent accruing due to him. Mr. Corry protests against this action, claiming that he expended more than twice the amount agreed upon as payment for the work.

10. Mr. Lamb was not paid anything beyond his salary and travelling expenses as engineer in charge of the district of western Ontario.

IMPROVEMENTS IN POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What improvements have been made in the postal facilities for handling mail during the past six months that will reduce the mutilation of envelopes, delays and mis-stateing of mails?

2. Did the government ask for tenders for carrying mail out of Sandy Cove, N.S.? If so, how many tenders were received, what was the amount of each tender, and the names of those tendering?

3. Did the government accept the lowest tender? If not, why not?

4. If the government did not ask for tenders, what reason does it give for not doing so, and when will the present contract expire?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. There is no mutilation of envelopes in the mails other than that caused by the necessary handling of the mails from post office to station, and station to post office, and the natural wear and tear caused by huge sacks piled one upon another in the trains en route. All cases brought to the attention of the department have been immediately investigated, and in no case has the department been able to ascertain that there was any intentional or wanton mutilation of mail matter or mutilation that in any way exposed the contents of the letters to observation, or that there was any mutilation whatever, except such as arose from the causes mentioned above and which are unavoidable.

All cases of delayed and mis-sent letters receive the prompt attention of the department and a return was lately made by the department to parliament, the perusal of which the department is confident will convince the most skeptical of the truth of this assertion.

2. Tenders could not be asked for carrying mails out of Sandy Cove inasmuch as no independent route from Sandy Cove exists, Sandy Cove being a way office supplied on the existing service between Digby and Westport. The second part of the question is answered by the first.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

All information as regards the contract for the mail service between Digby and Westport, and on which Sandy Cove is situated, was given in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Lambton on the 27th of April last.

PIER AT GRAND BEND.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. Is Mr. Eugène Lafleur Chief Engineer of Public Works?

2. Did said Eugène Lafleur personally see the pier at Grand Bend when completed? If not, who furnished him the information on whih he made the final estimate as furnished in a letter dated October 10, 1905, to the Department of Public Works, and what are the contents of reports to the chief engineer relating to the said pier?

3. Has the pier at Grand Bend been completed according to contract?

4. Were tenders called for under the contract given to John D. Warwick? If not, why not?

5. What reason does the government give for paying extras over and above the contract price?

6. Is the government aware that the pier at Grand Bend is in need of immediate repairs?

7. Does the government intend to dredge the river alongside of said pier? If so, when will the work commence?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. (a) No.

(b) The engineer in charge who forwarded the final estimate duly certified.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. No extras allowed.

6. The necessity for repairs has been brought to the attention of the department.

7. Matter under consideration.

MONCTON SHOPS—PAYMENTS TO E. A. WALLBERG.

Mr. CROCKET asked:

1. What amount has been paid to date to E. A. Wallberg on account of his contract for the construction of the new Intercolonial Railway passenger car repair shop, paint shop, office and stores building at Moncton?

2. What amount has been paid to date to Mr. Wallberg for work and materials over and above that shown on the plan and specifications on which tenders were invited for the construction of said buildings?

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

1. Amount paid on bulk sum contract, $138,656.74.

2. Amount paid on account of schedule for additions or deductions, $9,079.34. Total amount paid, $147,736.08.

TIFFIN—TENDERS FOR DREDGING.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

What tenders were received for dredging besides that of the Owen Sound Dredging

Company for dredging at Tiffin in the year 1907, and what in each case or cases was the price for rock and for other material?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

	Price per yard, scow measurement. Rock. $ cts.	Other Materials. cts.
First call (Midland-Tiffin):		
Dominion Dredging Company..	2 50	30
Canadian Dredge and Construction Co..	2 40	53
Penetanguishene Dredging Company..	3 00	57
Second call :—		
Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Company.	2 00	27
R. Weddell..	2 50	31
R. Macdonald..		33

MIDLAND—TENDERS FOR DREDGING.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What tenders were received for dredging besides that of the Canadian Dredge and Construction company for dredging at Midland in the year 1907, and what in each case or cases was the price for rock and other material?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

	Price per yard, scow measurement. Rock. $ cts.	Other Materials. cts.
First call —		
Dominion Dredging Company..	2 50	30
Canadian Dredge and Construction Co..	2 40	53
Penetanguishene Dredging Company..	3 00	57
Second call :—		
Canadian Dredge and Construction Co..	2 25	26
R. Macdonald..		33
R. Weddell..	2 50	33

VICTORIA HARBOUR—TENDERS FOR DREDGING.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What tenders were received for dredging besides that of the Owen Sound Dredging company for dredging at Victoria harbour in the year 1907, and what in each case or cases was the price for rock and for other material?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

	Price per yard, scow measurement. Rock. $ cts.	Other Materials. cts.
Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Co..	2 00	8
Windsor Dredging Co..	2 25	9

HATCHERY OF SHAD AT WINDSOR, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. BLACK asked :

Has the government any intention of undertaking the hatching of shad at the fish hatchery at Windsor, Nova Scotia?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Matter stands for consideration.

SHAD FISHERIES ON ATLANTIC COAST.

Mr. BLACK asked :

1. Does the government propose to appoint a commission to make inquiries and gather information in regard to the shad fisheries on the Atlantic coast of Canada?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The subject is at present under the most serious consideration.

EMPLOYMENT OF MESSRS. ALONZO, LOUIS AND CHARLES L. CHILVERS.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Is one Alonzo Chilvers, Louis Chilvers and Charles L. Chilvers, recently from Essex county, in the employ of the government?

2. If so, in what capacity, what is the date of each appointment, and the amount of salary received by each?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) could give an idea of what department these men are supposed to work in perhaps I could answer it. At present we have no information that such men are employed by any of the departments.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

ADJOURNMENT—EMPIRE DAY AND ASCENSION DAY.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That when this House adjourns on Friday next it stand adjourned to Tuesday, the 26th instant; and that when it adjourns on Wednesday, the 27th instant, it stand adjourned to Friday, the 29th.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

On the orders of the day being called :

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is a matter which was brought up in the House a day or two ago of sufficient importance to demand a reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can only bring this matter up at this stage with the consent of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is in reply to a question asked by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). With the con-

sent of the House I wish to make just a few observations. The other day the hon. leader of the opposition read from a despatch in one of the newspapers, which I noticed afterwards had very large headlines over it, that a portion of the Transcontinental Railway in the vicinity of La Tuque had been badly damaged by flooding and that it would probably be necessary for the location of the line to be changed or for the roadbed to be very materially raised. I immediately inquired into the matter and I have a memorandum from the district engineer in charge which, I think, in view of the publicity that has been given to the statement, should be read. This is a letter which has been placed in my hands by the chairman of the commission. It was addressed to him yesterday by the district engineer.

Ottawa, May 20, 1908.

Hon. S. N. Parent, Chairman.

Dear Sir,—In answer to your inquiry concerning the despatches published in the newspapers as to the flooding of the Transcontinental Railway in the vicinity of the St. Maurice river, I have to confirm the reports in so far as they allude to the exceptionally high water experienced this year, not only on the St. Maurice river, but also on all the other rivers and streams in my district, and to give the most unqualified denial to the reported damages caused to our railway by these same floods. There is not one foot of track under water in my district extending from the New Brunswick boundary to Weymontachene on the St. Maurice river. The reports seem to have originated through the flooding of an embankment at La Tuque which had been built temporarily, and which was not within seven feet of the grade laid down on our profiles. Owing to the extreme floods this year, it might be prudent to build concrete substructures of some of our bridges higher than we originally intended to protect our steel superstructures later on from possible damages by ice and log jams, but I am glad to say that not one dollar's worth of damage has been done so far to the structures and culverts in district 'B,' neither will it be necessary to change one foot of our adopted location.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) A. E. DOUCET,
District Engineer, 'B.'

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY—POSTAGE STAMPS.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out from the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) if the souvenir postage stamps to be issued in connection with the tercentenary are still under consideration and if any decision has been reached especially with regard to the question as to whether the stamps are to be printed in both languages.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). It is not customary in matters of this kind to give to the public, before the day of issue, the nature of the stamp to be issued, but still I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. A. Lavergne) that I will be in a position to make a statement very shortly. I intend that the stamps shall be issued the very day the tercentenary begins. Otherwise I would have no objection to give my hon. friend and the country a description of the stamps.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I do not want a description of the stamp. But I put two questions to the minister lately and I want to find out if the two languages are going to be used. Am I not entitled to an answer ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have just answered my hon. friend.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS WITHOUT NOTICE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Mr. Speaker, might I make inquiries as to the necessity of notice of motion to confirm reports of an important nature which are presented to this House before these reports shall be confirmed. I observe that one was moved yesterday without notice, a report of the Committee on Debates of a rather important character, and in order that the practice may be known in future I would venture to bring the matter to your attention that you may lay down, for the information of the House, the correct practice for the chairman of these committees to observe in making such motions. I am not doing this for the purpose of finding fault with the particular report confirmed in this instance but merely to safeguard notice to the House in order that there may be a proper discussion, if discussion is necessary, of these matters.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Perhaps I may be permitted on this point to say shortly that when I was Speaker of the House it had been established as the practice that when reports came from committees they should not be concurred in on the same day, but that notice should be given that upon some future day a motion to concur in these reports would be made. If it were possible to adopt this practice I think it would be very much better for the members of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I found the practice to be very much as is laid down by Bourinot. On referring to past proceedings of the House I found that it had been followed almost systematically. The practice is laid down by Bourinot at page 555 as follows :

Many motions for concurrence in reports of select standing committees are brought up without notice and allowed to pass by unanimous consent.

That is frequently the case. Usually I pause for a moment to see if there is any

objection and if there is I intimate to the House that a proper course to adopt is that the matter should be allowed to stand as a notice of motion. The sentence immediately following the one I have just read is as follows :

But in all cases objection may be taken, and it is the regular course to give notice.

It certainly would appear to be the more proper course that notice should be given in all cases.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed, on the same subject that was brought up by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and in reference to which you, Sir, made some remarks, I desire to say that there was a report of a committee made yesterday. The committee was called in the morning at ten o'clock after the House had adjourned at three o'clock on the same morning. Some of the members of the committee had no notice of it. Some action was taken by the committee and the report was moved in the House at two o'clock in the afternoon. We all know that very few members are here at two o'clock on Wednesday afternoon as they have not yet become accustomed to the House meeting at that hour. The report was carried immediately—on the very same day upon which it had been adopted by the committee. Without discussing the merits of the report it seems to me extraordinary that it should be carried so quickly when there has been a report of the same committee before the House for three weeks which has not yet even been considered by parliament. It seems to be somewhat irregular. I understood that the chairman would to-day bring up the report adopted at the previous sitting of the committee. He did not happen to be in the House when the Speaker called for the reception of reports and as a matter of fact this report has not been discussed yet. It certainly looks extraordinary that a report of the same committee and upon a similar subject should be passed hurriedly in the morning and adopted by the House at its opening in the afternoon, while this report which has been before the House for three weeks has not yet been considered.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was my hon. friend informed of the sitting of the committee yesterday morning ?

Mr. BERGERON. I found my notice in the box when I got here in the afternoon. The post office was closed when I left the House late the previous night and I suppose my notice was there, it having been delivered very late apparently, and I got it in the afternoon. What strikes me as most peculiar is that the Minister of Finance, when the report was moved yesterday, should have asked the chairman of the Debates Committee : Is that the report my hon. friend called my attention to, and the chairman of the committee said : No. There seems to be something strange in that. Why not discuss the prior report of the committee as soon as possible and let the House get rid of it ? The right hon. the Prime Minister has always been very strong in his attitude in supporting the reports of the committees of the House unless there is something extraordinary in them ; he has always maintained that these reports should be respected, and yet here is a report made by a select committee of the House three weeks ago and it is not yet adopted. The powers of this committee are delegated by the House and it is a slight on the House not to adopt the report. I do not say anything against the report the committee made yesterday as to the merits of the case, but I trust that this report of the same committee made three weeks ago will be considered by the House as soon as possible.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). As to the report of three weeks ago to which my hon. friend refers, when in the House the chairman of the committee proposed that that report should be adopted some time ago, the right hon. the Prime Minister suggested it should stand over. The reason for asking it to stand over is that the report—I am not speaking of the report of yesterday, but the prior report—proposed to increase salaries and make payment for former years, both of which were matters which we thought should receive the consideration of the government, and that the government should have to take the responsibility of approving or disapproving, on the general principle that appropriations of public money should receive the assent of the government. It was for that reason the report was allowed to stand over. That was a good reason and it is only for that reason. It is fair to the chairman of the committee to say that the report of the committee which was adopted yesterday was not open to the same objection as the report which was presented a few days ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not yesterday's report involve a charge on the revenue ?

Mr. FIELDING. No ; the chairman of the committee told me of the report of yesterday before it was presented and I said at once : Are you proposing to increase any salaries. He said, No ; we are proposing to fill a vacancy, this adds nothing to the expenditure ; and I said : If that is the case the objection which was taken before would not apply, and the assurance was given me that it was not a proposal to create any new vacancy or to create any increase of salary.

Mr. FOSTER. But it adds to the expenditure ?

Mr. FIELDING. The information given me was that it was to fill a vacancy.

Mr. FOSTER. If the vacancy was not filled there would be no money expended for it.

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever may be said as to the powers of the committee to select officials to fill vacancies and to make a choice of them, it seems to me there would be a distinction between such a proposition and a proposal to increase the expenditure. At all events that was the line of difference in my own mind between the two reports. The one proposes to fill a vacancy at an established salary, so I was informed, and the other proposes to add to the salaries and to make payment for the services of past years.

Mr. BERGERON. The statement of the Finance Minister shows how useful and necessary it is to discuss these matters. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is entirely mistaken in his understanding of what was said to him. There is no doubt that the report of the committee yesterday created a new office and a new expense. It was to appoint a new employee altogether and that at a certain salary and that is the report which was adopted. I do not object to it. It is a report made by a committee of the House and I am ready to stand by such a report. Now as to the other report of three weeks ago which has been delayed at the demand of the government, it again shows how useful it will be to discuss these matters, because there are any number of precedents to show that such reports have been adopted by the House time and time again. I hope therefore that for the sake of the proper conduct of the business of the House that the adoption of this report shall be moved as soon as possible and that we shall have an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. FIELDING. There is some room for difference of opinion as to the method of procedure by committees under such circumstances. There are precedents to show that the work of the 'Hansard' staff—because it relates to these gentlemen—comes under the direction of the Committee on Internal Economy.

Mr. BERGERON. That is entirely new.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will find it is not entirely new. But, there are also cases where a committee without objection has been allowed to deal with these matters. There is room for honest difference of opinion as to what is the proper channel and I am not offering any decided opinion as to which is the better way. It is only fair to say that was the reason why this report was laid aside for consideration.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. If I understand your ruling now, Mr. Speaker, it is that nothing of this kind shall occur again and that although there is no objection to a motion, the only way you can possibly put it to the House would be by suspending the rule. Last session I objected again and again to reports of committees of the House coming up for consideration without the necessary notice required by the rules of the House appearing upon the Votes and Proceedings, and as I understand you now, Mr. Speaker, you will in future strictly enforce the rules of the House and that unless there is unanimous consent on motion for the suspension of the rules of the House, none of these motions will be allowed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It would seem to me that if the principle laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) is adhered to it would impede the proceedings of this House. Many of these committees are simply formal and require no debate, and they are adopted whenever presented, such for instance as a report from a committee that it should have power to take evidence under oath and employ shorthand writers. Mr. Speaker has stated that yesterday he waited to see whether any objection was taken to the adoption of this report and no objection was taken. When the report was brought in I inquired from the chairman of the committee and I understood from him that the report did not involve any new charge on the revenue, but simply filled a vacancy, and I understood under such circumstances there would be no objection at all. I may say to my hon. friend and to the House that if the good faith of anybody has been infringed upon, we will reconsider it. I do not want to have the matter passed in that way. There is no reason why this report should not be debated if it is to be debated at all.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). The Minister of Finance must have either misunderstood the chairman of the Debates Committee or the true state of the facts was not represented. There was a meeting of the Debates Committee in the morning at ten o'clock and I was present at that committee with four others, just enough to form a quorum. The chairman of the committee stated there was a demand for a new translator, an additional translator. I took exception to it and I moved—but I did not get a seconder—that we should have the work done by tender and contract. There are some nine or ten men there now doing the work that two men with two stenographers ought to do. The member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) moved, seconded by the member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) and supported by the member for Calgary that the appointment be made and I voted against it. However it carried and the report was presented to the House and rushed through yesterday. It appeared to be a rush thing altogether. It was the appointment of a new member to that translation staff

without any doubt in the world. I have not the slightest doubt but that the staff is now overloaded and that half the number of them could do the work. One of the proofreaders was appointed to the translating staff at a salary of $2,000 a year and there was a new man appointed to fill the position of proofreader. There is no doubt there was a new appointment and an increase in the public expenditure.

Mr. FIELDING. Lest I should mislead the House, I want to say at once that I have not the slightest doubt that the chairman of the committee acted in good faith, but from what he said I certainly did understand that this was not creating any new office, but filling a vacancy. That is why there was in my mind, whether properly or improperly, a distinction between this report and the previous one, this report not adding any obligation, but the previous one adding a considerable sum. It may be that I misunderstood the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be as well to read the report, and it is necessary to read more than is on the face of it to get the understanding which the Finance Minister said he received :

Your committee recommend that E. Charlier, who has been employed in the capacity of proofreader on the staff of translators of the Debates be appointed as translator at a salary of $2,000 per annum, and that Rodolph Girard be appointed to replace the former as proofreader at a salary of $1,500 per annum.

It does not say that the proposed appointment is to fill a vacancy or anything of the kind. On the face of it, it means a new position, and my hon. friend says it is a new position. I most certainly would like to discuss the matter of adding translators before the report goes through, and I think the suggestion made by the Prime Minister should be carried out, to have this report reconsidered and committed to the House to be discussed when the next report comes up.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not like to take this position to-day in the absence of the chairman of the committee, but, certainly, if there is not a proper understanding of the report, there is room for explanation.

INQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he will bring down the original papers with reference to the fire extinguishers on which we had a little mild discussion in the House. It was supposed to be exigent at the time that the papers should be copied to get them into the hands of the commission, but the commission is now at leisure, great leisure I may say, and I suppose the minister will now lay them on the table of the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that some of the papers were personal. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not ask that these should be brought down?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the file as used and quoted from by the minister should be brought down. I have a great suspicion of personal communications. We had an example yesterday of things marked private which were absolutely public. I think that whatever was on the file should be brought down.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that the papers quoted by myself were not marked personal. But I find that a paper which was quoted by my hon. friend was marked personal.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not make it not a public paper.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether my hon. friend was justified in quoting in a file which was handed over to him a letter which was marked personal.

Mr. FOSTER. It appears to me that you cannot change the value of a sovereign by stamping it twenty-five cents.

IMMIGRATION—ORDER IN COUNCIL.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) if he is prepared to bring down the recent order in council with reference to immigration founded upon the recent amendment to the Immigration Act ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am sorry that the order in council is not ready to be brought down. It is under reconsideration by council and as soon as the reconsideration has been completed it will be brought down.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume the minister will lay it on the table of the House when it is passed?

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

SUPPLY—THE ROSS RIFLE.

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

Mr. A. N. WORTHINGTON (Sherbrooke). Mr. Speaker, I propose for a short time this afternoon to discuss the Ross rifle and to conclude my remarks with a motion. In bringing the subject of the Ross rifle before the House I would refer to my remarks of last session, in which I stated that it was not my intention to endeavour in any way to embarrass the Department of Militia, to injure the manufacturer or to impede the manufacture of the rifle in Canada. My object was to have placed in the hands of the militia of Canada a safe, serviceable and efficient rifle. With that object in view I urged the Minister of Militia to submit the rifle to such an inspection

at the hands of musketry experts of note as would result in one of two things—in alaying the fear which existed in the minds of an already gun-shy militia, or in the rifle being perfected or a better rifle being placed in the hands of the militia of Canada. This the minister refused to do in spite of the criticism in the House and in the press, in spite of the absolute condemnation of the rifle by the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, in spite of its more or less general failure in the hands of the permanent force and the militia, in spite of the refusal of the men to use it, and in spite of the severe accidents which have happened at St. John, at Eastman and at Lethbridge; so that to-day, Mr. Speaker, I have no apology to offer for a strenuous criticism of the weakness of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House and his War Minister in placing in the hands of the militia of Canada an unsafe and unserviceable rifle—an action, Mr. Speaker, which, in the mind of any one who has read the report, is nothing short of criminal.

To begin with, I would refer to the raison d'etre for the rifle. It was a very commendable idea on the part of the Minister of Militia and the Militia Council to have a rifle manufactured in Canada—to have a factory established within our own borders capable of turning out a sufficient number of arms so that in the event of our being cut off from the mother country in the time of trouble we will still have our own source of supply. This was a very commendable idea, but we shall soon see, Mr. Speaker, how this idea failed, and how a contraband Yankee rifle came to be placed in the hands of the militia of Canada. The Minister of Militia started in search of a rifle and somebody to manufacture it. The manufacturer was soon forthcoming in the person of Sir Charles Ross, and the rifle adopted was the Ross straight-pull magazine rifle. A company was formed and incorporated. As to the personnel of the company it matters little, as we were told by the minister in the House that the original company never went into existence, but that Sir Charles Ross is doing business individually under his own name. The company was given a free site on the Plains of Abraham. It might be well to inquire why the Ross rifle was adopted? How it came to find favour in the eyes of the Minister of Militia and the government? It is very hard to say, but we were told in the Public Accounts Committee by the solicitor of the company that the Ross rifle was an exact reproduction of the Manlicher rifle with which some 250,000 men of the Australian army were armed.

We were also told that the commission had sat upon and adopted this rifle as being one of the best and most up to date. But in the event of the rifle having been adopted on the strength of its being the same as that used in the Austrian army, that army has not been rearmed since 1896 so that we are not getting a very new or up to date weapon. As no very favourable opinions were given at that time, it would be only reasonable to ask if the rifle had been reported on by the war office or any particular commission up to then. We have been told by the Minister of Militia that the War Office had never reported upon or criticised the rifle for the simple reason that it had never been submitted to the war office. A fairly comprehensible alibi. But a statement I would be inclined to take with a grain of salt considering the fact that the hon. minister has told us that none of the component parts of this rifle were manufactured in the United States. For that reason I would be inclined to doubt that statement, but, in any event, about the time the rifle was adopted, or shortly afterwards, Lord Middleton, then secretary for war, in a despatch to Lord Minto, regretted that while the Ross rifle would take the same ammunition as the Lee-Enfield, the different parts of the two rifles were not interchangeable, which would be a great drawback.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Whose report is that?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Mr. Brodrick, who was then secretary for war.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the hon. gentleman aware that no two parts of the Lee-Enfield are interchangeable, and there are eighteen different sections?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The hon. gentleman will have ample opportunity to speak his little piece when I am through. This despatch also says that two of the Ross rifles had been tested by the officers of the Musketry School at Hythe in connection with two Lee-Enfield rifles, and the report showed the marked inferiority of the Ross rifles. This, of course, has been denied by the Minister of Militia. There is therefore good reason to suppose that the Ross rifle must have been adopted for some and good and sufficient cause.

We are told that the Ross rifle was tested at Springfield and New Haven and other places and passed very creditable examinations. The test of the earliest date of which we have cognizance is to be found in the report No. 5 of the Public Accounts Committee on the Ross rifle. I take the following from the report of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) page 197, after stating that he had visited the United States of America arsenal and factories at Springfield, Massachusetts, and the Pratt & Whitney and other works in Hartford, Connecticut, and expressing his appreciation of the courtesy extended to him, he reported as follows to General Otter:

It may be noted that on active service in South Africa I chanced to take several straight pull actioned rifles from the Boers. Though the action was weak, the resistance lug or block being at the rear of the bolt, yet the ease in loading and firing, the steadiness of the rifle, its magazine, its steadiness impressed me. It was of the Mannlicher type straight pull. The Sir Charles Ross rifle has all the advantages of the other with none of its drawbacks. The Sir Charles Ross rifle locks its resistance lugs at the forward end of the bolt; is the strongest rifle I have seen; is least likely to get out of order, and is the simplest to dismount and put together.

He also speaks about the tests of the Ross rifle made at Hartford in comparison with the Lee-Enfield. He says:

The first defective in the Lee-Enfield blew off and smashed the magazine.

That is the defective shell which is used in testing the Lee-Enfield.

The second Lee-Enfield was disabled by the next defective, the extractor spring being broken. Thus far nothing had happened the Sir Charles Ross action. It may be noted the first defective from each was fired with the rifles firing screwed in a vice at the muzzle, both rifles slightly opened the action from the recoil.

I simply quote that because it differs very materially from the report I have here, which comes from the Springfield armoury, dated 31st of August, 1903, and which is signed by the members of the board, Charles H. Clark, manager of the ordnance department, president; John P. Thompson, captain, ordnance department member; W. S. Pierce, captain ordnance department, recorder. A number of tests were made. The first one or two I shall not read as they are not important, as they deal with rapidity and accuracy, and also the single shot tests. But when they got down to test the rifle as a repeater, the report is as follows:

As repeater—time 1 minute—number of shots, 29.

In this and other tests in which the piece was used as a repeater, the magazine was charged from pasteboard boxes holding five cartridges each. The cartridges were intended to be poured from these boxes, using the latter as chargers. The boxes, however, were not of exactly the right shape and frequently failed to work satisfactorily.

Test No. 111—endurance.

In this test the piece was fired in a fixed rest.

First series of 50—At one charging of the magazine only four cartridges could be entered, due apparently to stacking of the first two.

Second series of 50—The same difficulty in charging magazine occurred several times. On one of these occasions the fact that the fifth cartridge had not entirely entered the magazine was not observed until an effort was made to close the bolt when a jam resulted.

Third series of 50—One miss fire occurred.

Fourth series of 50—A jam occurred after charging the magazine as noted in the second series. Two cases extracted with some difficulty.

Fifth series of 50—One miss-fire occurred.

Sixth series of 50—One empty case stuck, and in the effort to extract, a portion of the rim of the case was sheared off by the extractor. The case was rammed out from the muzzle. Another case failed to extract at first trial, but was extracted on second trial.

Seventh series of 50—No remarks.

Eighth series of 50—Two cartridges missed fire at first trial, but fired when struck a second time. One cartridge failed to feed from magazine in closing the breach, but fed properly on second trial.

Ninth series of 50—The stacking in charging the magazine noted in the second series occurred once. Two cartridges missed fire and two cases required a second effort to extract.

Tenth series of 50—Three miss-fires occurred and one cartridge required two blows to fire it.

Series (b).

Five cartridges required two blows of the firing pin and five misfires occurred in this series. Three cases failed to extract after several efforts due to shearing of the rim in one case and over-riding of the extractor in the others, and had to be rammed out from the muzzle. One case required a second effort to extract and another several efforts. One jam resulted from throwing the magazine on by accidentally moving the catch lever.

Then comes the series of August 10:

August 10, 1903.

Test No. 4—Dust.

After dusting as prescribed for two minutes, the piece was fired 20 rounds as follows:

(a) Magazine empty when dusted. Before firing the magazine to be loaded and held in reserve until 15 rounds are fired as a single loader; then the cartridges in the magazine to be fired.

Three misfires occurred. The mechanism worked rather stiffly at first, the cutt-off requiring some manipulation before it functioned properly.

(b) Magazine loaded when dusted. The cartridges to be removed and wiped before firing, and piece used as a repeater.

Six misfires occurred and three cartridges required two blows of the firing pin.

Test No. 6—Excessive charges.

This test was taken up before test No. 5 pending the preparation of the defective cartridges required for the latter test. Cartridges giving a chamber pressure of 75,000 pounds per square inch were used.

1st round.—The primer blew out of the case giving what practically amounted to a blow back. The bayonet lock in the rear end of the bolt-head which held the main-spring sleeve in place was destroyed by the breaking off of part the part in rear of the slot forming the lock, and the firing pin was forced about one inch to the rear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. member (Mr. Worthington) read that again? What blew back, the cartridge, or the rifle?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The primer blew out of the case.

The remainder of this test was discontinued for the time.

Test No. 5—Defective cartridges.

Defective No. 1.

The bolt shield was bent up and the forward end broken off. The slot in the bottom of the bolt sleeve at the rear end in which the lug of the cocking-piece slides was contracted and bound the cocking-piece slightly. This was remedied by filing out the slot until the movement was free. The shield was removed before the next round.

Defective No. 2.

The cartridge missed fire. As it appeared that without the bolt shield the firing pin might be released in the act of closing the breech, the rifle was withdrawn for alteration. The possibility of the release of the firing pin as noted was due to the fact that with the shield removed the bolt sleeve is not supported by the guide groove on the right side of the receiver and can therefore rise at the rear end sufficiently to disengage the cocking piece from the rear.

The inventor then submitted for a continuation of the defective cartridge test a second rifle which differed only in length of barrel and a few similar details from the one withdrawn and the test was recommenced.

Defective No. 1—The bolt shield was entirely blown off the edge engaged in the receiver groove, being stripped and remaining in the groove.

In both these rounds the cartridges were so placed in the chamber that one of the cuts in the head pointed up and the gas escaping upwards struck against the under edge of the front of the shield with the results noted. It was evident that the shield was not strong enough to withstand the blow and that some modification in it was necessary. The second rifle was accordingly withdrawn and further trial discontinued pending changes to be made in the shield.

The next test, No. 6, was a test with excessive charges. As before, cartridges were used giving a chamber pressure of 75,000 pounds to the square inch—five rounds used.

1st round.—No remarks.

2nd round.—The firing pin appeared to move stiffly on examination, after this round, apparently from fouling due to the previous rounds with defective cartridges.

3rd round.—The action of the firing pin same as after previous round. The bolt was cleaned before the next round.

4th round.—A blow back occurred. The firing pin moved with greater difficulty. On examination it was found that the rear of the cocking-piece slot in the bolt sleeve was slightly burred, binding the movement of the cocking-piece and firing pin. This portion of the bolt sleeve had not been hardened. The burrs were filed off and test proceeded with.

5th round.—A partial blow back occurred. The case could not be extracted by hand, but on the second trial using the foot to move the bolt back the case was extracted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the test of the rifle as made in the Springfield armoury.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the date?

Mr. WORTHINGTON August, 1903.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And what is the date of mine?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I do not see any date. Possibly this report is made after that of the hon. gentleman.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I would like to ask for some definite information as to this report—as to where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Worthington) got it; whether he knows that the rifles supplied were of the same kind that Sir Charles Ross is delivering to the Canadian government, and so on. I think we are entitled to know something about this report.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. This report, I believe, emanated from the Springfield armoury in Massachusetts, and I believe it was made on rifles submitted to that board by Sir Charles Ross himself.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Worthington) give us any evidence—the names of the board?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I have already read the names of the board. I will read the first part of the report:

The board met at 10 a.m., August 6, 1903, pursuant to the verbal instructions of the commanding officer. Present, all the members. Meetings were continued from time to time until the tests were completed.

Sir Charles Ross appeared before the board and presented his magazine rifle for examination and test.

So, I presume, this was an authentic test made of the rifle.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I suppose this is taken from a printed document?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. This is a typewritten copy.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If I may be allowed to interject a word here, the papers which have been brought down to this House are given with full authority from the Department of Militia and Defence. It seems to me that the House ought to be seized of the origin of this report, and ought to have proof of its genuineness.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is nothing seriously wrong with it.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. This report winds up as follows:

Approved, and concurring in the opinion of the board that there is no advantage to be gained from further experiments with the Ross rifle.

(Signed) FRANK H. PHIPPS,
Colonel, Ord. Dept., U.S.A.,
Commanding.

Springfield Armoury, October 17, 1903.

Now, it seems to me that on these reports mainly, this Ross rifle was adopted. And the result is, a site was given on the historic battlefields of Quebec to the Ross Rifle Company, and in a building on that site the company, is now manufacturing,—or, rather assembling, from the small arms factories of the United States component parts of this rifle. The contract was entered into between Sir Charles Ross and the Department of Militia and Defence, the preamble of which is as follows :

Whereas, it is considered in the general interest of Canada that the rifles required by the government for the purposes of militia and defence should be manufactured in Canada, and whereas the contractor has proposed by himself or his assignee to undertake the establishment and operation of a suitable factory in Canada for the manufacture of such rifles and to supply the government with the rifles so required, manufactured at the same factory and delivered at a cost to the government not exceeding that which the government would have to pay for similar rifles purchased by or for the government as heretofore in the English market.

Now, this is the reason for the rifle being manufactured in Canada. I would like to show the facts concerning the importation of the component parts of this rifle from the United States. The great cry in favour of the Ross rifle was that it was to be made wholly in Canada, a Canadian product, so that if, in case of trouble, we were cut off from the motherland, we should have our source of supply within our own borders. This was a very commendable idea, but it will be seen that for some years back we have been living in a fool's paradise, for no less than from 17 to 20 of the component parts of the Ross rifle have been made in the United States. Suppose we were called upon to-morrow to defend our southern border from invasion, what position would we be in with the component parts of our rifles manufactured in the small arms factories of the United States?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Does my hon. friend say there are seventeen parts of the rifle completely manufactured in the United States ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I will go further than that and say there were more than that made at one time.

Mr. CARVELL. Now ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are talking about the present.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I am talking about the position until the time the 'Star' got on to the job. I do not know that there are now as many, but there are some, and if the minister makes inquiry from the Quebec Central Railway Company, I think he will find they are still coming through in barrelfuls, almost as many as ever.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is where you get your information, is it ?

Mr. CARVELL. Would the hon. gentleman give the names of the different parts manufactured in the United States ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I will give them all in just a minute. The minister does not anticipate any trouble with the United States, he has already sheltered himself behind the Monroe doctrine and is very fond of entwining the Old Glory of the United States with the Union Jack on festive occasions. On one occasion, at Windsor, Vermont, while he was engaged in the interchange of international bouquets, the Union Jack, almost at the moment he was speaking, was being trailed in the dust at Detroit. So the time may come when the hon. gentleman will regret the terms of that contract.

In this connection I wish to draw the attention of the House to the minister's straight denial of the fact that parts of the rifle are manufactured in the United States, a statement I believe to be not only absolutely incorrect but wilfully misleading.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member has gone a little far ; the statement 'wilfully misleading' can hardly be permitted.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The statement was not only absolutely incorrect but had the effect of appearing wilfully misleading, for at this very time importations had been and were going on from the United States in large quantities as the payments to Billings & Spencer, Hartford, Conn., will show. I have here a statement of payments to Billings & Spencer for 1902 and 1903, which is as follows :—

Quebec, June 11, 1903.

PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF MATERIALS.

1902.

Oct. 16.,	To Billings & Spencer Co., rifle forgings..	$ 4,044 37
Dec. 22,	To Billings & Spencer Co., barrels bands, etc..	4,814 47
		(4,912 72)
Dec. 24,	To Billings & Spencer Co., freight, sundries..	106 60
Dec. 29,	To Billings & Spencer Co., receivers....	2 72
Dec. 29,	To Billings & Spencer Co., rear bands....	11 54

1903.

Jan. 27,	To Billings & Spencer Co., receivers..	1 74
Feb. 9,	To Billings & Spencer Co., barrels, etc..	8,438 64
Feb. 23,	To Billings & Spencer Co., freight, sundries..	163 59
April 23,	To Billings & Spencer Co., freight, sundries....	75 21
April 23,	To Billings & Spencer Co., barrels, pins, etc..	4,241 67
March 4,	To Billings & Spencer Co., sight leafs....	149 40

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Surely my hon. friend knows that these are steel forgings and not completed parts. That was proved in the Public Accounts Committee, and he knows it very well.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Then there are a number of items during March, which I believe to be fixtures and which no doubt came in quite legitimately, amounting to about $10,000, which I shall not read.

I have here another statement of payments to Billings & Spencer amounting to $17,681.92, the items of which are as follows :—

BILLINGS & SPENCER.

1903.

Feb. 9, Gun barrels, $7,582. Bolt sleeves, 427.
" Bolts, $12,382.....Butt plates, 8,045.
" Trigger guards, $3,600.
" Rear banks, $9,370.
" Receivers, $5,038.
" Sears, $15,038.
" Triggers, $4,857.

I wish to quote from the 'Hansard' a few questions and answers showing the minister's denial of the fact that any parts were made in the United States. On May 14, 1906, at page 3246 of 'Hansard,' I asked the following question and received the minister's answer :

Is any part or parts of the Ross rifle manufactured in the United States? If so what parts and by what company?—A. No.

The minister's answer could not have been more explicit. On January 14, 1907, the following questions and answer appear :—

1. Are any parts of the Ross rifle manufactured by Messrs. Billings & Spencer, of Hartford, Connecticut? If so, what parts?
2. Are these parts dutiable? If so, under what clause do they come?
3. Is it the intention of this company to establish a branch factory in this country? If so, at what place?
4. Is this company incorporated in the Dominion of Canada? If so, under what statute or Act?
5. Who are the members of the company?
6. What contracts, if any, exist between this firm and the Ross Rifle company?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). We have no information in the Department of Militia with regard to any of these questions. I have made inquiries at the Customs Department and find that nothing is known about the matter there.

I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Customs was not going around with concealed arms, as well as the Minister of Militia. We have these invoices from Billings & Spencer amounting to many thousands, and yet this firm is unknown at either department. At this very time Billings & Spencer had incorporated in Canada and were hunting for a suitable place to establish a factory. They are situated now, I understand, at Welland, Ont., where they are manufacturing forgings. Some of their drop forgings are manufactured there but some are imported from the United States, at least three of the most important parts of this rifle. At page 1107, Vol. II., 1906-7, I find the following :—

Is it true that parts of the Ross rifle manufactured by the Ross Rifle Company at Quebec are imported into this country from the United States; if so, what parts?—A. Yes, flat springs.

Q. Have any parts of said rifles been manufactured by Messrs. Billings & Spencer, of Hartford? If so, what parts?—A. No, but some rough drop forgings had been supplied by Messrs Billings & Spencer.

Then the Minister of Customs gave the importations of component parts as follows: For the year ending June, 1904, parts had been imported to the amount of $38,116 ; 1905, $28,939 ; 1906, $38,314.

Mr. TAYLOR. Were duties collected on parts?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Everything comes in free for this company. The fact seems to have been established in 1906 that the Ross Rifle Company were manufacturing the component parts of their rifle largely in the United States. This fact has been more recently brought out by the Montreal 'Star' and the Boston 'Herald.' The Montreal 'Star' seems to have taken a trip into the interior of the Department of Militia, with the result that one of their agents visited the United States and found the Frank Mossberg, of Attleboro', Mass., in his bicycle bell and manicure factory, was manufacturing seventeen or eighteen parts of the Ross rifle. Although these facts were published and were brought before the government in the Montreal 'Star' and the Boston 'Herald' under large headlines, there does not seem to have been any denial of them in this House, or any denial by any authority of the Department of Militia anywhere. The Montreal 'Star' of March 4, 1908, publishes an article under the following heading :

Essential parts of Ross rifle are to-day being made by United States factories.

Canada's national rifle factory would have to stop operation if communications with the American republic were broken. Seventeen important parts turned out by one manufacturer in Massachusetts. New national enterprise inaugurated six years ago is still dependent upon foreign makers.

Then it goes on to state that a representative of the 'Star' visited Mr. Frank Mossberg's bicycle bell and manicure factory and found that, behind closed doors, all these component parts were being manufactured under contract with Sir Charles Ross for Canada's great arm of defence, and for the factory at Quebec. This rifle was to have been manufactured in Canada.

The Boston 'Herald,' in a tone of blasphemy, described the Ross rifle factory as

being as useless as a cheese factory. The Boston 'Herald' of March 5 contains the following headlines :

Canadian army rifles mostly American. Seventeen leading parts of Ross weapon made in Attleboro. Contract calls for manufacture in Quebec.

This paper enters into a description of the component parts of the rifle that are sent here. I will read a part of it :

The rifle is turned out by the Ross Rifle Company, of Quebec, a firm made possible by its contract with the Crown, and subsidized by the Canadian government. The head of the firm is Sir Charles Ross, a Scotch baronet. The contract under which he was granted the right to manufacture the standard military arm specifies that it shall be strictly a Canadian product.

However, all the Canadian workmen have to do is to assemble the pieces, and hand over the finished product. Only one principal part of the work do they attend to—the boring and rifling of the barrels.

The steel from which the barrels are made comes from Pittsburg, Pennsylvania.

The wood for fashioning the stocks is ordered through a New York firm and is carried up the St. Lawrence in ships from Europe.

The forgings from which trigger guards, receivers and bolt sleeves are manufactured, are made by the Spencer-Billings Company, of Hartford, Connecticut. The springs are made in England.

The metal punchings and the pressed, stamped or dyed steel parts are made by the Frank Mossberg Company, of Attleboro, Massachusetts.

In case of war or any national emergency requiring the immediate supply of arms, the Ross rifle factory, quietly reposing behind the big guns of Quebec's impregnable citadel, would be about as much use as a cheese factory.

That is what the Boston 'Herald' says.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is conclusive.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Yes. In what condition were these parts brought in? Many of them were brought in from the Mossberg factory ready to be put into the gun, in a finished condition. I have a letter from a man who served four or five years in the Mossberg factory, and it is as follows :

Dear Sir,—I got your letter yesterday. In reply would say that I have worked for the Frank Mossberg Company, of Attleboro, for over five years in two different times. The first time was seven years ago. Worked for them four and a half years, and left their employment for about six months and went back for them for another year and left them the last a little over a year ago.

Now, about the manufacturing parts of the Ross rifle, I can't say how many parts are made, and name them as there are many parts that I don't know by name, but I can show them on the rifle.

As for the parts that I remember I can give you a list of them that were made just a year ago.

The pawl.
The sear.
The trigger.
The stock plate.
The lifter is made in two parts and assembled in the Mossberg shop.

As near as I can remember there must be between 15 to 20 parts made there, and all sent ready to be put in the rifle, except a few parts that have to be case-hardened, as ever part is made of machinery steel, cold rolled. Find inclosed a few sketches of parts made there that I made some of the tools myself.

Hoping this will help you a little.

I remain, yours,
(Sgd.) X. T. DELORME.

Here is a drawing of the parts which he has made from his memory after having been engaged in making these parts. On March 5, 1908, the Montreal 'Star' comes out with another big sensational column, headed as follows :

How Mr. Mossberg, of Massachusetts, came to make seventeen essential parts of Ross rifle. Visit to the factory at Attleboro where, behind locked doors, force is working hard on 'Canadian rifle' contracts. Make every effort to keep visitors from seeing the work in progress. In interview with 'Star' reporter, Mr. Mossberg says he joined hands with Sir Charles Ross on a purely business basis. One asks for goods, the other sells them.

Then on March 10, Mr. Mossberg pays a hurried visit to Ottawa, and the Montreal 'Star' reported the visit under the following heading :

Sir Charles Ross issues hurry up call to Mr. Mossberg to explain.

Massachusetts manufacturer in Montreal this morning after session of Ross rifle authorities makes interesting statement.

Mossberg goes on to say in this paper that although there are certain alleged affidavits produced may be he is still doing business at the old stand and manufacturing most of the component parts of the Ross rifle.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. He denied that the next day in the Montreal 'Star.'

Mr. WORTHINGTON. He did not deny it in the 'Star.' The 'Star' confirms the report that his previous statements were practically correct.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Is my hon friend (Mr. Worthington) aware of the fact that Sir Charles Ross has specifically denied this whole statement and that this Mr. 'Mossback,' or whatever his name is, also made a denial?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I don't quite understand what the minister has said.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware, or perhaps he is not aware, that Sir Charles Ross has

specifically denied the allegations made in that paper and that this Mossville' or 'Mossback,' or whatever his name is, also denied that he made such statements as are attributed to him in the 'Star' or to the 'Star' reporter?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I know there are a great many 'Mossbacks' connected with the rifle, but if your Mr. 'Mossback' was not guilty of manufacturing parts of the Ross rifle why did he come up here on Sir Charles Ross' suggestion? What call had Sir Charles Ross on Mr. 'Mossback' and why did he respond so quickly to the call?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Who says he did? You don't know. That is a newspaper statement.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Mr. Mossback was here for two or three days and he confirmed every statement he made previously. He says he personally made a number of these parts until a year ago, and if the hon. gentleman will inquire at Welland, Ont., where the Billings & Spencer Company are now doing business, he will find that although they are making some drop-forgings, and very good drop-forgings, they are still importing at least three of the essential parts of the rifle from the United States to-day.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am glad the hon. gentleman approves of the drop-forgings.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be a mighty poor case if he could not find something good in the whole thing.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is a proper thing for a committee to investigate.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Now as to the contract between the government and the Ross Rifle Company. This contract was one of the most ridiculous and unbusiness-like contracts ever entered into by any business like government and a totally one-sided affair. According to the terms of this agreement the Department of Militia and Defence was to purchase from the Ross Rifle Company a number of Ross rifles at the rate of 10,000 a year at the price of $25 a piece, the company to receive an advance payment of 75 per cent on the selling price of the rifles on advance estimates. The company also is allowed to import the machinery and raw material free of duty. This means that the government actually became the bankers of this company which had previously received a free site on the Plains of Abraham at Quebec for the nominal fee of $1 for 99 years with the option of extension. It is needless to discuss the manner in which this site was obtained. The lease in its present form is simply a subterfuge to alienate portions of the Plains of Abraham. The reasons advanced by the government for locating at this point, as we were told by Mr. Nesbitt in the Public Accounts Committee, was that the factory would be under the guns of the fleet. Which fleet is not stated. Possibly it is the fleet which the right hon. gentleman and his government have accepted the protection of since they came into power, but towards which they have refused to contribute one cent. It is certainly not the fleet of vessels which might be giving us protection on our Atlantic and Pacific sea-board, had the right hon. gentleman and his government contributed towards instead of putting the money into the pockets of the British ratepapers through the British preference. However, one thing is certain in the granting of this site, and that is that there must have been a straight pull on the site as well as on the gun. There the Ross Company has been assembling the component parts of this rifle and putting them together at a prince of $25. which is more than the cost of the Lee-Enfield or the new Springfield, the American rifle.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That statement is incorrect.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Which statement?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As to price.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The $25?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The statement as to the price of the English rifle and as to the price of the American rifle is incorrect.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. As to the price of the American rifle I am going to take the word of one of the Minister's own Rifle Commissioners, and that is Colonel Anderson who in writing to the 'Militia Gazette' concerning the Palma trophy and the respective merits of the Lee-Enfield and the new, states that the price of the Springfield rifle is $15. Possibly some of these commissioners do not know anything about rifles, but I am willing to accept Colonel Anderson's statement that $15 is the price of the rifle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Possibly he took the erratic figures of the hon. member for Sherbrooke last session.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. In view of the price which this government is paying for the Ross rifle and the terms under which it was to be delivered, I would like to consider the previous armament of our militia and the value and stability of the rifle with which it was armed. During a discussion of this matter on February 26, 1907, I quoted a letter from Messrs. Greener, small arms manufacturers in England, to the effect that they would supply this government with the new pattern British army rifle with bayonet complete for 80 shillings if large lots were required. Now, as the minister knows there is always a 5 per

cent discount for cash on these firearms and they are generally delivered f.o.b. at a British port in cases at that price. The letter also states :

We may tell you that we are making large quantities for Australia at the present time.

I also had a letter from a colonel in the militia who has been several times at Bisley in which he states that men of the Bisley team have frequently while there bought in the open market Lee-Enfield Greener make rifles at £3 10. Mr. Henry Burns, of New Haven, Conn., who at one time was in the employ of the Ross Rifle Company, states that $25 is not too much for the Ross rifle manufactured as it is under the present management, but he states they could be manufactured for the same price as the Springfield or 'Model 90' Winchester, which I believe is $15. Now, the former Conservative government bought the same rifle, the Lee-Enfield, for about an average cost of $17, as was quoted by the Minister of Militia himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. That included the bayonet?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. The Lee-Enfield rifle cost delivered here $26.40. bought from the trade.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does that include the bayonet.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. it includes the cost of inspection.

Mr. TAYLOR. And duty added?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly the hon. gentleman is a protectionist.

Mr. FOWLER. And you are bringing all the parts of the Ross rifle free into this country.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I think the hon. minister has stated differently elsewhere, which I will try to show before concluding my remarks. Practically the difference in cost between the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield rifle is in the vicinity of $10, which would make a difference on 100,000 rifles of $1,000,000. A man prominent in the United States Small Arms Manufacturing Company states that the Ross rifle could be made at a profit for $15. But when discussing the cost of the rifle, the minister says we have to take into account the cost of the factory, the rent of land, the interest on capital and all that sort of thing. I do not know why we should in this case. The Minister and the late deputy minister of Militia have stated, and it has been sworn to by many in the Public Accounts Committee, that the Ross Rifle Company is a private concern doing business with the government. So these things should not be taken into account. When the minister buys boots for the militia, he does not take into account the rent of the Slater Shoe Company, he buys boots in the open market. So in buying uniforms for the militia, the minister does not take into account the cost of the Sanford factory.

As regards the record of the Lee-Enfield rifle, which we are casting aside, I would refer to the remarks of Lord Roberts made at the close of the South African war. He said it had been brought to his attention on more than one occasion that when the Boers picked up a Lee-Enfield rifle on the line of march they so preferred it to the Mauser that they threw away the latter and took the Lee-Enfield. Mr. Haldane, late Secretary for War, in his report, stated that the Lee-Enfield had been subjected to many hardships in South Africa and the northern parts of India and had proved a most satisfactory arm. In addition to these recommendations may be added the significant fact that it is still retained by Canadian marksmen in all international contests at Bisley, and almost entirely in the Dominion and provincial rifle matches. In fact, it is seldom that a Ross rifle is seen on the ranges in competition unless in the hands of some marksman of note who has been employed by the company to exploit the gun.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May I ask the hon. gentleman how is it that the English people are so obtuse as not to use the new Lee-Enfield rifle ? Why do they stick to the old Lee-Enfield on the ranges at Bisley ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Because they think the old rifle the best, I suppose. I might ask, why don't they take the Ross rifle ? Now, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman has introduced the subject of the new Lee-Enfield rifle, I may say that the London Small Arms Company are prepared to supply 10,000,303 Lee-Enfield rifles, at 80 shillings each, packed in tin-lined cases, and delivered f. o. b. at a British port, subject to 10 per cent discount for cash, which bring it to about 75 shillings. The new Lee-Enfield rifle is quoted in their catalogue at several dollars more than the old Lee-Enfield.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, knows that the upright view is a very inferior rifle, It is not the War Office test at all. I would like to have the date at which that quotation was made.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. It was made this month. In regard to this contract, what the public of Canada wants to know is how it is that the Ross Rifle Company have been able to get such an amount of coddling from the government. A site for a nominal rental, free importation of machinery and raw material ; 75 per cent advance on working estimates, and estimate of the estimate paid on orders, months and even years before the delivery of the previous orders. Most industries would never dream of asking a

government to provide them with capital upon which to start their enterprise. They would be satisfied to get a protective duty upon their output. Even a contractor working entirely for the government is expected to supply his own capital and live up to the terms of his contract. But the Ross Rifle Company, it appears, has been required to do none of those things. The government openly becomes its bankers, pledges itself to advance the money for the purpose of enabling it to purchase raw material, and even for the payment of wages up to 75 per cent of the value of the completed rifles ordered. This was a very generous proposition——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If it were true. But the hon. gentleman surely knows better than that. Why should he persist in misrepresenting the company and the government in this way ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Am I to understand from the minister that the government are not advancing 75 per cent on the working estimates ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman will understand from me that the government are not advancing capital to the Ross Company, and he knows it. Why should he persist in making that statement ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The government are paying the Ross Rifle Company 75 per cent advance on the working estimates, which amounts to $18.25 or thereabouts, which is several dollars more than the price of the Lee-Enfield or the new Springfield rifle ; so that I think I am practically right in saying that the government is supplying working capital to the company and even becoming responsible for the wage account up to 75 per cent of their orders.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not at all. The hon. gentleman knows that Colonel Wurtele's evidence before the Public Accounts Committee proves that out of $1,100,000 which had been paid over to the Ross Rifle Company, the Ross Company had expended on the work alone of manufacturing the rifle $100,000 more than that, besides the cost of the building and the cost of the machinery, and that $90,000 out of the $1,200,000 had gone to pay labourers in the city of Quebec. The hon. gentleman knows that, and why should he persist in making these statements ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I am stating practically what is in the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not the money that Sir Charles Ross pays his labour working capital ? If the government had not advanced it, would not Sir Charles Ross have had to get it elsewhere ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What the hon. gentleman means, I take it, is that the government advanced to the Ross Rifle Company its entire working capital. What he knows is that Sir Charles Ross constructed his building and put in his machinery, and he must have had capital in order to do this, because he did not get the money from the government until after the work was done.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the hon. gentleman said that the government provided the capital for working the concern, and it absolutely does.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But it did not buy the machinery.

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody said it did.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. This proposition was of such a generous nature that the government felt itself obliged to limit it, and so required that the rifle must be delivered within the year in which these advances were made. But, after having made this proposition, the government soon proceeded to ignore it. It made its first advance, on this first order of 12,000 rifles, in March, 1903, and did not get its first delivery until August, 1905.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Whose report is that?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I am reading, as far as I can figure it out, from the blue-book.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Does the contract require that these rifles must be actually delivered into the possession of the government before the advances are made?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I am not saying whether it does or not. I am stating what happened until the intervention of the Auditor General. The government made its first advance on this first order of 12,000 rifles in March, 1903, and did not get its first delivery until August, 1905. It had made all its advance payments up to the full 75 per cent of the selling value of the whole order by July, 1904, when there were still 3,000 of these rifles to be delivered. This is an example of the manner in which the agreement was kept. The advance on the second order of rifles began in February, 1905, though the delivery of the first order had not then commenced, and the second order was then 3,000 short.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I know how anxious the hon. gentleman is not to mislead the House. Does he not know that the balance of 3,000 which were short on the first order of 12,000, was delivered in the form of Mark II., and there was no shortage on that 12,000 order?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What difference does it make whether they are marked one or two?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is trying to create the impression that this government advanced 75 per cent on 3,000 rifles and never got anything for it.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I do not say that. I say they got them later, but the delivery was three years behind. I say that the government had made all its advanced payments up to the full 75 per cent of the selling value of the whole order by July, 1904, when there were still 3,000 of these rifles to be delivered. The advance on the second order of rifles began in February, 1905, though the delivery of the first order had not then commenced, and the second order was then 3,000 short. Advances were made in February, 1906, on the third order, and though for a long time no delivery was made, advances began on the fourth order.

This question of advances and delivery then assumed vexatious proportions. The company was usually two years behind in the delivery of the goods, although their contract called for delivery the same year as that in which the advance payments were made, and it was only when attention was called through the press to the fact that Mark I. rifles, on which the whole advances were paid three years ago, had not then been delivered, and that the company was two years in arrears on some later contracts, that the advances were stopped, and for three or four months there was nothing doing in the way of payments. This was largely due to the fact that the Minister of Militia was absent in England. During his absence the Auditor General and the acting minister, Sir Richard Cartwright, had stopped these payments, and it is understood that there were some hot times trying to finance the company, and some pretty warm discussions in the Militia Council. However, on the return of the hon. gentleman, the financing of the company was a very easy matter.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman inform me where he gets his information about what goes on in the Militia Council?

Mr. FOSTER. He got it from one of your own ministers, when he told us that you fought like blazes.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. This question of advanced payments and deliveries culminated in the refusal of the Auditor General to sanction any more advances, and he suggested, as one of his reasons, that we might find ourselves in possession of a lot of material only fit to be sent to the junk heap and on which we had made large advances. Does the hon. minister dispute that statement? He has disputed nearly everything else.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Auditor General was new then. It was just after he got office.

Mr. FOSTER. You have him broken in by this time.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The correspondence makes it clear that a deadlock occurred until an order in council was passed extending the time for delivery of the rifles. On May 13, 1907, the Auditor General wrote to Colonel Fiset, Deputy Minister of Militia, as follows:

I notice that you paid to March 31, 1907, on account Mark II, 1906, order, $272,441.04, and $11,250 on Mark III, although apparently no rifles have been delivered. Paragraph 8 of the contract allows 75 per cent of the advance of the costs of only such rifles as are to be delivered in that year. Pending your explanation of the non-observance of this part of the contract in connection with the payments made on account of the rifles, I would ask that no further payments be made to Sir Charles Ross on account, out of your letter of credit.

To this letter Colonel Fiset replied:

I attach herewith the statement called for in paragraph 2 of the above mentioned memo, showing the payments that have been made to the Ross Rifle company up to date. Up to the present date, the department has paid to the Ross Rifle company, $329,743.55 in advance on progress estimates. My predecessor, Col. Pineault was of opinion that the Ross Rifle company in accordance with the terms of the contract, were entitled to 75 per cent progress estimates on all orders received, independent of delivery, and acting on his advice, my minister had always authorized these payments.

Then comes a statement of the payments:

The statement attached showed that up to May 14, 1907, the following payments had been made:

Total advances..	$872,243 55
Twenty-six payments (final) at.. ..	6,250 00
Twenty-six thousand rifles received.	162,500 00
	$1,034,743 55

27,000 received to date at $25 each (no final) payment made on the last 1,000 received, $675,000. Balance (this represents payments made on progress estimates on the 25,000 rifles still to be delivered by the company) $39,743.55. The advances were made on account of orders given the company as follows:

No. 1.. ..	For delivery in	1903..	12,000
2.. ..	"	"	10,000
3.. ..	"	"	10,000
4.. ..	"	"	10,000
5.. ..	"	"	10,000

In his reply to Colonel Fiset, on May 23, the Auditor General said that, according to his interpretation of the contract, no advances should be made on account of work done or material supplied except on such rifles as might be delivered in the year. He added:

At present advances have been made amounting to about $360,000. This represents

over 15,000 completed rifles; and judging by the rates of delivery so far, it will tax the energy of the company to complete and deliver that number during the year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman give the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice? The department was acting under the advice of the Department of Justice.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The Auditor General suggested, in conclusion, that an examination of all the stock on hand and represented by progress estimates should be made by an expert competent to judge the value of the stock. 'Otherwise,' he said, 'the department may find itself in possession of material to be consigned to the junk heap, for which large advances have been made.' Now, there's a prophecy which possibly may be soon fulfilled. On May 28 the Deputy Minister of Militia wrote to the Auditor General, inclosing the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice as to the advances made, as follows :

I see no reason to doubt that your department is liable to pay the accounts in question. It may be that you had a remedy against the contractor for breach of his contract to supply the rifles within the stipulated time, but you would have to proceed accordingly, and cannot yourselves break another term of the contract as a sort of set-off against the contractor's breach of contract, which I suppose to be what your proposition really amounts to.

Referring to the ruling of the Justice Department, the Auditor General said, after repeating his former argument :

If this ruling is accepted and acted upon, whither are we drifting? Does your department intend to advance seventy-five per cent on 10,000 rifles for 1907 delivery and receive no rifles, seventy-five per cent on 10,000 rifles for 1908 delivery and receive no rifles, and so on ad infinitum? I am not credulous enough to believe that the government would enter into a contract containing any such possibilities.

All I can say there is that the Auditor General did not know the government. The correspondence continued at intervals until August 6, 1907, when the Auditor General wrote to Colonel Fiset a letter which is explanatory of what progress had been made towards the settlement of the dispute. He said :

I received a copy of the order in council of July 27 last, extending the time for delivery of the balance of the Ross rifles ordered, viz.: 15,000 to be delivered before January 1, 1908, and 10,000 before June 1, 1908.

The Department of Justice having reported that under contract the company is entitled to advances on progress estimates on orders for rifles to be delivered up to 75 per cent of the cost of the rifles, and your department having agreed to appoint an officer competent to examine the books and accounts of the company and certify to the expenditure made on the rifles, and having had an interview with Sir Charles Ross and Colonel Wurtele, the proposed inspecting officer for the purpose, when it was agreed that a certain form of certified statements would be furnished this office, a copy of which statements was handed to me to-day and afterwards transmitted to you, I therefore withdraw the restriction placed on your letter of credit in connection with the payment of these advances.

Thus we find that, through the intervention of the Minister of Justice the restrictions placed upon the letter of credit were withdrawn and the ruling of the Auditor General as to the payments for advance estimates was overruled. Now, before going on with my remarks as to the efficiency of the rifle, I would like to read letters from two of the former employees of the Ross Rifle Company, in order that the House and the public may see what was transpiring in the factory at the time. The first is a letter from Mr. R. Henry Burns, of New Haven, Conn. He was employed in the Ross rifle factory in the latter part of 1903 and the early part of 1904. He said :

I have made a specialty of the manufacture of guns for several years. I realized at that time that it was and would be impossible to manufacture guns under the systems they had adopted. I understood the condition of affairs throughout when I was with this company, and as I was somewhat interested, I have kept in touch with the conditions that have existed ever since. I can safely say that the Ross Rifle Company has made no progress towards manufacturing their rifles since 1903, and I can positively say that they never will, under the present arrangements. From the general manager down to the men in charge of the several manufacturing departments, there was not a man that had had any experience in the manufacture of guns until he entered the employ of the Ross Rifle Company. I should judge that there is a strong feeling that an A1 rifle should be manufactured on Canadian soil. The United States government manufacture their rifles and bayonets very satisfactorily. There is no reason why your government cannot do likewise. $25 is not too much for the Ross rifle, manufactured as it is under the present management. It can be manufactured for the same price as the Springfield or the model 90 Winchester.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the date of that letter ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The date is torn off. I can give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) the original. Another employee is Mr. J. H. Stanton, who wrote from St. Catharines as follows :

St. Catharines, December 11, 1905.

Sir F. W. Borden, K.C.M.G.

Sir,—I trust you will pardon me for taking the liberty to write you and ask a simple question. Are the shops now running in Quebec and known as the Ross Rifle Factory, being run as a private enterprise or are they being run as a government concern? My one

idea in asking this question of you is to get at a few simple facts.

He goes on to state, at the conclusion of his letter :

I have been advised to take this course by Mr. E. J. Lovelace, our defeated member for the county of Lincoln.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mr. Lovelace never wrote. He never supported that letter.

Mr. LANCASTER. He is postmaster there now.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The deputy minister wrote back telling Mr. Stanton that the Ross rifle factory was a private concern. Mr. Stanton wrote the following letter :

St. Catharines, December 28, 1905.

Department of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Your favour in answer to my inquiry regarding the Ross rifle factory at Quebec received and fully noted, and in reply to same will say:

From authority gained in the factory the Ross Rifle Company is a false face, and the factory is a government concern, and a veritable sink-hole, as bad as the Curran bridge or Langevin block.

It is needless to comment on these—all Liberals know how bad these two deals were said to be. We heard a great deal about them, and they were supposed to be very rotten.

The rifles they are turning out are useless and worthless as a military arm and for several reasons, too, and would not be accepted by any country wanting a first-class military arm.

Many of the arms now being turned out will not stand 100 shots in succession without becoming a complete rattletrap, and a danger to any one using them, and will be pitched in a scrap heap.

He has anticipated the Auditor General there.

While I am a thorough supporter of the present government, the country is being robbed by aliens, and there must be a thorough investigation. Perhaps the government can afford to wink at this, but the evidence will be pie to the opposition. If this develops into a McGreevy, Curran bridge or Langevin block scandal, the government must stand pat, as a warning note is sounded.

In another letter in January, 1906, he said :

I have no object in view except to protect the land of my birth and born of United Empire loyalist stock. I may say as a prelude I was not popular, because I found fault with the drawings furnished for men to work from. It was the remark of the men without exception that they were the crudest attempt at drawings they had even had put in their hand to work with.

And further on :

I have not said anything regarding the construction of the gun they are now turning out. The original Ross rifle was a fairly serviceable arm, but the one they are now building I would prefer to have it reported on by a thorough expert in military arms.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That would be Mark I then ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Mark I.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. You will not have a good opinion of Stanton after that?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. (Reading).

If you would care to satisfy yourself on one point alone, write to either the Winchester Arms Company, New Haven, Conn., or the Marlin Arms Company, same address, Remington Arms Company, Ilion, N.J., or the Savage Arms Company, N.J., or any company in Great Britain building military arms, and ask them if they approve of using a thread, four to the inch, or a four pitch, to join the barrel to the receiver and you will get a prompt reply. I have it from the Winchester, Marlin and Savage people, saying we do not approve of such a coarse pitch for a rifle using such heavy charges. Just say the arm is to use the heavy government charges. Another serious defect: the action is not fastened to the stock in any way except by the three bands around the barrel and stock. The wood under the action is cut away to receive the magazine till there is no strength left to it and many of them will not stand one hundred shots fired from them without the stock becoming a complete wreck. The working mechanism is complicated with a number of small parts and spring and very easy to go wrong in the hands of a novice, and the arm is useless.

I read this letter because the remarks continued in it are practically substantiated by the reports of many of the Militia Board of inquiry later assembled to pronounce on the rifle.

In order to understand the quality of the rifle in relation to stability and efficiency it is necessary for us to take a sort of transcontinental tour from Halifax to Vancouver, for really the rifle has been condemned from one end of the country to the other. A board was held at Halifax. The report of that board was forwarded by Col. Cotton, and read as follows :

Headquarters, October 8, 1906.

From the Master General of the Ordnance,
To the Inspector of Small Arms, Ross
Rifle Factory, Quebec.

Board of Officers Ross rifles.

Inclosed herewith is a copy of the proceedings of a board of officers on Ross rifles held at H.M. Gun Wharf, Halifax, by order of the officer commanding maritime provinces.

Most of the defects are those of which we are aware, but some further rather startling weaknesses have shown themselves.

Will you please be good enough to note them carefully and report progress being made in

the line of improving these weaknesses and defects.

(Sgd. W. H. COTTON, Col.
Master General of Ordnance.

This was forwarded to Col. Drury and in due course Col. Drury commanding the maritime provinces, reports as follows:

1. That a large proportion of the mechanical defects and the defects in sighting reported would be remedied by greater care in details of manufacture and in testing for accuracy at the shorter ranges.
2. That the construction of the back-sight and bolt of the rifle require reconsideration with a view to strengthening.
3. That the butt trap should be strengthened
4. That the foresight should not be white.
5. That the sling should be altered to permit of its being used for steadying the rifle when firing.

I would also suggest for consideration that the magazine should be fitted for clip ammunition which might overcome the present tendency to jam which is to some extent due to the cartridges not lying true when inserted one by one in the magazine.

The report of the proceedings is as follows:

Proceedings of a board of officers assembled at H.M. Gun Wharf, Halifax, N.S., on August 23, 1906, by order of officer commanding fortress of Halifax, N.S., for the purpose of reporting on the defects found in the Ross rifle, Mark II by units which have lately undergone their annual musketry courses.

President, Lieut.-Colonel R. L. Wadmore, R.C.R.

Members, Major H. C. Thacker, R.C.G.A., Captain P. H. French, R.C.E.

In attendance. Nil.

The board having assembled pursuant to order proceed to record evidence:

First evidence, Lieut. R. B. Willis, R.C.R., states:

I have been acting as musketry instructor to the Royal Canadian Regiment at their musketry training at McNabs. I have been five years and seven months in the Manchester regiment as lieutenant before joining the Royal Canadian Regiment. I was three years assistant adjutant (musketry) in the fourth battalion and am in possession of the Hythe certificate.

On the morning of May 15, 1906, I commenced the instruction of the recruits of four companies of the Royal Canadian Regiment. in table A, and immediately defects were reported as under mechanical (a) foresight. In many cases I find the fixing screw comes loose, and in a few cases, when the screw is firm, the foresight will still be loose.

(b) Lower band—Being riveted, in some cases becomes loose and consequently the hand guard drops off.

(c) Back sight—The leaf of back sight easily bends to right or left. In two cases the wind gauges broke completely off, in a great many cases when the rifle is fired the back sight jumps 100 to 200 yards.

In a great many cases the projections to back sight leaf which hold it in its place are too short and do not retain their grip so that the leaf flies over on to the hand guard. The gooseneck of the slide in some cases is too high, and one cannot see the foresight in the V of back sight.

The wind gauge leaf has a tendency to work loose.

Bolt stop—In a great many cases the bolt stop when pressed down remains down and the consequence is the rifle cannot be pressed down.

Bolt—In a great number of cases, the projection on the left slide of bolt breaks off, this also renders the rifle useless for magazine fire. This frequently happens in opening the bolt.

Extractor—The hook of the extractor in a few cases has broken off (about 2 per cent). This renders the rifle useless.

Main spring striker—In a great many cases the main spring is too weak, the striker leaves an indent on the cartridge but does not explode it.

Striker—In a very large number of cases the striker breaks off inside the bolt head.

Safety catch—In a great many cases the safety catch does not go home, but gives a click leading a man to think it has gone fully home. The consequence is that the rifle goes off when the safety catch is pushed home, and on releasing it again, the rifle sometimes goes off. In one case the safety catch blew right away and was never found.

Magazine—In a few cases the magazine cut-off will not remain down.

Butt trap—The slide is too thin, when arms are ordered and it strikes a stone it gets indented and cannot be opened.

Barrel—In a few cases the barrel can be taken by the hood of foresight and twisted right round until hood is underneath.

Piling swivel—If this gets broken, a new one cannot apparently be put in.

General—Very frequently on ordering arms the bolt slips open.

Special defects active service.

(a) Foresight—Being of white metal militates against accurate and rapid sighting.

(b) Sling—There is no means of slinging the rifle properly, nor is there any chance of steadying the arm for firing by using the sling.

(c) Bayonets—None yet issued for the rifle.

(d) Micrometer thimble—When at zero, leaves a space open with three of the threads which the screw works on exposed to sand and dirt, which would choke its efficient action.

(e) Bolt action—The space in rear of the bolt being exposed is easily clogged with dirt or mud, and would quickly render it impossible to fire the rifle by stopping the action of the sear.

(f) General—Between May 15, 1906, and July 1, 1906, forty-five rifles were reported as defective from various causes, that was about 25 per cent of the rifles now in use.

The weakness of the striker spring as above mentioned in miss-fires is a most serious defect on active service.

(Sgd.) R. B. WILLIS, Lieutenant,
Royal Canadian Regiment.

I propose to read all of these reports because they are most convincing and every one of them is equally as damaging as that. The magazine is useless, the side of the bolt breaks off, the back sight on the rifle

jumps when fired from 100 to 200 yards. One would think to read these reports that these were rifles picked up on a field of battle and reported on after a severe scrimmage. But it is not so. These were rifles shipped direct from the Ross Rifle Company to the regiments, issue and taken from the racks, taken down to the ranges, used carefully and brought back.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are they not inspected before they are sent down ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. My hon. friend ought to know.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I say they are inspected.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Second evidence. —No. 105 Armourer Sergeant Edward Billings, Ordinance Stores Corps, states :

I was a professional gun and rifle manufacturer for about eight or nine years before joining the service. I joined the Imperial service in 1894 in what was then the corps of armourers and I completed 21 years in the Imperial service, in the armourers section of A.O.D. I have been about six months in the O.S.C. I am attached to R.C.R. for duty as armourer sergeant, and in that capacity, have been repairing damages and defects to the Ross rifle Mark II since it was issued to the R.C.R.

Mechanical.

(a) Foresight—A large number of rifles have been sent in with loose foresights. These have been adjusted by tightening the foresight screw, after this has been done I do not know if they again work loose.

(b) Lower band—This is so thin that there is no thickness for a screw thread to be properly made, the consequence is that the screws fall out. In the Mark I Ross rifle, there was a good sound lower band with a sling swivel on it, which in my opinion was much better.

Back sight—The projections to back sight leaf which holds it in its place, are simply riveted in. Both these should be screwed in. When necessary to repair the spring of back sight, one of these pins has to be knocked out, and then knocked in again. This is a faulty system.

The wind gauge in some cases when screwed right over to extreme limit, cannot be screwed back to centre. This is due to the milled head not being properly fixed, it is only driven on to a cylindrical shaft. When screwed right over, the backsight side of the milled head gets burned up and jams.

As regards to backsight jumping, the spring which engages the slide on the toother gearing is very faulty and does not act in some cases; it can hardly be called a spring.

Bolt stop—Is made of iron, case hardened. There is not sufficient bearing surface to give the necessary resistance.

Bolt—Is of iron, case hardened. The resisting lug frequently breaks off, the metal being extremely brittle just surrounding it.

The bolts should be numbered, with the rifle, in order that the right bolt goes in the right rifle.

Extractor. The hook sometimes breaks off. It is not strong enough.

Main spring striker—This spring is defective, and misfires are due to the defects. It is not powerful enough, and a certain amount of the force of the spring is lost due to friction on the channel of the bolt. There should be little or no friction there. The outside diameter of the spring should fit the channel, and the inside diameter should fit the shaft. Owing to fit not being good there is too much side play of the spring.

It is very difficult to take out the spring striker and to replace it.

Striker—The point frequently breaks.

Safety catch—The milled head for attaching safety catch falls out in some cases. This renders rifle useless. Some of the bolts open when the safety catch is home. The trigger sometimes jams when the safety catch is home and on the catch being released, the rifle fires.

Magazine—The bottom plate to magazine drops out in some cases. This cannot in some cases be replaced without using undue force.

Barrel—Frequently the barrels have not been fitted properly into the body. The browning is very inferior.

Piling swivel—If broken, a new one cannot be put in, in any way whatever.

Butt—Inadquate protection for the butt when arms are ordered.

Magazine platform spring — Frequently breaks.

General—Interior parts are not oiled when put together. To the best of my recollection, I have repaired defects in at least 150 rifles since May 12, 1906.

(Sgd.) E. Billings.

Sergeant Billings demonstrated each point fully and practically to the satisfaction of the board, using a Ross rifle Mark II. in which a number of damages and defects had been collected from other rifles, for the purpose of demonstration.

Third evidence.—Capt. M. St. L. Simon, R.C.E., O.C., 1st Fortress Company, R.C.E., states :

My company is armed with the Ross rifle and commenced table B for R.C.E. on July 16, 1906, at McNab's Island. During the course, I noticed the following defects in the Ross rifle :

Mechanical (a) foresight—is too blunt and band holding foresight is shrunk on, which causes uneven expansion of a heated barrel.

(b) Lower band—Should have a swivel for sling.

(c) Backsight—Too delicate. Leaf is too flimsy, the micrometer screw has been reported to move on firing and sometimes cannot be moved at all. The slide of backsight sometimes jumps 100 or 200 yards on firing, the V of the backsight is too small. The centre line on leaf is very badly marked in some cases.

The backsight leaf in some cases jumps right over, owing to projections to backsight leaf being too short.

At low elevations, the V of backsight is sometimes hidden by the wooden grip.

(d) Bolt stop—in some cases the bolt stop, when pressed down, remains down.

(e) Bolt—The resisting lug has been found to shear off sometimes.

The striker will go forward with the bolt open one inch.

Extractor—Sometimes fails to extract and ejector sometimes fails.

Main spring striker—Misfires were very frequent due to weakness of main spring, or wrong adjustment of striker.

Striker—In one or two cases head of striker was broken.

Safety catch—Sometimes goes apparently home when it is not truly so, giving a false impression and leading a soldier to think that on pulling the trigger, the rifle will not go off. On replacing the safety catch to danger position the rifle has been found to go off without pulling the trigger. I consider this a most dangerous defect.

Magazine—The magazine cut off is not easy to work, the feed of magazine is bad.

Barrel—There has been a case of a loose barrel.

Chamber—Numerous cases of split cartridges, all split at forward end. This may be due to defective ammunition.

Piling swivel—has not been used yet.

General—The parts have the appearance of being loosely fitted together.

Special defects active service and musketry.

Foresight.—Bad colour.

Sling—Is too short.

Bayonets.—None issued.

Backsight.—Would be easily put out of action by sand and dirt.

Bolt.—Would be easily put out of action by sand and dirt.

Sighting—Under 100 yards the sighting is inconsistent.

In one rifle, firing at 200 yards, backsight was at zero, and man was aiming below the bottom of target, and was getting hits. In another, firing at 200 yards, backsight was at 250 yards.

In another, the rifle threw 3 feet to the left at 200 yards. This would appear due to want of adjustment of foresight before issue. At 300 yards, the elevations varied between 80 to 6 yards, and 340 yards the deflection varied from zero to six feet in practically still weather; this latter would also appear due to faulty adjustment of foresight before issue.

General remarks.—I found 35 rifles defective out of 79. I can get the numbers to identify the defects as above noted, if required. The company have not done much parade work with their rifles, but it has been noticed that the bolt opens sometimes in ordering arms.

(Sgd.) M. ST. L. SIMON, Capt. R.C.E.,
O.C. 1st Fortress, R.C.E.

Fourth evidence.—Capt. A. C. B. Gray, R.C.R., states :

I am of No. 1 company, R.C.R., at present at McNab's island during musketry table B. My company started on August 1; and defects were reported as follows:

Mechanical.

(a) Foresight.—One rifle burst at muzzle. This occurred while man was firing standing, at third or fourth round, he had previously fired some 60 to 70 round. This may have been due to a stripped bullet, but nothing was found in barrel.

Foresight is very loose, moves about from side to side.

(b) Lower band.—Rivetted on. In one case it has come away, causing handguard to come off.

(c) Backsight.—Sometime firing at 200 yards, the foresight is obscured by gooseneck of leaf of backsight. In one case the left band side of ratchet band was loose.

The windgauge is frequently very loose. The backsight slide jumps sometimes on rifle being fired.

The leaf of backsight frequently gets out of projections to backsight leaf, and goes right over on to the handgaurd.

Bolt stop.—Sometimes will not go down, and frequently when down will not come up.

Bolt.—The resisting lug, in many cases, shears right off. This has occurred particularly in rapid fire. Difficult to replace in fire.

Extractor.—No faults so far.

Ejector.—Has sometimes broken off, and sometimes when not broken, does not eject.

Main spring of striker.—Misfires were very frequent.

Striker.—No case of broken heads.

Safety catch—In many cases the safety catch appears to be home, when it is not so, and the rifle can be fired. When catch is put to danger the rifle goes off. I consider this a most serious defect.

Magazine.—The feed is bad, and jams were frequent. The cut off is faulty, and sometimes does not stay down.

Butt trap—Liable to be bent on ordering arms.

Barrel—One case of a loose barrel.

Piling swivel.—If broken, a new one cannot be put in.

General—The trigger guard appears to be very soft metal and bent easily.

Active Service and Musketry Defects.

(a) Muzzle of barrel is cut off flush, and the interior is more liable to accidental damage.

(b) Foresight. White sight is objectionable. gives bad definition.

(c) Sling—No use as at present attached.

(d) Bayonets—None issued.

(e) Backsight—Micrometer screw very liable to get choked with dirt.

(f) Bolt—Liable to be choked with dirt.

(g) Sighting—Backsight generally is flimsy and liable to be bent. Little consistency in sighting. In elevation, in one case, firing at 150 yards, the man was at zero, firing low, and made good shooting.

(h) General—No oil bottles issued. Up to date (27-8-06) I have sent in twenty-four defective rifles out of about seventy, but have not yet completed my practices, and have at least two more defective rifles on hand.

Sgd. A. C. B. GRAY, Capt.
No. 1 Company, R.C.R.

I know my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) does not like to listen to this tale of woe. This may appear to him to be the abomination of desolation, but I wish he would keep quiet while I am reading.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Oh, yes, but I want to put some life into this thing ; it is very dead.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Well you can't put much life into it ; its a dead dog.

Fifth evidence : Captain A. P. B. Nable, R.C.R., states :

I am in command of No. 6 Company, R.C.R., now going through table B at McNab's island.

My company is armed with Ross rifle, Mark II. I started table B on August 1, and defects have been reported as under.

Mechanical.

Foresight—No complaint.

Lower band—In many cases, worked loose.

Backsight—In one case, leaf bent. The clamp (or slide) of backsight sometimes moves when rifle is fired. The micrometer thimble in many cases moves when rifle is fired.

Bolt stop—In many cases slides down, will not come up, in others will not go down.

Bolt—Resisting lug frequently breaks off. Is difficult to replace in rifle. The striker and bolt will go forward on pressing the trigger, when bolt is open one inch.

Main spring striker—Very large number of misfires.

Striker—Frequently broken off.

Safety catch—In very many cases it goes in and appears to be home when it is not so. A man is led to believe that the rifle is safe when it is not so. On pressing the trigger, the rifle fires. Also when safety catch is put back to danger from this half-way position, the rifle fires. I had to stop firing from the magazine in field practices, on account of weakness of safety catch. I consider this a most dangerous defect.

Magazine—Large number of jams, especially when cartridges are put in hurriedly, as they generally would be. The cut off sometimes does not work. There is not sufficient distinction in position of cut off when open and closed. There should be no doubt whatever on such a point.

Butt trap—No complaint so far.

Barrel—One loose barrel.

Piling swivel—Was easily bent, preventing arms being piled.

Trigger guard—In one case, a man was skirmishing, his rifle got knocked on a stone. This bent in the trigger guard, and the trigger could not be used. The trigger guard was not strong enough.

Active Service and Musketry.

Foresight—White colour is objectionable, does not give clear definition.

Sling—Cannot be used.

Bayonets—None issued.

Backsight—Very liable to be broken. Very liable to get out of order from dirt. Generally too flimsy for active service.

Sighting—The sighting is inconsistent, the variations in elevations of different rifles at same range being considerable.

General—No oil bottles. Out of my company, firing seventy-eight, I have sent in thirty defective rifles from one cause or another; and have not yet completed table B.

The barrel is cut off flush at the muzzle. I consider this renders the interior more liable to damage.

Sgd. A. P. B. NAGLE.
Captain R.C.R.

Sixth evidence: Captain E. H. Robinson, A.O.D., (Inspector of Ordnance Machinery) states:

I have noted the following defects in the Ross rifle, Mark II:

Mechanical.

Foresight—Screw of foresight works loose due to the plate being too thin, causing only about 1½ threads to be doing the work.

Lower band—Not sufficient number of threads in the band to take the threads of male screw.

Backsight—Hinge pin of back of backsight leaf is too small in my opinion, and also the boss where it passes through should be solid and not hollow as it is. This would add very little to the weight.

Micrometer screw jams occasionally. Windgauge screw jams occasionally.

The projections from slide of backsight which hold leaf down are too short, or the lip of leaf too narrow.

Bolt stop—Material is too soft. If made of wrought iron, it should be case hardened.

Bolt—Resisting lug broken in several cases.

Main spring of striker—Is in my opinion weak. It starts compressing at four and a half pounds to five pounds instead of seven pounds to nine pounds, as it should do.

Striker—The striker protrusion varies in all rifles, and no gauge is yet available to correct these. If the strikers were all one protrusion and that the correct one, misfires would not be so frequent.

Magazine loading tray—Sometimes found to throw to one side more than the other.

Barrel—The ·072 inch gauge goes into the chamber and allows the bolt to shut, whereas the ·64 inch gauge should only be able to go in and allow the bolt to close home.

One barrel was found to be loose in its attachment to the body.

General remarks—All these defects can in my opinion be overcome. The backsight can be strengthened, the stop to bolt can be made harder still, the broken lugs on bolts appear to be more difficult to overcome, but even this with some alteration in manufacture can be made good.

(Sgd.) E. H. ROBINSON,
Captain, I. O. H.

Seventh evidence: Lieutenant R. F. C. Horetzky, R.C.R., No. 2 Company, R.C.R., states:

I was with No. 2 Company, Royal Canadian Regiment, during its musketry training at McNab island, table B. Captain Caye, who commanded the company is now on leave. I noted the following defects in the Ross rifle, Mark II:

Mechanical.

(a) Foresight—I found the foresight in many rifles loose.

(b) Lower band—This works loose in a few cases.

Backsight—When the leaf of backsight is up, in numerous cases, it jerks from right to left. When at short ranges, the V of backsight is obscured by wood of hand guard, in some cases.

In firing, sometimes the slide of backsight will alter 100 yards.

The wind gauge screw in some cases is very difficult to work.

Bolt stop—No remarks.

Bolt—Several of the resisting lugs were broken off.

Extractor—In some cases the extractor would not work.

Main spring of striker—During the course there were a number of misfires.

Striker—There were about 8 strikers broken out of a strength of 98 men firing.

Safety catch—Most of the men were not aware when the safety catch was on, as it

would appear to go home without actually being so. I consider this a very dangerous defect.

Magazine—The cut-off is too small, and does not always work. There is not sufficient distinction between its two positions.

Butt trap—In my opinion is of too thin metal, and would quickly get damaged.

Special defects, active service and musketry.

(a) Foresight—The white foresight does not give clear definition. Hood protector spoils shooting.

(b) Sling—No swivel on lower band.

(c) Bolt action—Liable to be clogged with sand.

(Sgd.) R. F. C. HORETZKY,
Lieutenant, R. C. R.

Eighth evidence: Captain J. D. Doull, R. C.R., states:

I am in command of No. 3 Company, Royal Canadian Regiment, which commenced the musketry training, table B, about June 7. I found certain defects in the Ross rifle Mark II, as under:

Mechanical.

(a) Foresight—Works loose in many cases. The adjustment of a foresight is a very delicate matter at any time.

(b) Lower band—In one case the screw came out.

(c) Backsight—In some cases the gooseneck of leaf of backsight is too high, and covers the aperture in the backsight.

In a number of cases the projections to backsight leaf works out and leaf springs right over on to the hand guard.

The wind gauge slide sometimes works loose. The sight is one that takes a great deal of teaching to recruits and is at times very slow to adjust.

Bolt stop—In one case when pressed down it remained down.

Bolt—I have seen several cases where the resisting lug had broken off.

Extractor—It failed to work once on account of a split cartridge.

Main spring of striker—A large number of misfires have occurred.

Striker—One the head flattened, and a number were broken.

Safety catch—I consider dangerous. It catches twice as it goes home, a man hears the first catch and imagines it is home. If the trigger is then pressed and safety catch put to danger, the rifle goes off.

Magazine—Jams are liable to occur. The loading tray jammed in one case. The cut-off is not sufficiently distinct in its two positions, and it is not easy to tell when it is on or off.

The screws on under side of magazine plate occasionally drop out.

Butt trap—Liable to damage from stones.

Barrel—The chamber is too large for the cartridge, a very large number of split cartridge cases was observed, which I consider due to too large a chamber.

One case of a loose barrel. This is dangerous.

Special defects, active service and musketry.

Foresight—The white sight does not give clear definition. I consider the band objectionable from a shooting point of view.

Mr. WORTHINGTON.

Sling—Cannot be used.

Bayonets—None issued.

Micrometer thimble—Liable to get out of order quickly on service due to sand and dirt.

Bolt action—Liable to be clogged with sand and dirt. Hand to be put in quickly.

Loading tray—Attachment liable to be easily damaged.

General—No oil bottle. About 40 defective rifles sent in for various repairs out of 120. 18 were beyond the work of the armourer sergeant.

The barrel gets extremely hot very rapidly. Sighting is very erratic.

(Sgd.) JOHN D. DOULL,
Captain, R. C. R.

Then I will read the following resume of defects:

A.—Mechanical defects.

Foresight.—1. Works loose in very many cases.

Lower band.—1. Works loose in many cases; 2. No swivel for sling.

Backsight.—1. Leaf. Too flimsy, hinge pin weak. Flies over on to handguard frequently; 2. Windgauge. Works loose or screw jams in many instances; 3. V. Gets obscured at short ranges frequently; 4. Slide. Jumps on discharge frequently; 5. Micrometer screw. Moves on firing, or jams, in many cases.

Bolt stop.—1. Works inefficiently in many cases; 2. Considered weak.

Bolt.—1. Resisting lug. Breaks off frequently; 2. Extractor. Occasionally fails, and occasionally breaks off; 3. Ejector. Occasionally fails; 4. Main spring of striker and striker. Misfires extremely common. Strikers frequently break.

Safety catch.—1. Works inefficiently and is a source of danger.

Magazine.—Cut off occasionally faulty; 2. Little indication to a soldier, between cut off open, and cut off closed; 3. Feed generally poor and jams frequent; 4. Loading tray occasionally jams; 5. Platform springs occasionally break.

Barrel.—1. Several cases of loose barrels; 2. Cartridge cases frequently split, chamber considered too great a diameter for ·303 inches ammunition; 3. Muzzles cut off flush exposes interior to accidental damage.

Butt trap and butt plate.—Metal too thin, liable to injury from stones; 2. Inadequate protection to butt or rifle.

Piling swivel.—1. Renewal very difficult.

(Sgd.) R. Lyndhurst Wadmore, Lt. Col.,
President of board.
(Sgd.) H. C. Thacker, Major, R.C.R.,
(Sgd) P. H. French, Captain, R.C.E.,
Members.

B.—Special defects active service and musketry.

Foresight.—1. White foresight gives bad definition.

Sling.—1. No practical provision for use of sling.

Bayonets.—None issued.

Backsight.—Liable to be easily choked with dirt.

Bolt.—Liable to be choked with dirt.

Sighting generally.—Shows want of adjustment before issue.

Generals remarks.—No oil bottles. Bolts occasionally drop out on ordering arms. Trigger guard of weak material. The bolt is difficult to replace in the rifle.

(Sgd.) R. Lyndhurst Wadmore, Lt. Col., President of board.
(Sgd.) H. C. Thacker, Major, R.C.A.,
(Sgd.) P. H. French, Captain, Members.

That, Mr. Speaker, concludes the evidence of the board of inquiry on Canada's great national arm of defence, held at Halifax in October, 1906.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. When the House rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I had completed reading the report of the inquiry into the Ross rifle held at Halifax. From that report it would seem that every one of the witnesses examined concurred in four or five particulars. They were all of the opinion that, as a magazine gun, it was deficient; that, in a great many instances, it jagged. Every witness said that the back sight jumped when the rifle was fired from 100 to 200 yards ; that the bolt lugs frequently broke off and were of improper material. These are practically the main points upon which they all agreed. In summing up their evidence, I find that every witness said that out of his particular company there was from 25 per cent to 35 per cent of the rifles issued damaged during target practice, so that it would seem it is hardly a weapon which the people of this country would care to have put into the hands of their brothers and sons who go out to defend Canada and the empire.

While discussing the experience in handling the rifle in the maritime provinces, I would like to read a report from the camp of instruction at Sussex in 1906, page 280 of the Public Accounts Committee report on the Ross rifle :

SUSSEX CAMP OF INSTRUCTION, 1906.

Defects reported in certain Ross rifles (Mark I) produced for inspection at the above named camp:

Four rifles—extractor failed to work.
Two rifles—went off as bolt was closed.
Nine rifles—screw head (top of block) broken off.
Four rifles—loose foresight.
One rifle—catch for locking bolt failed to engage.
Two rifles—bolt falls out when rifle is ordered. (Screw top of block) split. Stiff action.
One rifle—stiff action.
Three rifles—piling swivel fallen out or broken off.

Then follows a list of the casualties more or less serious, which are as follows :—

Cartridge sticks in breach, extractor failed.
Two screws fallen out from trigger guard plate.
Screw (top of block) deficient when issued.
Cut-off broken. Striker does not touch cartridge.
Extractor fallen out.
Interrupted screw, head of cocking piece, badly made. The head of cocking piece flew out when firing blanks.
Magazine platform fails to work.
Bolts sometimes jam when pressed home.
Piling swivel deficient. Fails sometimes to extract.
Micrometer timble jammed.
Defective elevating back sight spring.
Stiff bolt action. Protruding striker. Very dangerous.
Cocking piece comes out when drilling. Inferior thread to screw.
Screw deficient from trigger guard plate.

That is a list of the casualties at the Sussex camp, and with each casualty is given the number of the rifle, but I have not thought it necessary to read the numbers. As I said this afternoon, in summing up the weaknesses and general deficiency of the rifle, it was necessary to go from one end of the country to the other to ascertain its defects. We are next billed for St. John, N.B. This is the report sent in by Beverley R. Armstrong, major commanding the 3rd Regiment of Canadian Artillery :

The rifle practice of the Unit under my command for the annual training in 1906 has not been carried out owing to the fact that the regiment is armed with Mark I Ross rifles, which, in consequence of accidents to two of these on the 24th May last, when being used by No. 2 company, the officers and men are afraid to use them.

The following is the report on those two accidents. This is from the officer commanding 3rd Regiment Canadian Artillery and the district officer commanding Militia District No. 8 :

There have been casualties in the way of explosion of parts of two rifles but no casualty to the men however resulted.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. When did the alleged explosion occur ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. On 24th May.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And it was not reported until the end of December.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. That shows lack of discipline on the part of the militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It shows that they did not think anything about it until reminded by somebody here.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. It was reported to the district officer commanding on the 3rd December, 1906, in reply to a request for annual rifle practice returns :

That in consequence of two accidents having happened to rifles when in use by No. 2

Company, such practice had not been carried out.

There was an accident on the 24th of May, when the breech block of two rifles exploded, but no men were injured.

In one case the milled thumb pull at end of firing pin was burst in at least three pieces, on discharge of the cartridge, and blew in different directions. Two pieces were afterwards picked up. In the other case, a cylindrical piece of steel, about three-quarters of an inch long, from in front of the milled thumb pull, flew over the rifleman's shoulder and was picked up in rear. The thumb pull in this case was blown away but not found. This accident is thought to have been caused by premature explosure, due to the fact that the firing pine had worked forward, the closing of the breech caused the firing pin to strike the cartridge before the breech was properly closed. It was only by good fortune that the men handling the rifles, in these cases, were not injured.

The annual rifle practice of the 3rd Regiment Canadian Artillery was not carried out this year because, as stated on December 3, on account of the accidents mentioned, the men would not voluntarily use the rifles, and the officers did not care to take the responsibility of ordering them to do so.

This practically confirms what was said at the Halifax board—that even when the safety catch is set, the rifle may still go off; so that the soldier who puts down the safety catch is never sure but that his rifle may go off when he least expects it.

Now, we will take the report made on the rifles at Quebec, where, on the Plains of Abraham, the component parts of this rifle are assembled and put together. This report is from Major Fages. I will read only the most important parts of it:

I may add that a few of the rifles when firing from the magazine (rapid fire) twice or three times out of five shots it will be a misfire.

The musketry is only starting and I have no doubt that by the time it is completed other defects may be found out and a further report will then be sent.

The retaining pin that prevents the back sight from flying forward is also loose and liable to come out at any moment.

The leaf of backsight is of light material and is easily bent. At this morning's practice there were several misfires and when using the magazine the cartridges jammed in it and did not work properly.

The extractors also in many cases failed to respond. The ten rifles referred to above have been handed to the Master General of the Ordnance for inspection at his request, and should said rifles not be returned to the depot instructions to remove them from our books will be required.

At the board of inquiry held at Quebec, a great many witnesses were examined and gave testimony as to how they considered the rifle to work. None reported favourably on the rifle.

One man, No. 8236, Pte. R. W. Bell reported:

I was firing at the 500 yard range on the 18th instant. After firing several shots, I placed another cartridge in the chamber and fired it, whereupon the bolt blew open, the dust-plate in the bottom of the magazine blew out and the hand-guard blew off. The cartridge knocked around the base.

Then, we come to St. Johns, Que. And I attach a good deal of importance to this report because it was sent in with an accompanying letter from a man who now holds the position of Adjutant General in the minister's department.

Ottawa, January 29, 1907.

From the Officer Commanding the Royal Canadian Dragoons to the Master General of Ordnance.

Sir,—I have the honour to state from reports of the officers commanding 'A' and 'B' squadrons, Royal Canadian Dragoons, relative to the Ross rifle at present on their charge, it would appear that 'A' squadron is in possession of the Mark II Ross rifle, but did not put in its annual musketry practice, 1906, with that rifle for the reason that there is no rifle range at St. Jean, Quebec.

2. The Mark II, Ross rifle was used by 'B' squadron at its annual musketry practice and no serious accidents happened during the practice.

3. About 20 per cent of the rifles were damaged during practice, the following being the principal defects:

(a) The retaining lugs on the bolt are very weak, and a number of them were broken off (about four or five).

(b) The magazines were useless, in almost every case when the magazines were ordered to be used the cartridges jammed at the second shot. There seemed to be a weakness at the platform spring.

(c) The leaf of the backsight in nearly every case, had to be adjusted after each shot, and seemed to be very easily injured.

I have the honour to be Sir,

Your obedient servant,

F. L. LESSARD, Brevet Col.
Commanding R.C.D.

Accompanying this report is a long list of defective rifles, in which it is said that the projections on the left side of the bolt broken off; foresight and backsight became loose; magazine jammed; strikers are broken, and a long list of other casualties.

Then, at Eastman, in the province of Quebec, it was found necessary to hold a board to examine into the casualties that occurred there last fall. It appears that two rifle associations, one from Mansonville and one from Eastman, met to have a friendly shoot and, incidentally, to test the merits of the Ross and Enfield rifles. I happened to be in the vicinity at the time, and perhaps know the facts as well as anybody else. Seeing a young man about the hotel with his head swathed in bandages, and blood spots oozing through the bandages, I asked what was the matter. His reply was that he had been fool enough to get behind a Ross rifle. He said that during the contest he was selected to shoot with one of the opposite party, Captain Seale, who was using

a Ross rifle. The young man objected to shooting beside it, stating as his reason that on a previous occasion at some shoot an accident had happened to a Ross rifle while he was shooting with an opponent at the butts. They rather laughed at him and said that his fears were due to the fact that he was a Tory and had nothing good to say for the Ross rifle. So he got down beside his opponent. They were at the 500 yard range. Captain Seale put his cartridge into the chamber and pushed back the bolt. The magazine exploded.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman tell——

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I will tell what I——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Have you the photographs there?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. As the hon. gentleman does not feel inclined to take my word, any more than I would his, I think I had better read the evidence, which is as follows:

I am the captain of the Eastman Civilian Rifle Association, which was formed about a year ago and is composed of forty-two members. We received ten Ross rifles, Mark 1, last fall for use of the members. We had a practice with them almost every Saturday during the summer. We also received a free issue of ammunition about the same time, but as we were out of it on the second October instant, we borrowed two hundred and forty rounds from the Mansonville Civilian Rifle Assocation. It was 'cartridges S.A. Ball 303 Cordite, 24-1-05, Mark IV,' which we were using as far as I know on 2nd October. On that date we were having a friendly match at Mansonville with this association twelve men a side. We had all finished firing at the 200 yards range and I was firing at the 500 yards firing point, when my rifle exploded. We were shooting in pairs, and my mate was a Mr. Peabody, of Mansonville. We had each fired three sighters and five shots on our scores when the accident happened.

I was on my sixth shot. I had pressed the bolt home pretty hard, but can't swear that it locked. I produce the damaged rifle, which is numbered E923, and all the broken parts which I could find in the field near me, some may be missing—I was not aiming, and it was just when I pushed the bolt home that the explosion occurred; my fingers were not on the trigger, and my right hand was on the bolt sleeve knob.

Both my hands were numbed by the shock and I could only use the first finger of my right hand. One of the pieces hit Mr. Peabody on the right temple, and must have gone horizontally as he was lying down as I was. I cut an artery, I think, and Dr. Painting attended him.

There is a part of the cartridge case still in a barrel of the rifle, but I cannot produce the wrapper of the ammunition, because we were not in the habit or keeping them, ... I always used the same rifle and looked after it in my own house. I also allowed others to shoot out of it, but always cleaned it myself.

In this case the board came to the conclusion that,—

From the evidence so far adduced it is impossible to arrive at a definite conclusion as to the immediate cause of the accident, and recommend that the broken parts, exhibits and proceedings be sent to experts for their examination and report.

The men composing that board were Lt. A. McMillan, Royal Canadian Dragoons, a man who has seen considerable service; W. L. Carey, Royal Canadian Engineers, a man who holds a prominent position in the Militia Department, so prominent in fact that he has been entrusted with the inspection of the fortresses in course of construction at Quebec, and J. S. Dunbar, Lieutenant-Colonel and Deputy Adjutant General for the province of Quebec. I understand that after these broken parts were sent to the Ross Rifle Company, the cause of the explosion was found, that it was stated, although this is heresay, by the experts of the Ross rifle factory that the trigger had been filed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman but he knows, he heard Major Pym state in answer to his own question, that that rifle had been tampered with. The rifle was sent to Major Pym, not to the Ross rifle factory, it was sent to the inspector. The inspector was present at the meetings of the board and the hon. gentleman himself asked Major Pym the question in the committee and elicited the information which I have just given.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Perhaps he could tell us more about it if he chose, about the photographs and all that sort of thing.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is very much worried about my advocacy of the Lee-Enfield rifle. I do not know whether it is because the commercial instinct is so strong that the hon. gentleman thinks I have some interest in the Lee-Enfield.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I am doing this because this is my own, my native land.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Possibly he does not understand that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, I know nothing about it.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I would not if I were you. As to the statement of the min-

ister I have no objection to telling him that Major Pym was present at the board of inquiry. He did not state that the rifle had been tampered with, did he ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, but in answer to a question put by the hon. member in the Public Accounts Committee he did.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I do not remember that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not convenient.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Major Pym was present at this inquiry. This tale of woe seems to excite the minister and my hon. friend.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, it amuses us.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is a misstatement.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I am going to read a report now from no less a man than the Brigadier General who commands the forces in Canada to-day. I presume that both my hon. friends have some respect for the opinion of this officer. In sending in a report of a board of inquiry he addresses the secretary of the Militia Council and in reference to a rifle on which he was specifically reporting he states :

1. I found in each instance that the retaining lug upon the bolt had been broken off, so that in the action of extracting the empty shell the bolt would come out.

2. It was impossible to tell whether the break was wilful or accidental, nor was I able to tell whether the break was caused by a flaw in the metal or not, owing to the time that had elapsed between the break and my examination.

3. Upon returning to the armourer's shop I tried six of these rifles, using no unnecessary force in extracting; two of the retaining lugs came off. An immediate examination of the break showed that there was a flaw in the metal at the butt of the lug. I did not try any more of the rifles.

4. I compared the retaining lug of the mark I rifle with the lug of the mark II rifle, and find the lug on the former to be over half an inch in length, while the latter is a ¼ inch in length.

5. I have not known a mark I retaining lug to break as the mark II has done. In order to more closely describe the part affected, I am to-day forwarding by express the bolts of the rifles complained of, viz, Nos. 123, 130, 372 and 378.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd) W. D. OTTER
Brigader-general.

He incloses with his report a resume of the list of casualties which is as follows :

Mr. WORTHINGTON.

STATEMENT OF ISSUE AND CONDITION OF THE ROSS RIFLE.

To whom issued.	Date of issue.	Number of rifles issued.	Defective rifles.	Accident to rifles.	Proportion of defects to number issued.	No. of page on file.
R.C.E.	April	144	34	....	13·2	129
	May	20				
	June	33				
	July	40				
	August	18				
Corps of Guides	July	5	1	...	⅕	127
1 R.C.R.	May	114	4	1	3·4	21-49-122-123
3 R.C.R.	June	140	1	1	0·7	53
5 R.C.R.	April	800	31	...	3·8	19-40-44-118
9th R.C.R.	June	85	48	1	42·0	4-31-103
	September	29				
R.C.R.	June	180	6	....	2·8	11
	July	30				
R.C.M.R.	June	120	5	....	4·1	2-17
R.N.W.M.P.	Nil	Nil.	33	....	....	23-24-25-26 14-15--16-17 18-19-20

There are two more reports from London, where boards were held, and which show very much the same defects and deficiencies as were found in the other rifles which were issued to the other companies of the Royal Canadian Regiment. Lt.-Col. J. Vance Graveley, in one of his reports, says :

Twenty-three were more or less damaged, many of the complaints being that the rifles were oversighted and that they missed fire. It was impossible to test these faults.

About this time the acting Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, Mr. E. F. Jarvis, writes to the Ross Rifle Company a confidential letter, as follows :

Ottawa, July 18, 1906.

Confidential.

Gentlemen,—I am desired by the Minister of Militia and Defence to forward for your information the inclosed lists of defects which have been found to exist in rifles, both Mark I and II pattern, manufactured by your company.

Without attaching undue importance to these lists, it will be seen that they afford sufficient grounds for the conclusion that serious defects have developed in both patterns of the Ross rifle, while in the hands of the troops, indicating, in one form or another, defective workmanship in its manufacture, and possibly also, insufficient inspection before the rifles are accepted by the Militia Department.

This being the case, the minister directs me to give your company immediate notice of these reports, as it is clearly necessary that some radical change must be introduced in the system of inspection, both during manufacture and by the inspection staff before the rifles are taken over by the department.

Mr. Jarvis seems to have struck the nail on the head when he said that :

Some radical change must be introduced in the system of inspection, both during manufacture, and by the inspection staff before the rifles are taken over by the department.

Within a week, or within a day or two, I asked the minister about the inspection, and his answer across the floor of the House was that the component parts of the rifle were inspected, and that then an inspection was held of the assembled parts, that is an upright inspection. Whatever the inspection is, or however it is carried out, certainly it must be defective, because it is hardly credible that anybody would accept these rifles unless they were reported as being thoroughly satisfactory and as having passed a creditable inspection. The minister incidentally told us also that this inspection costs something like 90 cents per rifle, which, any one will see, adds $1.90 to the cost of each rifle, making the price $26.90, to say nothing of the other charges, which, when added, bring the price of the rifle up to the vicinity of $30. Now, I think enough has been said as to the unsoundness of the rifle and as to the fact that it is an unsafe rifle. As the rifle is not in use on the ranges of this country, either in the provincial or Dominion matches, or in the matches at Bisley, it might be well to inquire why the marksmen of this country have not taken kindly to it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not quite correct. The rifle is in use on this range now, and on all the principal ranges.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. It may be in use every day now, but not during matches.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It has been.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It happened to win the first prize last year at Toronto.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The hon. gentleman gave us an exhibition of what he could do with it last year at 500 yards, and he did not hit the target.

Mr. FOSTER. The target was not big enough.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I may say that it was a 9-foot target.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman is just as fair in that as he is in everything else. He is absolutely unfair, he does not know how to be fair, but we will teach him when our time comes.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Some members of the Bisley team have won such honour and distinction in these competitions that their names have come to be household words with the militia, and perhaps one whose name is as well known as any other is Sergeant Hayhurst, of Hamilton. Sergeant Hayhurst has made a report upon this rifle. I consider him a most competent person and one able to report from an impartial standpoint, because he has received many favours from the Militia Department of this government. His statement is as follows :

Hamilton, December 20, 1907.

Lieutenant Colonel E. E. W. Moore,
Commanding 13th Regiment Infantry,
Hamilton, Ontario.

Sir,—In reply to your communication asking for a report on the improved Ross rifle issued to me during the summer, I have the honour to say that:

Shooting—I have given the rifle a fair test under favourable conditions making the following scores:

July 20—

200—4 4 3 5 5 4 5=30
500—3 2 3 4 4 4 5=25
600—5 5 4 5 5 5 5=34
—99

July 26—

200—3 4 3 4 5 4 3=26
500—3 3 4 5 5 3 4=27
600—4 3 3 5 5 2 5=27
—80

August 2—

200—4 4 4 4 5 4 5=30
500—5 4 5 3 5 2 4=28
600—5 4 4 5 2 5 3=28
—86

August 15—

800—4 4 4 4 3 5 5 0 5 3=38
900—3 0 2 5 3 2 2 3 2 4=26
1,000—3 5 5 3 3 0 3 5 2 2=31
—95

Giving an average of 85 at the shorter ranges and of 95 at the longer compared with 93 and 124 respectively in all my shoots this year with the Lee-Enfield.

You will notice in all my scores with the Ross some very wide shots, more particularly at the longer ranges. I also used the improved Ross in practice for one week at Bisley in 1906 and had a similar experience.

Sights—The above wide difference of results I place by far the greater part to the imperfect state of the rear sight, which is much too weak in its parts to stand the strain of even careful usage, and any service rifle must necessarily be subjected to a certain amount of strain.

The sight consists of too many working parts all of which must have some play, the aggregate of which make a serious disturbance of aim.

I consider the worst features of this sight, the range locking plate with its square recesses instead of V-shaped, and the light sheet metal leaf. Of the foresight I do not look upon the hood as of any advantage except to protect the barley corn, the possibility of adjustment is a decided advantage as a

true shooting rifle is most necessary to the soldier.

Given a rigid sight bed and firm strong removable leaf, of which there are several excellent examples of Canadian make, and I mention three in the order in which I consider they come, from a mechanical as well as a rifleman's view. The Reardon, Mitchell and Sutherland. With any of these sights the shooting and serviceable qualities of the rifle would be much improved.

Barrel—Of the barrel there is not much to say, if greater care were taken in selection of material and workmanship in rifling, as it is an almost exact copy of a well proved barrel which has given splendid results. Extreme accuracy in long range target shooting has been somewhat sacrificed for less weight and shorter length but this does not materially detract from its usefulness as a general service rifle barrel.

Breech mechanism—Of this there are many excellent features, particularly the head locking, with its strong durable lugs, preventing any lift of the bolt at the discharge and less liability of wear. Also the straight pull. There is a weakness in some of the smaller parts as instanced by the breaking of the shell ejector at the first shot. I fired from rifle No. 69. The long drag pull can and should be eliminated.

As to the magazine there is no question but that it would be much improved by the introduction of the clip feed in place of the hand feed. I found after careful practice that more cartridges go on the ground than into the magazine, and this would be much worse under the excitement of even rapid fire, not to speak of action.

Stock.—There is much that could be improved in this feature particularly the fitting, selection of material and strength.

Of the many rifles I have examined the fitting was very bad, and the wood was frequently crossgrained and spongy where it should have been straight and sound especially at the small of the butt, a weak point.

In conclusion I would say that with all of the bad faults and many of the weak features removed and strong durable parts introduced in their place a very fine serviceable rifle would result, but which for a fine accurate target shooting rifle would still be inferior to the present Lee-Enfield barrel with good sights and ammunition.

I remain, sir,

Yours obediently,

(Sgd.) F. H. HAYHURST,

Sergt. Instr. Musk., 13th Regiment.

That is signed F. H. Hayhurst, sergeant instructor of musketry, 13th regiment. You will notice that he says that with all of the bad faults and many of the weak features removed and strong durable parts introduced in their place a serviceable rifle would result. Well, that would be like buying an old horse on the market and after removing his spavins and ringbones you would make him perfectly sound. I shall now read the following report from Major M. S. Mercer, second regiment Q. O. R., president of rifle club, to H. M. Pellatt, commanding the same regiment:

Mr. WORTHINGTON.

Headquarters, Toronto,

January 10, 1908.

From Major M. S. Mercer, 2nd Regt., Q.O.R.,
President of Rifle Club,

To H. M. Pellatt,

Commanding same Regiment.

Sir,—I have the honour to report as follows on the Ross rifle issued in 1907, to the 2nd Regiment for test purposes, being Nos. 37, 62, 72 and 80, 1906.

The rifle is of the Mark II. pattern.

The woodwork is still rough and unfinished, badly fitted and permits too much dampness remaining underneath the barrel

The toe is too long.

The magazine still occasionally jams.

The backsight is useless for service purposes. the 'V' is too shallow, and the elevated sight too liable to injury. I used this rifle in wet weather, thoroughly cleaning all parts, but the sight, after leaving it standing for fifteen hours, the sight was unworkable, and required several hours work to restore it to its original condition.

The hands are entirely too light.

The bolt arm is too long, result in skirmishing is that the least touch of arm releases bolt from position and shot is lost. The discharge returns the bolt to the proper position but force of spring is so diminished that cartridge is not discharged. To further test this feature I used rifle in hunting and lost several shots through bolt arm being slightly released by coming in contact with twigs and light underbrush. The bolt action is eminently superior to that Mark I. rifle, which should never be permitted to be used as it is dangerously defective.

The shooting qualities of the rifle I found fairly good, from 100 to 500 yards for five or six shots. When barrel became heated, shots were wild and uncertain. At longer ranges, results were more satisfactory. I attribute this somewhat to the lightness of the bands, and also to the lightness of the barrel. I have tested a number of Mark II. rifles with like results in this respect. This rifle has not the merit that would justify me in recommending it for sharpshooters or to expert riflemen for match purposes.

In many respects I like the Ross rifle. It is light, simple, has a good foresight, well hooded; is easily cleaned and easy of adjustment, but many improvements are yet required before it can be said to answer the requirements of a national service weapon. Troops armed with this rifle in its present condition would be at a terrible disadvantage against forces equipped with other well known national arms.

If permission were given to apply the test of 'rough usage' even to the destruction of one of these rifles, with a view to ascertaining inherent defects, if any, I would be pleased to continue my investigation, as I believe this test necessary to any complete judgment on the merits of the rifle.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) M. S. MERCER, major,

President Q.O.R., R.C.

The following report which I shall read was sent in by a man who possibly knows

the Ross rifle as well as anybody who has been connected with it since it was brought to the attention of the public. This report is from Major E. Helmer who at one time held a responsible position on the commission which reported on the rifle and this is his report to the chief staff officer at Petewawa :

Petewawa, August 14, 1907.
To C.S.O., Petewawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to report that in accordance with instructions contained in H.Q. 314-15-28, the necessary arrangements were made to carry out the tests of the Ross rifle requested by the M.G.C., and beg to submit the following:

The men selected to carry out these tests are experienced instructors, excellent rifle shots, and altogether reliable. The rifles used bear the 'S' inspection mark (as well as one Mark III) and had not been previously issued to any corps. The tests carried out, together with results, are as follows:

1. Accuracy.—One sighting shot and seven rounds were fired at each of the following ranges: 100, 200, 500, 600 yards, and while there were cases of over undersighting the rifles tested were found for all practical purposes to be accurately sighted.

2. Magazine fire.—The magazines were used for one minute rapid fire at 100 yards. There were a number of jams due to two cartridges lying side by side in which cases the cartridges had to be released from the top, the lifter finger piece being of no assistance. Bad extraction and ejection caused jams in other cases preventing a reasonable number of rounds from being fired.

In connection with the above there was no attempt made to fire a large number of rounds as each shot was carefully aimed so that 'troubles' were not due to undue haste on the part of the firers.

3. 'Handling of sights when rifle is hot.'—Magazines 669 were charged at 350 yards and 5 rounds fired. The squad was advanced 50 yards at a time firing 5 rounds from the magazine at each halt adjusting the sights to suit the distances. At the fourth halt the men complained so much about the heated sights that the firing was stopped although it had been intended to advance to 100 yards as per instructions. The shots were deliberately aimed as the appended detail of hits will show. Both the finger clamps and micrometer rings were so hot as to be unbearable even to hardened fingers. Some of the 'rings' were 'bound' so tightly that they could not be turned at all.

(This applies also to Mark III sight as well. See report S. M. Duncan herewith.)

4. The O.C. cavalry was requested to test the buckets supplied and to report on the suitability of the rifle for mounted units.

Appended hereto will be found reports and details of the shooting as well as the impressions of the different men engaged in carrying out these tests.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant.
(Sgd.) R. A. HELMER, Major,
D. AA. G.M.

The last report I have to read, although really it was the first report that came in, is from the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. It contains a list of casualties similar to the others and it was stated by Major Perry who was in charge of the force that the rifle practice had to be discontinued for fear of accident owing to the dangerous nature of the rifle. At the present time we find that the Royal Northwest Mounted Police force which is under the charge of the right hon. the Prime Minister is armed with rifles of any old pattern and vintage dating away back to the Winchester 1876, Lee-Enfield, Lee-Metford, and Martinis. All these rifles have no component parts interchangeable and all take different brands of ammunition. That is a very deplorable condition of affairs and we find that during the practice in one instance the bolt flew back and resulted in an accident by which Sergeant Major Browbridge almost lost his eye. This report is sent in by Assistant Commissioner McIlree to Commissioner Perry. The reference to it is as follows :

I got a telegram yesterday evening that Bowbridge's eye injured, bolt of rifle flying back at target practice.

Mr. Speaker, any one criticising this rifle is subject to the imputation that he is disloyal and unpatriotic, and that he is prejudicing the minds of the militia. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not you are a militiaman ; probably all of us at some time or other have borne arms for our country ; and I would like to ask you whether you consider a discussion of the defects of that rifle to be prejudicing the minds of the militia ? Would you rather experiment with the rifle or run the risk of having your mind prejudiced, or would you require an ocular demonstration of the carrying qualities of the rifle similar to that which Sergeant Major Bowbridge received ? I do not think we have to look very far to see why, when these reports came in from the Northwest Mounted Police, a halt was not called and the rifle improved or perfected. This body of men is under the direct charge of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, and has been under his charge for a number of years. Report after report of a damaging nature reached his department, so that the right hon. gentleman has not even the excuse of having been asleep at the switch. He knew from the first, that the rifle was bad, and yet we do not find him giving the benefit of the doubt to the man behind the gun, to the men directly under his control, to the riders of the plains who have preserved order in the west since the inception of the provinces, who have served their country with distinction at home and abroad; but he gave the benefit of the doubt to the war minister's little manicure gun which is warranted to do business at both ends simultaneously. The benefit of the doubt had to go to the gun with the straight pull, and at a very serious time.

We heard some nights ago of the unerring instinct which guided the right hon. gentleman in settling the affairs of his party and of the country; but this unerring instinct does not seem in this case to have been at work. For the right hon. gentleman, the other night, according to 'Hansard,' said this—I hope he will excuse me if I do not read all the speech:

Yes, I see signs of war——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is out of order.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. If the right hon. gentleman went into action with a gun such as the hon. gentleman who controls the Militia Department sees fit to put into the hands of the militia of this country, I am afraid that it would be worse than another catastrophe which the right hon. gentleman mentioned in a discussion on the census in connection with the Immigration Bill, when he spoke of the angel of death visiting the first-born throughout Israel. I would like to tell the right hon. gentleman, and I tell him frankly, that I think his angel of death is but a kindergarten angel of death in comparison with the angel of death which he has put into the hands of his war minister. My hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes), of glorious and immortal memory, seems to be distressed more or less. About the time the discussion was going on in the 'Star' and other papers regarding the importation of parts of the Ross rifle from the United States, an article appeared in the 'Herald' saying that the Norwegian army was about to be armed with the Ross rifle: but a cable despatch shortly afterwards admitted that the commander-in-chief of the Norwegian army did not contemplate re-arming the Norwegian army, and had not even heard of the Ross rifle. Now, these reports of a very unflattering and uncomplimentary nature have been coming in, in one continuous stream, to the Militia Department. So it has been found necessary to do something to brush up this gun; and working on the assumption that what cannot be cured must be endured, a whitewash board was held at Quebec and a number of friends hied down to the ancient capital, where, on the historic battlefield and under the guns of the fleet, they proceeded to subject this rifle to some most serious tests. One was in regard to disassembling and putting together the motor parts of the rifle. In this engagement a Tommy was taken from the citadel and an expert from the Ross rifle factory, and the test went on, and it naturally resulted in the component parts of the Ross rifle being reassembled in a few seconds quicker than the component parts of the Lee-Enfield.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member is such a fair-minded gentleman that I am sure he would not like to deceive or mislead the House in any way; but he should know that the sergeant who took down the parts was the most experienced army sergeant in the Dominion of Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear; that is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he put them back again?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, he could not get it together at all.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. However, that test is of little moment, because nobody is allowed to take apart the Ross rifle; it is forbidden in the instructions of the hon. gentleman who controls the department. Militia order 98 says:

All tampering with small arms or the stripping or removing of any part of the arm (not intended to be used in the ordinary use of the weapon) is strictly prohibited unless carried out by the district armourer or by a regimental armourer who has been through a course of instruction at an ordnance depot, and who has received a certificate that he is capable of executing minor repairs.

You can see very readily that was a very unfair test.

This is practically the history of the Ross rifle. Canada's national arm of defence, the rifle which passed such creditable examination at the hands of Canadian musketry experts and with which the minister intends arming the defenders of this country—a rifle, which placed in the hands of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, was discarded by them because they considered it dangerous and were forced, by reason of that danger, to discontinue their target practice; a rifle which has been more or less a failure when placed in the hands of the permanent corps and the militia; a rifle which resulted in several serious accidents at St. John and Lethbridge; a rifle which is not used by the sharpshooters of this country for the simple reason that they cannot make good scores with it and prefer the old Lee-Enfield. But the manufacture nevertheless goes on just the same.

The minister tells us that no government ever perfects its first rifle, that it must run through successive stages of development from the cradle to maturity. Well, I hope my hon. friend is not going to assume the parentage of the dozen or so brands of vintages of the Ross rifle. I should recommend that he be guided more by a little incident which occurred in the history of a young curate who had a yearly stipend of only $80, but who had a sanguine temperament and high ideals and married for love. He christened his first child—Mark I—Alpha; the second Omega, but, alas, for the judgment of the reverend gentleman, he was obliged at the expiration of some time to call his Mark III. 'Errata.' I would suggest that the right hon. gentle-

man instead of calling his last rifle 'Mark III.' should call it 'Mark Time,' and then take the means to obtain a perfect rifle which would be a credit to himself and the country and which could be safely placed in the hands of our militia.

But according to reports which we hear from time to time possibly all our difficulties in the way of the Ross rifle will be brushed away. A 'peace at any price' park is to be established on the historic Plains of Abraham, and it is rumoured that possibly that will entail the removal of the Ross rifle factory, which now defaces the ancient battlefield and stands there as a tribute to the monumental egotism of the right hon. gentleman and his War Minister. Those gentleman know more about rifles than the officers of the Musketry School at Hyde or the commission which reported on the Ross rifle at Springfield or the officers of the permanent force who sent reports from all points from Halifax to Vancouver, and who persist in the idea of placing it in the hands of the militia of Canada. It does not seem that the people of Canada wish to have their militia armed with a rifle such as the one I have described to-night. It is not safe, it is unserviceable, and it comes to grief on the slightest provocation. The reports are unanimous in condemning it and in condemning almost every component part of it. However, there is one thing on which we may congratulate ourselves, and that is that the only Canadian product of the Ross rifle factory, namely, the noise it makes when it goes off, has been omitted from this category of defects, so that we have at least one feature which we may be proud of. I have nothing more to say in connection with the reports as to the efficiency and desirability of the rifle. I trust that the right hon. gentleman and his Minister of War will see fit to reconsider their determination to place this rifle in the hands of the militia. It will be a very serious thing to send troops into action, or even to keep them during peace, armed with a rifle which is not absolutely the best that can be obtained in the world's markets to-day. I beg, therefore, to move :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be left out, and the following substituted instead thereof:

The dealings of the Department of Militia and Defence in connection with the adoption and manufacture of the Ross rifle as an arm for the defence of Canada have displayed deplorable inefficiency, have been characterized by gross extravagance and improvidence, and have impaired public confidence both in the alleged efficiency of the rifle and in the management of the department.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). It can scarcely be truly said, Mr. Speaker, of the hon. gentleman's performance that he was 'all things by turns and nothing long.' He was all things by turns, but always very long. It would be difficult to say in which roll he was most interesting—whether as a Heaven-born patriot, as he declared himself in the opening of his speech, or as a humorist, in which mood he seemed disposed to close his remarks. But though his peroration may have been really genuinely humorous and amusing to himself, I doubt if any one else in this House fairly appreciated it. The hon. gentleman has succeeded at last in carrying his point with his party. He has apparently been strong enough to convince his party that it is a desirable thing——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Pardon me, please.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN—a portion of his party—that it is a desirable thing in the interests of that party and in the interests of the country that this question of arming the militia should be brought down to the level —the low level from the hon. gentleman's point of view—of party warfare. The hon. gentleman talks about patriotism. He says that he is actuated by a strong patriotic desire—and by that alone—to benefit his country and to benefit the militia, of which he is an officer. But I doubt very much if he will be able to convince right-thinking men, right-thinking officers of the force to which he belongs, that this is the truest and best way of exhibiting his love for the country and his love for the militia force. He may feel that his efforts have been rewarded to some extent. I think they have. If the desire to throw doubt upon a weapon with which the army of this country is to be armed, if that, in his mind, is the highest thing to be sought after, the thing which a member of parliament and an officer occupying a prominent position in the militia, should work for above and beyond everything, then I think the hon. gentleman may congratulate himself upon a certain measure of success, because, with the aid of certain newspapers—which, in some cases, he has inspired, and which, in more frequent instances, have inspired him—the hon. gentleman has been able to cause a condition of doubt to exist among the militia force of this country ; a condition, however, which, I am happy to be able to say, is very rapidly disappearing since the reports of the investigation which has taken place before the Public Accounts Committee during the past year and a half have been thoroughly circulated among the people. The hon. gentleman has taken a long time to get his courage up to the sticking point. He spent all last session asking questions—every day——

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Will the hon. gentleman (Sir Frederick Borden) allow me to say just here : the reason of the delay is due to his usual length of time in bringing down the reports we asked for, and the

length of time the Public Accounts kept the report before them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not responsible for the Public Accounts Committee. I was willing to have the question reported here long ago. No, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Worthington) is entirely responsible.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The hon. minisister did not bring down these reports until within the last two months.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, two months. Here is an hon. gentleman burning with a desire to save his country. He was lamenting over the dangers which beset the people of this country, and especially the militia—and here he has allowed, according to his own statement, two months to pass during which he should have been on his feet with the kind of impassioned eloquence we heard to-day, warning the House and the country of the terrible disaster awaiting us.

I do not propse to follow this line of argument any longer. The hon. gentleman has occupied three hours and a quarter, and I shall try not to emulate him in this respect at least. I propose, in view of the seriousness of the resolution which is now before the House, to address myself to two or three points connected with this matter which I deem to be of importance. I do not, for a moment, intend to follow the hon. gentleman in his meanderings among the reports of all sorts of committees which are of more or less consequence—and generally of much less consequence than more. However, before I take my seat, I shall refer specifically to the only three cases out of the whole number he has referred to in which the Ross rifle has been seriously attacked. And I propose to show that in each and all of these cases the statement that any accident occurred, any blow out or anything that might have seriously menaced life, is absolutely without any foundation in fact. And I propose to do that by the record, and not by reading such papers as the hon. gentleman did, a paper the authority for which he could not state, purporting to be a report from the United States government as to the test of certain rifles from the Ross factory——

Mr. WORTHINGTON. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Frederick Borden) will pardon me. Somewhat like his little manicure rifle, he is going off at half-cock. This report came from the Springfield Armoury, and is signed by competent and credible men, and they state that Sir Charles Ross was present and asked to have his rifle inspected.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I say that this House has no evidence before it beyond the hon. gentleman's statement, and—to return him the compliment that he paid me—I do not value that statement one single particle; it is not good enough. Now, if the hon. gentleman is going to bring down ordnance reports, let him bring them down with the proper seal upon them, as has been done by the Militia Department in every case; every paper is there to speak for itself, and it bears upon its face the authority from which it emanated. I do not come here, as the hon. gentleman did, with a typewritten paper which he tells us may have come from the Springfield Arsenal in the United States, but concerning which he has given us no proof that it came from there.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Does the hon. gentleman deny the accuracy of the report?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not denying it or amirming it; I say that that paper has no business to be brought into this House, because the hon. gentleman is not able to say where it came from.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I may say that the report of the Springfield committee on the Ross rifle is infinitely better than the Springfield report on their own rifle, as I shall show in due time.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would like, at the earliest moment, to set the mind of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Worthington) at rest with reference to the dangerous character of this rifle, which he so hates, and in connection with which he has become a sort of monomaniac; because he has done nothing else for two years, he has thought of nothing else, spoken of nothing else, apparently knows nothing else—and very little about that. But I want to make a statement at once, which I hope may have a soothing effect upon his mania, and that is that I will undertake to bring the evidence of men competent to judge to prove that there is not a single rifle which has been delivered and accepted by the Department of Militia from the Ross rifle factory—except the rifle which his friend tampered with at Eastman at a meeting at whicn the hon. gentleman was present and——

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I was not present; I was not within twenty miles.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman said he was.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I said I was in the vicinity.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He knew it had been tampered with, and did not like to go. I say that with the exception of that one rifle, which was tampered with in that way—and I will show in a few miutes what was done with that rifle so tampered with—there is not one single rifle of the 42,000 which have now been delivered that

is not a service rifle and is not fit and safe to use in the Canadian army if it were necessary to use it. I make that statement here and accept full responsibility for it. I make it upon the report which I hold of those who are competent to advise me as to matters of that kind. I shall read the particulars necessary to show that of those rifles which are not now serviceable there is not one which cannot be made serviceable with a very slight expenditure. Yet we have this hon. gentleman trying to terrify the militia, trying to persuade the House that we have purchased 52,000 rifles which are only fit to be placed on the scrap heap. I assure you there is not one word of truth in it.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The Auditor General said it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Auditor General did not say it—and the Auditor General, anyway, is about as good an authority as the hon. gentleman himself upon the usefulness of a rifle. I would ask the House to consider with me one or two questions that I propose to put to myself. First, what justification was there for adopting the policy of securing a rifle manufactory for Canada? I propose, in that connection, to read two or three short extracts from the proceedings of the Colonial, or Imperial Conference as it is now called, of 1907. I have here a paper which was laid before that conference, having been brought down by the Secretary of State for War. I shall quote from it briefly, giving only the salient words of each paragraph :

1. No review of the strategical conditions of the British Empire, even when such a review is limited to the purely military aspects of the question, can be undertaken without admitting as a first and fundamental principle that the maintenance of the empire rests primarily upon supremacy at sea.

2. The second great principle which must govern the military organization of the empire is that each portion of it should, as far as possible, maintain sufficient troops for self defence.

3. The third principle to be borne in mind in this consideration of the military requirements of the empire is the great one of mutual support at a time of emergency. It is evident that under certain circumstances the land forces of the various territories of the empire may be impelled by considerations both of safety and sentiment to act together in some great conflict which may imperil our national existence. Should such a situation arise it would be impossible to overrate the advantage of having in every case a system of military organization capable of being readily assimilated to that of the many other contingents which would compose the Imperial army.

Under the heading :

PATTERNS AND PROVISION OF EQUIPMENT AND STORES FOR COLONIAL FORCES.

It says :

It is essential that the small arms supplied to any force which may have to act side by side with troops from the United Kingdom should fire the same ammunition as that supplied to the latter.

And again :

It is most desirable that the area of supply of the warlike store under reference should be as wide as possible, and, therefore, the colonial governments should be urged to arrange for local manufacture and provision, rather than to rely on the resources of the United Kingdom.

It seems to me, taking the highest point of view, that we have in that paper evidence that it was the duty of this country to undertake to manufacture for itself the small arms required by it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Worthington), in a sneering way, referred to the alleged fact that the right hon. the Prime Minister had refused to contribute to the imperial navy. The hon. gentleman did not say whether he himself would be prepared to advocate the voting of a large sum of money to support the navy. We on this side of the House have taken the view that it is our duty in Canada to assist the mother country, at least to the extent of being able, in the first instance, to defend ourselves on our own soil; and we have taken a further step, and said to the mother country that we do not wish her over-burdened taxpayers any longer to pay for supporting garrisons in Canada, and that we in future, as we are doing to-day, will continue to relieve her from all expenditures of that kind; and while we are not able at the present moment to construct a navy, and while we are not disposed to pay any money to support a navy, in the control of which we have no direct interest, we are prepared to do our full duty so far as concerns maintaining control of our own territory and being able to defend that territory. One of the ways in which to do that is to be prepared to manufacture for ourselves our own small arms. This is the first step then, Mr. Speaker, and the first ground I give in justification of the policy which we have adopted.

In February of last year, on a similar occasion to this, I made a statement, and I shall trouble the House by reading very briefly from that statement to show other reasons which moved me and which influenced the government to undertake the responsibility of manufacturing our own small arms or having them manufactured in this country. 'Let me tell him that in the year 1900, when this government wanted to purchase rifles through the imperial government, it was impossible to secure a thou-

sand rifles in Great Britain.' It will be remembered that this was during the South African war, at a moment when we wanted 10,000 rifles. We had sent away to South Africa a large number of the rifles we had —and we had all too few—and it was desired to purchase 10,000 yet, not 1,000 could be procured in the whole United Kingdom.

It was impossible to secure a thousand rifles in Great Britain during the time of the South African war, and I thought that it was the duty of this government, under the circumstances, to make as soon as possible some arrangement by which our rifles could be manufactured in Canada. I was in England in 1900 and went to the Birmingham small arms people and tried to induce the company to come to Canada. I quite recognize the desirability of our having, if possible, precisely the same rifle in Canada as is used by the British army, because if the militia of this country should ever be called out for war, it would be better that we should have the same rifles. We have one, however, which differs so little from the Lee-Enfield that there will be no trouble on that score.

It was found impossible to prevail upon the Birmingham Small Arms Company, or any other small arms manufacturer in England, to come out here and start a factory. About that time Sir Charles Ross happened to be here. He had not then come to Canada for the first time, but, as the hon. gentle man must know, had been living in British Columbia, and had spent a great deal of money there in developing water-powers and establishing electrical works. He was introduced to me, I think, by Mr. Mackenzie, of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and brought other letters from the most reputable men in Canada. He explained to me that he had a rifle factory in the United States, and was selling sporting rifles, rifles similar to what are being manufactured here now. He said that he would be willing to establish a factory to manufacture rifles for Canada with the same bore and to use the same cartridge as the Lee-Enfield rifle. It seemed to me that it was a patriotic thing on my part to recommend and on the part of the government to accept this opportunity to secure a factory which would turn out rifles for Canda.

These are the grounds then, Mr. Speaker, upon which I justify the adoption of the policy of manufacturing, or having manufactured in Canada, our own rifles. Somebody may say : Why did you not construct a factory yourself ; why did you not become your own manufacturer ? I frankly admit that that may be a question fairly open to argument. We took the view that it would be better to allow Sir Charles Ross to manufacture his own rifle and so we adopted that policy. We knew that he had the capital to do it, we thought that the better course, we made a contract with him, as I shall show presently, and he proceeded to construct his factory. What was the rifle that we agreed to adopt ? I have already said that it was a rifle of the same calibre or the same bore as the Lee-Enfield. It had a slightly different action but the difference was not serious. Of course the parts of that rifle would not be interchangeable with those of the Lee-Enfield, but that is not a serious drawback.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is no Lee-Enfield that is interchangeable with its neighbour.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So I believe. What was this rifle ? It was known as the Mannlicher rifle, the rifle with which, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Worthington) told us to-day, the whole Austrian army is armed. He said that that army was armed with that rifle in 1896. The British army was armed with the Lee-Enfield before 1896 ; so that, that is not a very grave or serious complaint against it. The Mannlicher, I believe, is considered to be as good a rifle as there is in the world. At any rate, Austria is a warlike nation and I think we may fairly assume that the rifle that is good enough to satisfy the generals of the Austrian army may be good enough to satisfy the militia of this country. What did I proceed to do ? Knowing this, I proceeded, after consulting my colleagues, to bring together a committee of the best men I could find in Canada, as I believed, to examine this rifle and report to me as to whether it was a fit rifle to adopt in this country. Whom did I appoint on that committee ?—General Otter, now the chief of the general staff, one of the most distinguished Canadian soldiers, a man whose name is honoured not only in his own country but in England as well, a man who was offered, the other day, one of the best commands in the gift of the War Office in England ; Colonel Gibson, for many years an active militiaman, a man who took his part in repelling the Fenian invasion and a man who was for years and years the president of the Dominion Rifle Association. Colonel Hughes, who is well known in this House and the country, was the third man whom I appointed on that committee.

Mr. FOWLER. Colonel Sam ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Colonel Sam There is no other Colonel Hughes.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Yes, pardon me ; there are two more in the same family.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. When you speak of Colonel Hughes in this country every one knows who is meant. Colonel Anderson of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, a distinguished engineer, and Major Gaudet, at the head of the Dominion arsenal, a man of great experience and possessing technical knowledge, were also members of this committee. Those gentlemen met, the Ross rifle was handed to them, they reported, and I suppose I will have to trouble the House, very briefly, with an

extract from their report. I am going to read the whole of the opinion expressed ; I am not going to follow the example given us to-night of simply picking out things that suit my case and omitting those that do not. This is the opinion :

On the whole, the board find that the Ross rifle has features which in their opinion, afford advantages over the Lee-Enfield. All agree that the straight pull is a very important advantage over the Lee-Enfield action. The sample mechanism is evidenced by the fact that the breech can be taken entirely apart and put together again without tool other than an ordinary knife, and the operation of taking apart and assembling the parts, takes considerably less time than the Lee-Enfield. Another important advantage, is in the strength of the breech mechanism, while the limit of the Lee-Enfield is restricted. It may be said that any increase of velocity which is ever likely to be required, can with absolute safety be obtained in the case of the Ross rifle.

The Ross rifle is approximately a pound lighter than the Lee-Enfield.

The chief objection or difficulty which was found in connection with the tests to which the Ross rifle was subjected, was brought out in the 'endurance test.' While in firing 1,300 rounds out of each of the rifles, the Lee-Enfield stood the test quite satisfactorily. It was found that after heating, the breech of the Ross rifle closed with more or less difficulty, the action being very stiff with occasional jamming besides which a possibility of 'double loading' exists.

Were this an inherent objection to this rifle, independent of details of mechanism, the board would regard it as a very serious matter, but Sir Charles Ross states, that any difficulty in this respect can be effectually obviated, and the board submit herewith a memorandum (exhibit 'D') from him in reference to this point which in his opinion, affords an explanation of the unsatisfactory result of this test, and the manner in which the same may be overcome.

Speaking generally the board believe that the Ross rifle has features which are a positive advantage over the Lee-Enfield, while it is contended by Sir Charles Ross that he can easily remedy any of the drawbacks which have been pointed out.

The rifle has been on the ranges during the week of the Dominion Rifle Association meeting——

And yet the hon. member for Sherbrooke said that it was never on a range.

——and has been examined and fired more or less by many riflemen of experience, and while it is not suggested that any conclusive testimony has been afforded from such desultory examinations and tests, it is significant of the favourable impression of riflemen, that no adverse comments were known to have been made, and all seemed to be pleased with the action of the rifle.

Here is what Sir Charles Ross said in that connection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the minister leaves that, there seems to be a good deal left out of this report, a good deal of responsibility left for the minister before adopting the rifle. Because, while they say that certain defects exist, they do not themselves point out that they can be remedied, but merely declare the opinion of Sir Charles Ross to that effect. There is one paragraph which the minister did not read ; it is rather significant :

The board do not profess to pronounce upon the question of a complete remedy of this objection, but having called attention to it, assume that due precaution and provision with reference thereto will be taken in the event of the rifle being adapted.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I see I left that out and the clause following also.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a very important clause. I would like to ask what was done along that line before the rifle was adopted?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, the officers of the department were consulted and Gaudet, who was an expert and had taken a course in England just before that, was consulted with reference to the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Gaudet is the ammunition man ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Is there any written report?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think there is any memorandum on the subject. If there is it has been brought down.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It has not been brought down.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, then, there is not any. A great deal of the negotiations, a good deal of the advice obtained directly from the officers of course was verbal. It was the result of consultation between Gaudet, Cotton, my late deputy, myself and others.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The chief trouble at that time was because of cartridges sticking in the chamber.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. There is one thing which was pointed out to me and I might mention it now since the question has been asked. The rapidity of fire of the Ross rifle is very much greater than that of the Lee-Enfield, and for that reason there is a great deal more liability to heating of the barrel and jamming. I wish to call the attention of the House, however, to Sir Charles Ross' statement, and I will only read the concluding part of it with reference to this matter, because it has a bearing upon the question of remedying all the defects :

We particularly draw attention to the fact that the trouble is only a small detail of manufacturing owing to the difference in the shells, not having had the advantage of test-

ing with government cartridges and we undertake to meet all the necessary requirements on this point. (Sgd.) Charles Ross.
(Sgd.) J. A. BENNETT.

Bennett was his manager.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that report in the printed evidence?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, you will find it at page 204. Then, of course, there are letters from Colonel Hughes and from Colonel Anderson which I will not delay the House by reading. The hon. member (Mr. Worthington) read to-day certain alleged reports from the Springfield arsenals. I have already referred to them and given my opinion that they are not of much value until their authenticity is proven. So far as I am concerned I am not prepared to accept their authenticity. The hon. member also referred to what he called War Office reports and Hythe tests, and he ventured to say that when I was asked a certain question I had denied that any communication had been received from the War Office with reference to the Ross rifle. If the hon. member had been fair enough to read my answer he would have seen I had done nothing of the kind. I said there had been a communication and that it was marked 'secret,' and I referred to the nature of the communication. The communication points out that it might be undesirable to adopt a rifle which was not precisely like the Lee-Enfield because two forces fighting together in the field might require different parts and their armourers might be serving out parts for only one kind of rifle. That is a difficulty that no doubt would exist, but so far as the Ross rifle is concerned there was no very great difficulty about it. As I pointed out in 1902 when this matter was discussed in the colonial conference, the rifle is so simple that it is quite easy for a man, or at any rate for a sergeant in each company or in each regiment, to carry with him the necessary spare parts. That was pointed out and it was not denied; in fact, it was affirmed. What was denied was a statement which appeared in a newspaper in this city, and which the hon. member (Mr. Worthington) seems disposed to adhere to notwithstanding my contradiction, and which was that the Ross rifle had been tested at Hythe. I gave the specific statement on that head: That neither Sir Charles Ross nor his agent nor anybody for him nor any one on behalf of this government had ever handed over to any of the authorities at Hythe any rifles whatever for the purpose of testing them. In that connection I was practically charged—and this will illustrate the animus which actuates the opponents of this rifle—I was charged with having purloined from the parliamentary library a book which was said to have been there and to have mysteriously disappeared. I was able to produce here from the librarian a distinct statement that no such report from the War Office had ever been in the library and that every report of the year mentioned or of recent years that ever had been in the library was there still. I mention this again to show the animus behind all this and the unfairness of this crusade, for it is nothing else. A newspaper stated—inspired I believe by the hon. member—the Ottawa 'Citizen,' stated that I had refused to bring down a report sent here by the War Office with regard to this rifle and that such report had been kept off the files. And I was able to bring here to my desk the next day the return as I laid it on the table as long ago as March, 1907, and showed to this House the full report of the War Office just as it was sent to the Department of Militia, and I was able to show further that I had in the speech which I made in this House in January, 1907, referred to this very report as having been received and stated I was going to bring it down to the House. It is just as well perhaps to take note of these things so that the House may discount a little bit the professions of patriotism put forward by the hon. member who moved this motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this report of the War Office the report of the alleged trial or experiment at Hythe?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. I am speaking now about the report made at the Woolwich Arsenal on rifles which I sent to the War Office for the purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the Hythe investigation?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I said that neither the department nor Sir Charles Ross nor anybody for him ever sent any rifle there, and Sir Charles Ross assured me that it is an entire mistake to say that his rifle has ever been sent to Hythe or reported upon there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose it might have been tested there although it was not sent by Sir Charles Ross. Does the hon. minister know whether the Ross rifle was tested although it was not tested under his auspices?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would not say that it was not. It was about the time that the original rifle was handed to the government to be submitted to the committee which I spoke of a moment ago. I do not think there could have been such a test.

Mr. FOSTER. How many rifles have been accepted for that report of the Woolwich test?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I could not say, but my impression is that there were very few. The report, I think, was received from the War Office in the autumn of 1906.

Mr. NORTHRUP. There were 14,000 rifles up to the end of 1906.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I may say that the rifle sent was the Mark II, and that was the rifle reported on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another question which I would like to answer is: Was due care exercised in making the contract? Recently there has been a report, somewhat famous now, by a commission known as the Civil Service Commission, and in that report I find some more or less complimentary references to the Militia Department, which I hope to have an opportunity of dealing with some day before long. But incidentally, as a slight instalment of the good things given out to the Militia Department by that commission, it is stated that the contract was drafted by the contractor's solicitor. Now, in order to elicit information upon that point, the chairman of the commission, when he was examining the deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, with reference to the conduct of the Department of Justice, put certain questions; and I would like to read what took place:

Q. You prepare all contracts entered into by the several departments which you are asked to put into legal form, I suppose?—A. We draft them all or revise the drafts prepared in the departments.

Q. We had before us this morning the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, and we were asking him some questions about the Ross rifle contract. Was that contract drafted in the Department of Justice?—A. I do not know where it was drafted, but we had a great many conferences over it. It was, I think, drafted preliminarily by Sir Charles Ross' solicitor.

This is all the reason apparently that the Royal Commission had to jump at that conclusion.

Q. Had he a solicitor acting for him?—A. Yes.

Q. In drafting these contracts, if it should appear they contained something that might be detrimental to the interests of Canada, would it be your duty to go on with the drafting or call the attention of the department to the matter?—A. I would call the attention of the minister, or the officer from whom I was taking instructions, to any situation of that sort and ask him what was intended. As to the substance of the contract, I would not interfere with the policy, but would endeavour to see that any deficiencies that suggested themselves to me or any supposed provisions that I thought would not work with adequate security to the government, were called to his attention. Then, that being considered, I would take the policy of the contract from him and give effect to his intentions.

Q. You have nothing to do with the policy of the government—A. No, so far as concerns the business of the departments.

By Mr. Fysche:

Q. I suppose there is such a thing in the government service as cultivating a habit of doubt or suspicion about everything?—A. As far as I am concerned I have no suspicion. I point out to the government, or the minister or the officer who is instructing me, what I suppose to be reasonable or what may work unreasonably, but the policy in regard to that is a matter for him to consider and settle.

I think it is abundantly clear from this that the deputy Minister of Justice would have considered himself in duty and in honour bound to call the attention of the minister to anything which he thought would not work well, but would work to the disadvantage of the country. He had nothing to do with the policy. Whether we should have a rifle factory or not was none of his business. But when a contract was to be made with Sir Charles Ross, the Deputy Minister of Justice stated that he felt it to be his duty to see that the government's interests were protected in every way. And yet in the face of that statement, we have the spectacle of a royal commission trying to stab and injure the department and the government by the casual statement, the unjustifiable statement, to which I have referred, that this contract was drafted by the contractor's solicitor. Now, I have a very definite recollection of what took place in connection with that contract. There were eight or ten or twelve different drafts, and time after time I took to council a draft to consult with my colleagues about; and in my room over and over again, there were present Sir Charles Ross, my deputy minister, the Deputy Minister of Justice, and on one or two occasions Sir Charles Ross had with him his solicitor. The idea was to get at a contract which would be fair; and I was determined, so far as I was concerned, to enter into no contract until I had the advice of the Department of Justice upon it. I got that advice, and I got it in the view expressed by the Deputy Minister of Justice that it was his duty to warn me if he saw anything in the contract which was unjust or improper.

Now, the contract provides:

The contractor is to establish, at or near the city of Quebec, in Canada, a factory for the manufacture of rifles, with the necessary plant.

It is to be a Canadian factory, established at Quebec. The contractor undertakes to deliver a certain number of rifles in a certain length of time—only 12,000. He wanted to make a contract for a much larger number, but it was pointed out to him that that would be impossible without taking a vote of money. He said: Well, if you cannot give me a contract for 100,000 or 60,000 or whatever it might be, then you must undertake to buy from my factory all the rifles you may require. Therefore the third provision of the contract stipulates that the government shall buy from the contractor. Surely there was nothing improvident or unfair in that. Here was a man going to invest half a million dollars or more in the manufacture of rifles in Canada, and you could not expect him to do

that unless he had some guarantee of continuous patronage for a reasonable time at least.

In this third section there is a provision that, in case of war or a sudden necessity for a larger number than the contractor will be able to manufacture, he shall be given notice of the large requirements of the government and if unable to fill them, then the government would be at liberty to buy wherever it chose. I should not think that this was an improvident arrangement.

Then as to inspection, we have heard something about inspection and no doubt will hear more about it.

The said rifle hereby contracted for shall, previous to delivery, be inspected by the inspector of small arms of the government, and if, after such inspection, the rifles be found up to sample, delivery will be taken.

All sorts of absurd statements have been made as to the want of proper care in this matter of inspection. Any one can understand that the inspection would be according to the custom and usage in such matters, and so it has been. This of course was a new undertaking in Canada, and it is possible that the inspection in all cases has not been so rigid as it ought to have been. But I can say without hesitation that during the last two years there has been no failure in that regard. I do not wish to blame anybody ; I am here to take full responsibility for any mistake or error that may have been made by any officer in my department. But it was a new work they were undertaking and those errors, if there were any, were of the head rather than of the heart. These officers were undertaking new work, and I would not think of saying that every rifle which came out of that factory, any more than I would say of the Lee-Enfield or any other, had been thoroughly inspected and that nothing had been overlooked. There have been undoubtedly some defects discovered but they were only trifles and can be easily remedied. I am inclined to believe that a more rigid inspection—such an inspection as we are giving to-day—would have practically prevented the issue of any rifle which would show defects under ordinary usage. I am not claiming that this rifle is perfect or that every rifle we have received is absolutely perfect. There is no perfect rifle in the world. I know more about rifles to-day than I did four or five years ago and not very much yet, but I have read enough to have learned that there is no perfect rifle in the world and that there is not any country to-day absolutely satisfied with its rifle. There is no rifle which satisfies every rifleman. Why, you will not find one rifleman in fifty satisfied with any rifle you may give him. Show him a rifle whether Lee-Enfield, Mauser or Ross or what you like, show him any variety of sights you choose, and I venture to say he will want this to be changed or that and tell you that if this or the other thing were done, it would be an absolutely perfect rifle. But these are small things and things which are not material. It is not a target rifle we have been buying. It is a rifle with which to arm the forces of Canada, and I repeat that every one which has been accepted is a rifle fit for service.

The next clause to which I want to call attention provides that if any changes are required, they can be obtained on giving notice. Clause 6 provides that if a new rifle be invented, the government shall have the right to have that rifle. It goes so far as to say that, in laying down his plant and machinery, the contractor shall provide the best facilities to enable him to manufacture any such new rifle.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the system of inspection in Great Britain ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is the upright view, which is the simplest form.

Mr. FOSTER. Give it to us colloquially.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The upright view is taking the rifle completely finished, without any reference to its component parts, and testing it. The other is the government view, as it is called in England. That means the inspection of every part of the rifle or of the important parts, and that is the inspection which has been followed here. The rifle is inspected during the process of manufacture in all its essential and important component parts and marked by the inspector, so that he will know, if that rifle is refused and sent back, whether he has seen it before or not. That is the inspection followed to-day and it is a fairly good inspection—perhaps not quite as good as or up to the government view inspection in England, but Major Pym who knows his business fairly well, thinks it is absolutely satisfactory.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the British government inspect as to the interchangeability of parts ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you sure of that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Unless very recently. The Lee-Enfield rifles, which we have, are not interchangeable in their parts. The Ross rifle is inspected as to interchangeability. That is one of its strongest claims but Major Pym has reported that it would not be safe to rely entirely on its interchangeability.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the difficulty about interchangeability ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. When you are dealing with the two-thousandth or five-thousandth part of an inch in the circumference or thickness of a part, you see how difficult it is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have understood that in large manufactories of watches, for example, the parts are made interchangeable. One would suppose that a watch would have as minute parts as any in a rifle. So if this can be done in watches, I do not see that there should be any great difficulty about it in rifles.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree with the hon. gentleman in that. I think they ought to be interchangeable, and I think any difficulty that exists in the way of making them so will be overcome. I am stating the facts as they are. I have no desire or intention——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was only asking for information.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The parts are interchangeable in many of them, but I would not like to say they are all interchangeable.

Now, we come to the question of the price. We heard a good deal about the prices at which rifles could be obtained from some dealers of whom I never heard before. I notice that as they were quoted they indicated purchase on upright view. I am not going to say that the firms whose quotations were read are not the best in the world. I do not know. I am going to quote prices which I do know. The price of the latest pattern of the British rifle, made in the government factory—mark you, made in the government factory—is £4 5s, or, laid down in Canada free of all charges, $27.35. This makes no allowance for trade expenses or profit, and to cover these you should make an allowance of about 35 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that include inspection?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, it includes inspection, which is 6 per cent. The same rifle, if purchased from the trade, would cost approximately $6.25 more, or $33.60. Now, that is absolutely authentic information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does that include duty?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, 20 per cent. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will remember that when he was Finance Minister a large number of rifles was purchased in England. Part of them were from the War Office—that is, the government factory—and part were bought from the trade. I will deal with those bought from the trade :

	£	s.	d.
Birmingham Small Arms Factory, 13,000; and from another firm, 8,150..	4	0	0
Departmental expenses, &c.	0	4	5
Case, freight, &c..	0	2	3
Carriage..	0	0	9
Total..	4	7	5

Cost laid down in Canada in 1896, $22, or with duty—20 per cent—added, $26.40.

Now, it is only fair to say at once that that includes inspection. The rifle bought in 1896 under my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was bought on most favourable terms, as I shall show in a moment. It would have cost $26.40 if there had been the usual duty which now exists, as against $26.90—because I am going to add the cost of inspection, $1.90. So that the cost of the Ross rifle to this government to-day is $26.90, and the Lee-Enfield imported in 1896 would have cost to-day $26.40, or a difference of 50 cents in favour of the Lee-Enfield.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question? The way he deals with the duty is a little confusing to me, though there may be a perfect explanation of it. As I understand, in making the computation he takes into account the duty on rifles coming from Great Britain, but in considering the case of the Ross rifle, as it is to-day, he does not, as far as I can understand, take into consideration the duty on materials brought into this country for the manufacture of that rifle.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not done so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would seem that if you add the duty in one case you ought to add it in the other. I would suggest that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the duty would be very small, because notwithstanding all that has been said here to-day, there are no finished parts imported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But to make a fair comparison, I should think the duty, whatever it is, should be taken into account.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I could have the computation made in that way. It would not materially change the figures. I want to show how the price at which these rifles were bought in 1896 happened to be very favourable. I have discussed this matter with General Lake, who, I think, was employed to purchase these rifles, and I have from him this memo, which I have liberty to read :

Ottawa, January 29, 1907.

The Hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence.

You asked me to-day what reduction in price of the Lee-Enfield rifle had followed the decision of the War Office to revise, in 1896, the contract rates paid to the trade in England, upon the ground that the primary cost of installing machinery to manufacture the

magazine rifle had by that time been recouped by the trade.

Speaking from memory, I said it was about 10 shillings, but that I could not be certain.

I find that in the priced vocabulary of stores, 1893, the charge for the Lee-Metford rifle is £4 10 2.

In our contract with the War Office, March, 1896, the price for rifles supplied by the trade was to be £4, plus five and one-half per cent for inspection and departmental expenses, and for rifles made in the government factories, £3 12 0. The prices for the Lee-Enfield and Lee-Metford are given as the same.

Hence the 10 shillings reduction which I mentioned is probably an understatement; while it is clear that there was certainly a large reduction.

P. LAKE,
Chief of the General Staff.

Headquarters, January 29, 1907.

So that if the low price was due to the fortunate moment at which General Lake arrived in England to purchase this rifle, when the initial price given to the small arms factory had been reduced—for there is always a special allowance made in England in cases of that kind, where any new lot of war material has to be manufactured. That unusual additional price had been taken off so that under the ordinary course of procedure if General Lake had gone there a year before he would have paid 10 shillings more for the rifles, which would make the comparison very much more favourable to the price of the Ross rifle.

Something has been said about American rifles. I have not been able to get the cost of the Springfield rifle, I do not suppose it would be possible to do so. Even if you did, it would not be of much value because it is a rifle, made by the government and you would have to add 40 per cent to 50 per cent in order to get the price at which the trade could sell such a rifle. I find that the price of the Winchester rifle is $32 delivered here, less 10 per cent or $3.20, so that it is something like $29 without a bayonet. Thus we have the price of the English rifle as it was in 1896, the price of the English rifle to-day and the price of the Winchester rifle to-day. Of course the Winchester price does not include inspection, they would have to be inspected after delivery here.

I shall now read the clause of the contract governing the price, because it is important:

8. The government shall pay for the said 12,000 rifles mentioned in the second clause of this contract at the rate of $25 for each such rifle. The government shall pay out of moneys to be appropriated by parliament for the purpose for all rifles subsequently ordered as herein stipulated the same price of $25 for each of such rifles, unless one of the parties hereto shall upon the occasion of any demand for further rifles notify the other of such parties that the price of such rifles in similar quantities in the markets of Great Britain has relatively to the present price increased or diminished, in which case the aforesaid price of $25 shall no longer govern, but the price for the rifles so ordered and to be thereafter ordered shall depend upon a futher agreement of the parties, and in default of agreement the price to be fixed as provided in the ninth clause hereof.

I now come to the payment of money before the actual delivery of rifles, payment on account of progress estimates:

The price for all rifles herein contracted for or to be supplied pursuant to the provisions of this agreement shall be payable upon delivery; provided, however, that after the establishment of the said factory and supplying of the plant for the running of the same the contractor shall be entitled to payment in advance of delivery of moneys actually expended upon the rifles or parts thereof or fixtures therefor to be delivered in that year upon a statement certified by him of the amount so spent upon establishing the fact of such expenditure to the satisfaction, testified by his signature of such statement, of the government inspector of small arms, such payments in no case to exceed 75 per cent of the price of such rifles, the contractor undertaking whenever such advances are made to insure and keep insured the said rifles, parts and fixtures against loss or damage by fire for the benefit of the government to the extent of such advances.

A statement was made to-night with reference to this clause of the contract which was misleading, though of course not intended to be so. It was stated that the present Auditor General had discovered something very loose or undesirable in the way in which this business was being done by the Militia Department, had held up the department and had practically brought about a new system. It is only fair to the department, to the memory of my late friend and deputy, Colonel Pinault, that I should say that if any such impression as that were given it would be entirely unjust, entirely erroneous. I have read the provision by which this advance of 75 per cent was to be made:

Upon a statement certified by him of the amount so spent upon establishing the fact of such expenditure to the satisfaction, testified by his signature of such statement, of the government inspector of small sums.

Under this provision there seemed to be a difficulty at once. The then inspector of small arms did not feel disposed to certify upon the statement of Sir Charles Ross or anybody else and said he was not in a position to verify the statements.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he not say it was impossible to do it?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am speaking now of Gaudet. He may have done so. A good deal of correspondence took place, and there were several meetings between my late deputy and Major Gaudet and Sir

Charles Ross, with the result that Sir Charles Ross, or perhaps my late deputy, made the suggestion that a chartered accountant, a man of the highest character and standing, should be appointed to verify and certify to these accounts instead of the contractor. This was entirely satisfactory to Sir Charles Ross and it was satisfactory to Major Gaudet, who proceeded after that to certify all accounts so long as he was there. I do not know that there were more than one or two of these accounts. The point I wish to bring to your notice is that the chartered accountant who was selected to do this work and who has done it from the day that factory was started is Colonel Wurtele, and that the so-called change in system is a change between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee—it is not even that, it is no change, except that to-day the government of Canada is paying Colonel Wurtele and that before the change Sir Charles Ross paid him. The Auditor General said that, technically, under the Audit Act, the conditions of the Audit Act were not met by having that work done by an employee of the contractor. He satisfied himself that Colonel Wurtele was an absolutely reliable man and agreed to the change, which was simply this, that for the future the Department of Militia would pay him, whereas in the past Sir Charles Ross had paid him. My late deputy was something of an economist, he was always making the best bargain he could for the department. I suppose he thought it was under the contract, Sir Charles Ross' privilege and duty to do this, and that he should pay for having it done. This Auditor General takes a different view, but if any hon. gentleman wishes to satisfy himself upon that point, let him turn up Books Nos. 1 and 4 of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee of this session, and let him look at Colonel Wurtele's testimony and read all the evidence of the Auditor General, and he will find what I have stated set forth fully. So that all this talk about a change in the system of accounting is moonshine. There is nothing in it. The accounts have been carried on properly from the beginning. We pay the accountant now; Sir Charles Ross paid him formerly. Colonel Wurtele was recommended by the Bank of Montreal as the best man to do this work, and no man who knows him will dare to insinuate, no one has, that it made any difference to Colonel Wurtele whether he was paid by the government or paid by Ross.

Now, we come to another point in this contract, as to the change with reference to the way that prices would be determined in the event of a new rifle—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before leaving this I would like to inquire whether or not it is reasonably practicable to comply with the provisions of that section. How could the government inspector of small arms determine that so much money has been spent upon the rifles which are to be delivered to the government?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As a matter of fact the Auditor General relies entirely upon the accountant and the accountant takes stock every time. The departmental accountant, Colonel Wurtele, goes to the Ross rifle factory for the purpose of reporting upon progress estimates. He takes stock of everything there is there and makes a complete report to the Auditor General. The Auditor General is entirely satisfied with that method; so that the inspector has nothing to do with it until he inspects the finished rifle and then he give his report upon it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose the money expended must be represented by a great number of very small parts?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How does the inspector, assuming, of course, that he is diligent, faithful and capable—and I am not calling that in question—know whether or not, when he goes to make another similar report, that he is not embracing some of the material that has already been reported upon?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The inspector does not report; the accountant reports,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How can the accountant report upon a thing of that kind?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, he does it and he satisfies the Auditor General.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the report would be made by some one familiar with the process of constructing the rifle.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not necessarily, but he has access to everything in the factory, he goes through it thoroughly, he audits the accounts and he is given all the vouchers and bills of every kind and makes his report upon them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose it is capable of explanation if one had sufficient time to go into it, but how does the accountant know when he goes through these books that a part of the material which has been paid for has not gone into the rifles already paid for? How does he know that when he reports on what is in the factory at that time?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, I heard his evidence before the Public Accounts Committee and I think he satisfied that committee that he was able to do that.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the minister satisfied that it has been done?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am quite satisfied if the Auditor General is satisfied.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask the minister how often the employees are paid ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think once a month or once a fortnight,—certainly once a month.

Mr. TAYLOR. If it is once a fortnight it would take a fortnight to take stock. I know what taking stock is.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. These progress estimates are not paid every fortnight or every month. They are paid perhaps once in three months. It is only when progress estimates are made that this is done. At page 187 of book 4 the Auditor General gives evidence upon this point :

Mr. John Fraser, Auditor General, called.

By Sir Frederick Borden:

Q. I would like to have you state, Mr. Fraser, whether you consider the present method of guarding the interests of the public treasury in the matter of advances to the Ross Rifle company under the terms of the contract are sufficient, and if you will describe what they are, roughly?—A. In the first place Colonel Wurtele examines the books of the company to ascertain the amount they have expended, the books, vouchers and cheques for payment. At least these are the directions given to Colonel Wurtele, and I presume he carries them out. He examines the books, pay-lists, and vouchers for the purchase of material, etc., to ascertain the amount that the company is expending on the rifle, and he also is instructed to make an inventory once a month and a variety of statements in connection with it to satisfy us that all this labour and material is expended on the Ross rifle and not on any other rifle that may be manufactured in the establishment. Also, that the amounts included in the certificate do not include anything for—I do not just exactly know what you call it—but for the guns that do not pass inspection—

The very point that my hon. friend raised.

—the guns that may have to go back—the rejected guns that may require some work done on them. His instructions are not to include money expended on them, but that the expenditure he certifies to should be absolutely the first expenditure, 75 per cent of the cost of the first process of turning out the guns.

By Mr. Nesbitt:

Q. That is what he does?—A. I presume he does.

Q. You are talking about it from the government standpoint, I would like to go into the box and tell my impression of it—we get the worst of it every time.

By Sir Frederick Borden:

Q. Do you know anything of Colonel Wurtele, his character or qualifications?—A. I never heard anything against him; I believe his qualification is all right, and I am satisfied with Colonel Wurtele's certificates.

Q. You are satisfied with the work he has done?—A. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a question by Mr. Hughes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (reading) :

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. In regard to the 75 per cent is it all paid in one sum or is it paid on estimates as the work progresses?—A. It is paid on progress estimates.

By Mr. Northrup:

Q. Have you any check at all, Mr. Fraser, as to whether or not the arms as to which advances are made will be delivered during the year?—A. We cannot tell what will be delivered during the year.

Q. You have no check at all that they will be delivered?—A. That is not necessary at all under the interpretation of the contract.

Q. I am not asking you that, I am asking you whether or not there is any check that they will be delivered during the year?—A. As soon as they expend 75 per cent on account they are entitled to 75 per cent.

I think that is practically all. Then Colonel Wurtele goes into that quite fully, but I think this evidence of the Auditor General ought perhaps to be satisfactory on that point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that is a correct interpretation of the contract, it is different from the progress estimate conditions as they are usually found in a contract. The usual form of progress estimate contract is that 75 per cent of the amount of work done and material used, or a certain proportion, shall be paid over. But this seems to prove that everything shall be paid over up to 75 per cent; so that, for example, when 50 per cent of the amount has been expended the contractor gets everything and there is nothing left as security to the government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So far as I know, except the insurance. There is a provision in the contract that the material shall all be kept fully insured. Clause 9 provides that in case of the new rifles being invented the government has the right to demand that the rifle shall be made at this factory on giving proper notice, and then it states how the price shall be reached. An important paragraph at the end of this clause is the following :

It being the intention of this agreement that the price of the rifles furnished hereunder shall so far as it is possible be the same as that of similar rifles in like quantities purchased by or for the government, from British manufacturers in the open market in England and delivered in Ottawa.

So that the price of the English rifle is the basis of the price paid, and it is the basis of comparison in the future :

The contractor shall be permitted to import into Canada tools and machinery not manufactured in Canada up to the required standard necessary for the said factory and also all material or parts in the rough unfinished to be used in rifles to be manufactured by him for the government, free of duty, or in case of payment by the contractor of any duty on

any such tools, machinery or material or parts as aforesaid, the contractor shall be entitled to a drawback or remission of duty paid in respect to the finished parts to be used in any such rifles, consisting of screws, nuts, bands and springs.

Now, this is a clause about which a good deal has been said, and I regret to say that a great deal has been said that is absolutely unfair and untrue. It is not an unusual thing, Mr. Speaker, to give to a new industry special consideration of this kind, and particularly, I think, should that be so when it is one which can practically have only one purchaser. The government are practically the only customers who will require the products of this factory, and surely, with all the risk that this contractor was taking, it seems to me not unreasonable that he should be allowed to bring in, what?—machinery that is not made in Canada, material that cannot be procured in Canada, and unfinished parts and parts in the rough that cannot be procured in this country. The changes have been rung from Montreal to Boston—and Sherbrooke—about certain parts that were imported into Canada of this Ross rifle, and the hon. member thought it not beneath his dignity, shall I say—his patriotic dignity, perhaps I had better say—to call this arm a contraband Yankee rifle. That is the kind of thing we have to submit to, and the kind of thing Sir Charles Ross has to submit to. There is nothing in all this to justify any such statement as that. The parts are not imported completed. They are not completed parts. There may be one or two screws and two or three springs imported from the United States or imported from England; but, Mr. Speaker, this factory could not go on without permission to import materials out of which the rifle should be made. It is absolutely untrue to say that this factory is simply a factory for assembling parts. I would refer again to the evidence given by Colonel Wurtele, and what did Colonel Wurtele say on that point? Colonel Wurtele is the man who makes up the accounts, progress estimates; the man who sees every charge that is made in that factory, who is absolutely acquainted with every voucher and all the books of the company; sees every labourer's account, knows everything about it, so far as the premises are concerned, from beginning to end, and what does he say?

Q. How many men are employed?—A. From 300 to 500 men. There is something here I notice in the evidence with reference to a sporting rifle made there.

Q. What is the selling value of the sporting rifle?—A. $35 to $40.

Q. Have you taken an inventory?—A. I took an inventory in September.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Were not some affidavits published about these parts in the Montreal and Quebec papers?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think there were, but I never took any stock in the reports in the newspapers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There were affidavits by the workmen.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think so.

But the government itself sent down experts to take an inventory of every screw and everything else in the factory.

General Cotton went down there and spent three weeks, and found there was an immense amount of value over and above any claim that the government might have against the Ross rifle on account of advances in the event of their not going on and delivering the rifle.

Q. Speaking generally, from that information, are you able to say that the balance of the rifles are substantially completed?—A. Well, of course, taking it on the average I should say the contract is complete because they have got a great number of parts finished and complete, over and above the 52,000 contract.

Q. Now can you tell me the amount that has actually been paid out in wages up to date, in actual wages that has gone into the work in the city of Quebec by Sir Charles Ross? A. Roughly?

Q. Yes? A. Over $900,000.

Q. Over $900,000? Can you tell me how much has been expended in actual material and shop expenses? A. Over $300,000 shop expenses and material.

And yet we are told that all the principal parts are brought in from the United States. What have these 500 men been doing there? Can any one suppose that Sir Charles Ross is so stupid and unbusinesslike that he brings 500 men there to look at the parts which he brings in from the United States?

Q. Right in the city of Quebec? Of course, some material is purchased outside. That has nothing to do with the building, plant or anything of that kind?—A. Absolutely nothing.

By Mr. Reid (Grenville):

Q. Does that include the building? A. Nothing.

By Mr. Nesbitt:

Q. Then assuming that the rifles that are there in the inspection department are ready to be taken over when there is room for them, that would practically mean 38,000? A. 38,000 rifles.

Q. Better than 38,000 rifles. Then that would mean that there has been expended in actual wages in the city of Quebec and on materials and so on, over $100,000 more than the total advances of the government to-day?—A. About that, yes.

Q. And a lot of that material was purchased in Quebec?—A. Lots of it, yes.

Hon. Mr. Foster.—By wages and material you mean wages employed on, and material used in, the manufacture of rifles.

Mr. Nesbitt.—Yes.

Hon. Mr. Foster.—Simply that?

The Witness.—Yes.

Q. As to these sporting rifles of which there were 150 but you say 200, you have allowed for these?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Foster :

Q. I want to find out if any portion of that is for purposes outside of this contract, if it is for material and labour to make rifles, not to make plant for the manufacture of rifles or to get in water supply?—A. I understand thoroughly; it is for the manufacture of rifles and not capital. It is entirely independent from the capital of the company.

That is what I ventured to assert this afternoon, although my hon. friend was doubtful.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me for a moment. This is all a play upon words. The capital spoken of there in one respect was what went into the buildings and machinery ; that is, the fixed capital. But after a man has scraped up all he can and put it into his buildings and machinery, he cannot do anything unless he has working capital.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Precisely. Nobody denied that the object of this contract was to assist the contractor reasonably. A man who puts half a million of money into buildings and machinery and gets ready to operate and pays for them all before any money was handed over to him by the government, is surely entitled to some consideration. The hon. gentleman this afternoon was endeavouring to lead this House and country to believe that we were supplying all the money the Ross Rifle Company expended.

Mr. FOSTER. He meant working capital.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He did not say so.

Q. It has absolutely nothing to do with what is chargeable to capital account?—A. Nothing.

Q. This suggestion has been made to me among older things: have you been through the factory very recently?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you seen any boys employed on machines?—A. I have not noticed any boys on machines, no, sir.

Q. The tool makers, for instance, are a very highly paid class of mechanics?—A. Yes, Sir, they are more of experts.

Q. Do you know whether or not there was an understanding between the Ross Rifle Company and the government that the balance of the 12,000, assuming that only 9,000 of Mark I were delivered, that the balance of the 12,000 order of Mark I should be made up by the delivery of Mark II?—A. My recollection is that they supplied the deficiency in Mark II.

Q. So that there was no loss to the government in any particular as regards the 3,000 rifles which were not delivered, there was no loss to the government in those parts?—A. No, the company had to make good.

Mr. Northrup:

Q. When you came to look over the pay roll, if you found any Mark I rifles upon which 75 per cent had been advanced, and those rifles were afterwards turned into Mark II, would there not be double payment on them?—A. I do not see how you could exactly keep that labour separately.

Q. I do not think so either. As a matter of fact, you say you certified 75 per cent of the labour on Mark I, and if those rifles were afterwards used as Mark II, would there not be double labour upon those rifles?—A. Of course there would be some labour involved in the change.

Q. Then, when you came to estimate on Mark II, would you not be estimating a second time?—A. No, I could only estimate on 75 per cent of the total, all over and above that would be a loss to the factory.

Notwithstanding this evidence, a grossly unfair attempt has been made in the press and in this House to make it appear that the Department of Militia and Defence had advanced 75 per cent on 12,000 rifles, and had only got delivery of 9,000, and that the balance of 3,000 had been thrown somewhere into the dust-heap and the country was out that much—an assertion for which there was not the slightest foundation. So much for the contract. I do not think there are any other portions of it that I need deal with.

With regard to parts imported I would like to say a word. I suppose it will be generally admitted in this House that it would be reasonably good policy to encourage an industry of this kind, an industry which employs 500 men and which means the manufacture of our own rifles in our own country. I would expect at any rate that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would be extremely anxious, in accordance with their professions, to encourage a new industry of this kind. But I am beginning to think that they are going back on themselves ; for we find them criticising this factory for doing in a small way what nearly all the great factories in this country are doing in a large way. There is not a factory engaged in the manufacture of similar articles which does not import largely from the United States steel and various other raw materials. Take agricultural implements, the manufacturers are constantly obliged to bring in from the United States articles that go into the manufacture of these implements. Why, my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who is engaged in the manufacture of carriages, imports largely the material that go into his carriages. He would have to shut up his shops to-morrow if he did not import from the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman is mistaken with reference to carriages. With reference to the wheels——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, the wheel is a part of the carriage. I never knew of a carriage that could run without wheels.

Mr. TAYLOR. The wheel is simply the timber we have not in the country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not know as much about the way his carriages are manufactured as he thinks he does. I have here from a carriage manufacturer a statement of the things brought in from the United States :

Materials.	Per cent Imported. United States.	Per cent Imported. England.	Reason.
Lumber, all kinds.	50		
Mahogany, cherry, W. oak, cottonwood, gum, yellow pine	100	....	
Veneer	100	....	Not made in Canada.
Upholstering.			
Rattan	100	....	" "
Carpet	....	50	Quality not good enough, made here.
Steel for springs and crucible steel	100	....	Not made in Canada.
Pantasote	100	....	" "
Duplex duck	100	....	" "
Curtain fixtures	100	....	" "
Curtain rollers	100	....	" "
Moss	100	....	" "
Grommetts	100	....	" "
Curled hair	50	....	" "
Plush	.....	50	" "
Carriage and Wagon Hardware.	40		
Axles	.....	....	Special axle not made in Canada.
Springs	25	....	" "
Carvings, hearse	100	....	" "
Carriage lamps	100	....	" "
Malleable hardware including whiffletree irons, neckyoke irons, spring shackles, wrenches, holdbacks, &c.	80	....	" "
Hinges, landau, &c.	40	....	" "
Landau, top props and nuts	100	....	" "
Landau toilet sets	100	....	" "
Landau top fasteners	100	....	" "
Landau speaking tubes	100	....	" "
Curtain fasteners	100	....	" "
Steel skeins	100	....	" "
Tire steel	.....	10	Special rd, edge not made in Canada.
Whip sockets	20	....	Special not made in Canada.

Materials.	Per cent Imported. United States.	Per cent Imported. England.	Reason.
Car Fittings and Parts.			
Glass	100		
Headlights	100	....	Not made in Canada.
Trucks	100	..	Variety called for not made in Canada.
Brass tubing	20	80	Not made in Canada.
Brass rods			
Brass catches, come and go	100	...	" "
Stanwood steps	100	....	" "
Gongs, foot	100	....	" "
Heaters, car, electric	100	....	" "
Heaters, car, water	100	....	" "
Door checks	100	...	" "
Couplers, car	....	....	" "
Car fenders	100	....	" "
Braided copper wire	.....	....	" "
Electric fixtures, Benjamin	15	....	" "
Paints and Varnishes.			
Varnishes	.....	60	Not made in Canada,
Lacquer for metal goods	100	....	" "
Carminette	100	....	" "
Sponges	.....	....	" "
Chamois	.....	....	" "
Pumice stone	..	...	" "
Ribbon gold	100	.	" "
Gilders' gold	.....	100	" "
MISCELLANEOUS.			
Iron and Steel.			
Angles, beams, channels, hoop, bullet-proof	50	....	
Machinery	50	....	Specials, not made in Canada.
Tripoli and brass polishers' supplies	75	....	Not made in Canada.
Tarred rope	.....	100	Quality not made in Canada.
Chain	.. .	30	Special, not made in Canada.
Bolts, spec. hd	. . .	5	" "
Tools, drills, &c	50	....	" "
Hard and smithing coal	100	....	" "
Sand and flint paper	100	...	" "
Emery cloth	100	....	" "
Wicker baskets	100	....	" "
Wicker wheel guards, umbrella baskets	100	....	" "
Rubber cord step pads	100	....	" "
Arc lamps	100	....	" "

Materials.	Per cent Imported. United States.	Per cent Imported. England.	Reason.
Band saws	50	....	Special, not made in Canada.
Phosphor bronze sheet	100	....	" "
Time clocks and watchman's	.....	....	" "
Roller bearing wheels and axles	.....	....	" "
Cloth for carriage work	50	....	" "
Lace for carriage work	100	....	" "
Steel tubing, weldless	.....	100	" "

When special screws, spring or special fixtures are required, it becomes necessary to import or make them ourselves.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has enumerated a great many articles that do not go into the construction of a carriage.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Of carriages and cars.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman mentioned tire steel. We purchase it all in Nova Scotia, and do not get a bar outside this country. Nearly everything except the wood is made in Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Since how long?

Mr. TAYLOR. For years. I have been manufacturing twenty years and we purchase nearly all our supplies in Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have factories making motors in Canada. There is one which boasts that it makes an all Canadian motor. Well, of the various materials which go into that 50-H.P. motor, $1,900 worth are imported out of the $4,500. And for an 18-H.P. motor, $136 of materials out of the $1,600 price, come from the United States. I do not object to this, but I do object to applying to the Ross rifle a rule which hon. gentlemen are not prepared to apply to other manufactures in Canada. The time will come no doubt when all these things will be manufactured in Canada, the time will come when the steel will be manufactured here, and Sir Charles Ross has told me that the moment he can get the suitable steel in Canada for the manufacture of the parts of his rifle, he will buy it here. I am told that at Peterborough there are three or four most important industries which would have to close their doors to-morrow if they were not allowed to purchase from the United States, not raw materials, but finished products. Take door bells, the springs are imported ready to put on the bell. Take an auger or bit, the point is imported from the United States; it cannot be made in Canada. Take the manufacture of shovels, the wood and I think the steel must be imported. Surely we are not going to go back on our policy, surely the importance of having the labour done in Canada is something, when we find that out of $1,200,000 expended in the factory $900,000 were spent on labour alone. That one statement should put an end forever to these vain imaginings—for they are nothing more—begotten from a diseased mind——

Mr. FOSTER. Order; go it easy.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would like to have said a base desire to injure a Canadian industry—I shall not say anything about the government and myself.

Mr. FOSTER. The government is beyond injury now.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will find that out to his cost.

Mr. TALBOT. He is thinking of the old government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, the good old days. We have heard a good deal to-day about defects of rifles. We hear of the defects of the Ross rifle. Now, I am not here to make damaging or injurious statements about any other rifle. I am here to give the facts. And I am here to show this House that there are at least other rifles besides the Ross rifle to which accidents may happen. The Lee-Enfield rifle is, in my opinion, a good one. I would have been quite content to have had it manufactured in Canada. I gave the manufacturers in England the first chance and tried on more than one occasion to prevail upon them to come here. They would not do so. I have here a report of some damaged Lee-Enfield rifles :

REPORT ON DAMAGED LEE-ENFIELD RIFLES.

Place.	Year.	Corps.	Nature of damage.
Toronto	1905	C.M.R	Barrel burst.
"	1905	9th T.L.H	"
"	1905	10th Regt.	Barrel bulged.
"	1906	"	"
"	1906	Fenwick, R.A	Breech burst.
"	1906	21st Regt	Barrel bulged.
"	1906	9th T.L.H	"
Ottawa	1897	G.G.F.G	Bolt blown out.
"	1899	"	Barrel burst.
"	1903	74th Regt	"
"	1904	Renfrew R.A	"
"	1905	3 Coy F.G	"
"	1906	G.G.F.G	"
"	1907	"	"
Winnipeg	1903	LaRivière R.A	Muzzle of rifle expanded.
"	1903	Fort Saskatchewan R.A	Broken bolt.
"	1905	Springfield R.A	" Barrel twisted,
"	1905	Prince Albert R. A	Barrel burst.
"	1905	Saskatchewan R.A	Bolt broken. Barrel bulged.
"	1906	C.M.R	Barrel burst.
"	1906	LaRivière R.A	Bolt broken. Kink in barrel.
"	1906	Franklin R.A	"
"	1906	15th L.H	Cocking piece broken.
"	1906	C.M.R	Bolt broken.
"	1907	Nose Creek R.A	Butt plate broken.
"	1907	Cannington Manor R.A	Two bolts broken. Bulged barrel.
"	1908	Snow Flake R.A	Barrel loose.
Quebec	1908	S.O.O. reports	About twenty repaired annually lost swivels, loose butts, bolt blown out, bolt heads blown off cases of burst barrels.
Kingston	1908	General report	One or two barrels bulged. New striker required in one case.
St. John, N.B	1901	8th Hussars	Breech damaged.
"	1903	Moncton R.A	Barrel, body and chamber burst.
"	1903	73rd Regt	Breech damaged.
"	1903	C.C.R. Ass'n	Stock broken off.
Halifax		S.O.O. reports	Two barrels damaged. One bolt blown out.
Montreal		S.O.O. reports	19 repairs, owing to defective cocking pieces, sears and springs; 150 repaired, loose butts and covers; 25 repaired, hand guards broken barrels unserviceable, bolts broken.
Calgary	1906	15th L.H	Bolt broken.
Esquimalt	1906	5th Regt. C.A	Bullet jammed.
		S.O.O. reports	Repairs owing to defective material, handguards, 2; springs, 10; catches, magazine, 5; strikers, 1; bolts, breech, studs, 6; sears, 5; extractors, 2; stocks, foreend, 1; swivels, 5; breech bolt blown away, 2.

S.O.O. also reports 4 bolts blown back. In some case 'bands' were found to be 'loose'. Stock butts, some found loose. Piling swivel screws some lost owing to short screws.
Eye of magazine, about 1 per cent pull out owing to defective brazing.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Were there any big headlines in the newspapers about these ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not yet; there may be to-morrow. Now, what a terrible thing for my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to have armed the volunteers with such a rifle as that. I am not going to trouble the House by following the long weary reading which the hon. member (Mr. Worthington) made of certain reports which he wanted to place on 'Hansard,' but I have here a statement giving the whole thing boiled down. What it took the hon. gentleman two hours of our valuable time to read is here. It shows the number of damaged rifles, ranged under the headings 'Serviceable, Reparable' and 'Unserviceable.' And in this whole list, there is not one rifle that is not put down as 'serviceable.' Of all the list that the hon. gentle-

man read, every one is mentioned here by my officials, who take the responsibility for this, as being 'serviceable' and 'reparable' and not one 'unserviceable.' It happens—and a great deal was made of that—that there is a return of a large number damaged at Halifax, no fewer than 257. There are also 36 in Militia District No. 8 and 38 at Quebec. These are the only large numbers except at Halifax. The rifles were issued to all the districts throughout Canada and subjected to the same tests. I cannot account for it. I shall make further investigation. Whether it is due to the fact that there are in Halifax a lot of old English soldiers who had been accustomed to using the Lee-Enfield and who were not properly trained in the use of the Ross rifle, or whether there were officers who were prejudiced against the Ross rifle and in favour of the other, I am not prepared to say. But I intend to find out. I shall make it my business to find out. It is certainly a remarkable thing that nearly all these complaints come from Halifax. And yet there is not one unserviceable rifle, not one rifle that could not be repaired and put in proper shape of any armourer. Here is what appears at the end of the statement:

On receipt of these reports the inspector of small arms sends for such rifles or parts of rifles as cannot be repaired locally, or else forwards such spare parts as are necessary to enable the repairs to be made locally.

The general nature of the damage to these rifles is such that all are easily reparable.

In that connection, I wish to repeat what I said in the earlier part of my remarks. And I will read this so that there may be no doubt about it as to Mark I.

Although the details are not complete, there is every reason to believe that the complaints made against the Mark I rifle can be met and the arm put to very good use. For this purpose they have been recalled into stores and replaced by a later issue of March 11, and when the proper time arrives the necessary changes can be made, keeping the Mark I rifle as it is at present, and only remedying the complaint incorrectly described as to blow-back of the bolt. The very trifling expense of putting in a cross-pin will do all that is required.

As to Mark II.:

The majority of complaints have been made about the earlier issue of Mark II.

That is the Halifax issue.

And can be overcome in many cases, if not all——

These are the words of the inspector endorsed by the Master General of Ordnance, and I am sure every one of them can be made right.

—merely by the issue of spare parts to be fitted by a competent local armourer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

And this is the sum in toto of the indictment made by the hon. gentleman this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I insisted upon the Ross rifle being sent out to the troops all over the country, and in this respect the Ross rifle has been treated unfairly and differently from the Lee-Enfield. The Lee-Enfield was brought here about the time I assumed my present position and I wondered then what it was intended to do with it. When I asked: Where is the Lee-Enfiel rifle, I was told: Oh, it was packed away carefully—apparently in cotton wool, you could not get it out, they would not issue it and it was years and years before that rifle was issued except to camps of instruction to allow the militiamen to see it and fire a few shots. That is the way the Lee-Enfield was treated. But the Ross was unfairly treated and I am responsible to some extent because owing to the unjust criticism that was being made and the prejudice that was being created all over the country in order to injure the rifle, I thought it desirable that it should be issued, and it was issued before it should have been. I wish to say now and at once that at the camps this year I intend that the Ross rifle and the Ross rifle alone shall do all the target practice. The Lee-Enfield will not be used in this year's camps and we will have a still better test than we have had of the qualities of the Ross rifle. We are not afraid to use the Ross rifle. The Ross rifle is not dangerous, and the statement that it is dangerous is a diabolical invention intended to injure the rifle, intended to injure the factory, intended to alarm the militia of Canada. A more outrageous campaign was never undertaken in Canada and such a campaign was never thought of in either England or the United States. You could not find a man in England or the United States who would abuse his position in the army of either of those countries and in the parliament of either country to try to strike a blow at the service rifle which has been deliberately adopted by that country. We know what troubles they have had in those countries. It is not a question of Mark I, Mark II and Mark III in the case of the Lee-Metford rifle in England, it is a question of Mark XII, and the story goes to-day that the latest rifle is by no means satisfactory. Those who have followed events in the United States know that the same thing has happened there and yet you will search in vain the records of congress and the records of the British parliament to find anything to compare with the treatment which has been meted out to this government and to this rifle.

A great deal was said to-day about blow-outs or blow-offs. The hon. member said that this rifle was dangerous. He read for two hours from reports, but failed to find anything more than a screw loose in a

back sight, or a front sight, or some other sight and some little insignificant or trifling matters. He had to go back to the two or three cases upon which he rang the changes last year. He brought up a case at Lethbridge, another at St. John, N.B., and another at Eastman, the latter more or less made to order. I propose to say a few words about these three cases. Sergeant-Major Browbridge, of the Northwest Mounted Police, gave evidence before the Public Accounts Committee last year. I have the evidence here, but I do not wish to detain the House. After giving evidence for two or three days he came down off his high horse and admitted in almost as many words that it was not a blow-back, but some little nut on the end of the bolt had become loose and the spring had been forced back. That is what it came to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There was some report by an official connected with the Northwest Mounted Police. Is that the same man?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, he gave evidence here. I would like to say a few words about the St. John, N.B., case. The hon. gentleman read some letters this afternoon from Major Armstrong. It seems that there was a rifle practice on the 24th of May by the 3rd Canadian Artillery and an alleged accident happened. Nothing more was heard of it, no report was made until some time in December, when from headquarters the question was asked why this particular corps had not done its annual shooting. Then some excuse had to be put forward, they had forgotten all about the accident that happened on the 24th of May. No board was held, no report was made, but at the end of December, when it was necessary to account for their not having done their annual shooting the report came in of this terrible accident which nearly took somebody's life.

Mr. CARVELL. It came by telephone ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. Parliament was not sitting in May, or perhaps it was; at any rate it was sitting in December and the Ross rifle campaign had been begun. I am not going to delay the House, but I am going to read Major Pym's report of this accident. Major Pym was at once sent to St. John to look into the case, the rifles were secured and brought to Ottawa to see whether there had been one part of the rifle blown into three pieces or what had really happened :

Headquarters, March 12, 1907.
The M. G. O.

'The Inspector, Small Arms,

Inspection of Ross Rifles St. John, N.B.

With reference to your minute of the 4th instant, I beg to report that I proceeded to St. John, 6th instant, to investigate the circumstances under which two Ross rifles, Mark I, were damaged on May 24, 1906.

1. The case containing the two rifles in question was opened by me at the District Office. These rifles have been identified by the Officer Commanding No. 2 Company, 3rd Regiment, C.A., as those reported on by him.

2. I obtained from this officer a statement as to what occurred on May 24, 1906, when one of these rifles was reported to have exploded and the other considered unsafe to fire.

The information he gave me when compared with the official report previous to submission (Section 514, 15, 19) seems to show some confusion of ideas as to what actually happened; but taking his latest statements in connection with those of other members of the regiment, together with a further examination of the rifle, I arrived at the following conclusions :—

(a) There is no evidence to show that any part of the rifle flew into three pieces.

(b) No broken part has been found.

(c) No substitution of parts has been made.

(d) The rifle bears no evidence of a premature explosion.

No official report appears to have been made to the D.O.C., M.D. No. 8, of the occurrence until January 19, 1907, when it was given for the reason for not having completed the musketry course.

A broken cover screw was the only defect in the other rifle referred to.

(Sgd.) J. BEVILLE PYM, Major,
D.M. Inspector Small Arms.

For the Ministers' information.

(Sgd.) W. H. COTTON, Col., M.G.O.
12-3-'07.

This is the terrible case of the blow back referred to. I think, we might call it a boomerang.

Mr. TALBOT. Or a roorback.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Or a roorback. There is a more interesting and a more recent case—the Eastman case. That is an eastern townships case, and I propose to refer to that as briefly as I can. Something happened at a competition in the Eastern Townships. My hon. friend mentioned it to-day. He said it was a very narrow escape. There was a board held in connection with this alleged accident and at that board Major Pym was present. I think I will have his report a little later, but there are one or two questions and answers that I would like to read here.

By Mr. Barnes :

Q. Were you present at every practice when this rifle was used?—A. I may have missed two or three practices.

Q. Has the rifle been in your possession ever since the 2nd of October instant ?—A. It has—but on the 3rd of October, I think, any way shortly after the accident, I am sure now it was the day after, I was telephoned to by Sidney Longhurst at Mansonville asking me to send the rifle and parts there. There was a Conservative caucus there that night and my idea is he wanted it for that.

That is the way they are running the Ross rifle into politics. This is the sort of thing that my hon. friends are encouraging.

Q. Has this rifle always been in your possession?—A. No. Sometimes when I have been away other members of the rifle association have come to my house for it. I never took it to pieces and only put it together thus once when it came apart.

There are a number of questions and answers which I will not detain the House by reading but I have another little bit of evidence on this point which I would like to read. It will be found at page 142 book No. 4. Major Pym is giving evidence :

By Mr. Worthington :

Q. You have heard, no doubt, of the number of accidents that have been happening from the use of the Ross rifle throughout the country ?—A. I have.

Q. Have the rifles injured been submitted to you for your opinion ?—A. Some of them have.

Q. As a rule what was the cause of the accident, what was the cause in most of these cases ?—A. I think it depends upon what the nature of the accident was. If you could state that, perhaps I could remember the details.

Q. Did you see a rifle sent from Eastman, Quebec ?—A. Yes.

Q. I believe it was previously investigated by a court of inquiry ?—A. I was present at the court of inquiry.

Q. I think there was one court of inquiry held at Eastman ?—A. I was at Eastman too.

Q. What was the verdict of that court of inquiry ?—A. So far as I recollect the verdict of the court of inquiry was that there was reason to believe that the rifle, or some part of the rifle, had been improperly used and, therefore, that the bolt might have closed ; that is to say that the rifle might have been fired in closing the bolt, but there was no evidence to show what caused an explosion, which is a very different thing.

Sir Frederick Borden :

Q. The rifle might probably have been tampered with ?—A. Well, tampered with inasmuch as that riflemen will always tamper with their cocking-pieces, or with the sear, to get what they call ' a sweet pull off.'

Q. Was there not absolute evidence that a certain part of the rifle had been filed ?—A. Yes, it had that appearance. It bore that appearance.

I think we may fairly assume that we have disposed of the only three serious cases that have been put forward out of all the thousands of rifles which have been distributed throughout the country and which have been in use for the last two or three years.

There were a good many other matters that I had notes of but I am not going to detain the House. I will only stop to say now that a committee known as the Small Arms Committee has been permanently established in connection with the Department of Militia and Defence. There is such a board or committee, I believe in every country in the world. In England it performs an important function, that function being of an advisory character to the War Office. In the United States I believe there is a similar board. I thought the only safe way to deal with matters of this kind would be to establish by order in council a similar board and that has been done. Most of the gentlemen composing that board are well known throughout Canada although they were contemptuously referred to this afternoon, as a whitewashing board, by the hon. member who entertained us so long. The proper title of this board is the Standing Committee on Small Arms, authorized by general order 36, 1908.

President—
Brevet Colonel Sam. Hughes, M.P.
Members—
Lieutenant Colonel W. P. Anderson, R.O.
Lieutenant Colonel J. H. Burland, R.O.
Lieutenant Colonel C. Greville Harston, R.O.
Major R. A. Helmer, D.A.A.G.M.
A. O. Fages, R.C.R.
J. B. Pym, I.S.A., M.G.
W. H. Davidson, 8th Regiment.
J. E. Hutcheson, 43rd Regiment.
Associate members—
Lieutenant Colonel F. M. Gaudet, R.C.A., Superintendent Dominion Ordnance.
J. W. Harkom, R.O.
A. E. McIntyre, Esq., Ph.D.
A. H. Walters, Esq., M.A.

These last four are employed for their special scientific and general knowledge. Colonel Greville Harston is an ex-imperial officer, and was at one time employed by the British government in doing some work in connection with converting one type of small arms to another. I believe these men are able, conscientious and determined to do their duty. Some of them are now at Quebec testing carefully an improved, I suppose it might be called, or a modified Ross rifle. As the result of what has happened : as a result of the reports which have been made, and information which has been gained, the contractor, with the assistance of members of the Militia Department, has thought it desirable to make certain changes, and before the manufacture of the new order for 10,000 rifles is begun this modified form of rifle will be thoroughly tested. Already many valuable tests have been made, but I shall not go into that ; I am not an expert, and I know my hon. friend (Col. Hughes) will take that up when he has an opportunity of speaking. Suffice it to say that every effort has been made, as has been done from the first, to secure the manufacture of the very best rifle. I have been told by some men who were supposed to be somewhat critical of the rifle as first issued that they believe it is a remarkably good rifle. Certainly the shooting that has been done all over the country with the new rifle sent out by Sir Charles Ross himself (none have been issued by the department yet) has been remarkable. Most extraordinary shooting was made here a few days ago by the Ottawa member of the committee. I overlooked one thing

which I would like to say before I conclude. The hon. member, in his speech to-day, referred to two friends of his, I suppose, who had been saying nasty things about the Ross rifle. He gave the name of one as Luther R. Henry Burns, a former employee of the rifle factory, and the other he gave as J. H. Stanton, of St. Catharines. also an ex-employee. I know nothing about the former man, Mr. Burns. although I would think it somewhat undesirable for a member occupying such a prominent place as the hon. member does as an officer of the militia and as a member of this parliament, to read letters from a disappointed or dismissed employee.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Without any date.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mr. Stanton—I do not want to do him any harm—wrote letters to me, and they were sent to the Ross Rifle Company and were answered. I do not know whether the answers were published or not, but they are on the file of the return I brought down. He also wrote to the Prime Minister, and I find this letter in the return I brought down last session, and part of which has been printed in No. 5 of the reports of the Public Accounts Committee. But this letter seems to have escaped somebody's eagle eye, and so I shall read it. Mr. Boudreau, then the Prime Minister's secretary, had evidently written a letter to my late deputy, Colonel Pinault, who had sent him Stanton's letter, and this is Colonel Pinault's reply :

Ottawa, February 2, 1906.

Dear Mr. Boudreau,—With reference to the attached letter from Mr. J. H. Stanton, of St. Catharines, I would suggest that the premier should give very little of his time to this man. He has written several letters to this department, and for some reason perhaps known to himself, he refuses to accept as true what I have told him as regards the Ross rifle factory being a private concern. He has been told that we have nothing to do with the management of the company, and that all that we are concerned about is obtaining arms up to the standard for which the company have entered into a contract with the government, as to which our inspector is the judge.

Stanton was an employee of the company, and as is not infrequent when a man has been dismissed, he is disgruntled. He is known to have offered a bribe to have an invention of his own helped on, from which fact alone, he is hardly a man to be taken seriously when he preaches honesty.

The grounds I have taken in answering his letters are that such questions as the foreman's keeping the labourers waiting until he sees fit to give them work are for the company and not this department to deal with; that what we are concerned about is that the rifles they turn out are according to pattern.

Very truly yours,
(Sgd.) L. F. PINAULT.

Rodolphe Boudreau, Esq.,
Private Secretary to the Premier, Ottawa, Ontario.

In conclusion, I observe that the motion before you refers to 'the dealings of the Department of Militia and Defence in connection with the adoption and manufacture of the Ross rifle' and so on. Well, I have pointed out so far as I could the dealings. I do not quite know what the mover of the motion means by using that phrase. There were no dealings as to the adoption or as to the manufacture of the Ross rifle which were not absolutely straightforward and above board. I have given the reasons for encouraging the establishment of this factory in Canada. I have given the reason first of high policy, of imperial policy, and of policy which would properly safeguard the integrity of our own domain. I have stated that I did my best to persuade somebody in England—the Chamberlains, whom I saw more than once—to establish a branch of their great factory in Canada, but I failed. I am free to admit, and I will never deny the fact—there is no reason why I should—that I would have preferred the establishment here of the same service rifle as the imperial army is armed with. Not that it is a better rifle. I do not think it is as good a rifle. But I am not called on to make comparisons of that kind. As a matter of convenience I would have preferred it, and I did my best to bring it about ; but I did not succeed. I did what I thought was the next best thing, and I have been instrumental in encouraging the establishment in Canada of a great industry, and I wish to say that I am more proud of that act and that fact than anything else in my twelve years of administration. I am willing to stand or fall by what has been done. I do not pretend to say that no mistakes have been made. It would be utterly impossible that the introduction of a new industry like this could go on smoothly without some friction and some difficulty. It has never happened anywhere in the world, and it is not likely to happen here, because we have had less experience than other countries. But I repeat what I said, that the country has got value for its money, and that there are no rifles issued or to be issued or to be received by the inspector which are not good value and which could not be made serviceable in a very short space of time; and there are not many of them which are not at this moment serviceable. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must leave myself in the hands of this House. The House must judge as to my motives and my administration. If it will treat me fairly and consider fairly all the facts, I have no doubt what the result of this vote will be.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour not to emulate the preceding speaker in one respect at all events; because, when he rose at a quarter past nine to address the House, he referred in almost indignant and contemptuous tones to the fact that the hon. gentle-

man who had preceded him had held the House three and a quarter hours in making the attack, which of necessity should last longer than the defence, if the defence could be anything more than words, and yet the hon. minister has occupied within a few minutes of three hours in making his defence to the attack which he treated so contemptuously. The hon. gentleman, in beginning his remarks, said that the hon. gentleman who had made this motion had succeeded in bringing down the question of arming the militia to the low level of party politics. Now, sir, there are two ways of looking at this matter. The man who would wilfully and deliberately, in order to injure the soldiery of his native land, say one single word, would be a traitor of the deepest dye; but, sir, I think that a traitor of equally deep or perhaps deeper dye would be the man who, having been in the militia service, having left his native shores to fight for the old flag, having come back to this country has been honoured by the people by being elected as one of their representatives in this House, if he believed that there was being put into the hands of the soldiers of this country an inferior weapon, for which the money of the people of this country had been illegally paid, failed to bring these matters before this House. The minister contemptuously accused the hon. member for Sherbrooke of having excited discontent in the minds of our soldiers on this matter; and yet that hon. gentleman only took it up in 1907. It was in the year before, in July, 1906, that the complaint from all parts of this country were so numerous, so specific and of so unquestionable a character that General Cotton wrote, under the direction of the Department of Militia, because he swore that he did nothing without its direction, to the Ross Rifle Company, putting an embargo on the receipt of their rifles. Was the minister treating this House with proper respect when he made such a statement, knowing the facts as he did, and no one knows them better than he. Now, I think I can perhaps avoid following his example, and can discuss this question quietly and dispassionately, although I may differ with him in the conclusions at which I arrive. I agree with him that he must stand or fall by this question. It was mere braggadocio on his part to say that he must stand by what everybody knows he cannot help standing by. I hope he will take a broader view of his past career, and that the day will come when he can find some thing in that career on which he can look back with greater satisfaction than he can upon his connection with the Ross rifle. I think I am correct in saying that there has been no question before this country for years which has excited more widespread interest than this very Ross rifle. Perhaps it will not be out of place if I give a brief historical retrospect of that question, to show how it came about and how it stands to-day.

Mr. NORTHRUP.

We have a very voluminous report here. Our examinations before the Public Accounts Committee lasted a considerable time last year and this, and I must confess I was astonished that the hon. minister should have had the assurance to stand up in this House, where practically every member of it knows the facts as well as he, and taunt my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) with delay in bringing on this matter. Does the minister not know that it is he who is the culprit and that every member of the House is convinced he is? Why, the very returns brought down in connection with this matter and laid on the table on April 9, 1908, was brought down in compliance with an order of the House passed on the 11th December, 1907. Does the hon. minister charge this delay of over a year in bringing down this return to my hon. friend from Sherbrooke? I would not be at all surprised if he did. Yet it is just delays of that kind which account for this resolution only having been moved to-day and for my rising to address the House at this late hour. The Public Accounts Committee sat on this matter last year and had not finished its investigation when the session prorogued. The minister knows that no debate could have been had on the subject last session because the matter was then before the Public Accounts Committee. The proceedings of that committee were continued this session from last year. Nothing could be said in this House while the matter was before that committee. Then take this whole volume, the report of the Public Accounts Committee, selected from 3,000 pages of correspondence and reports brought down—not more than three weeks at the outside have passed since this literature was put in our hands, and this is really the first opportunity we have had of discussing it. Every one knows that the peculiar circumstances of the last couple of weeks prevented our taking up this Ross rifle matter. I state here on my responsibility that no man could have been more anxious to bring the matter before the House than my hon. friend from Sherbrooke, and he brought it up the very first day he could.

Coming now to the history of the question, in 1901 Sir Charles Ross—I think I can discuss the question without referring to him in any other way than as a business man who came here and made a very successful contract, very unsuccessfully carried out—in 1901 Sir Charles Ross and the Minister of Militia met—in an unhappy hour I think for this country. Evidently the establishing of a rifle factory was then discussed, with the result that a meeting of officers was called in the city of Ottawa and took place on June 28. There were present Colonal Otter, Lieutenant-Colonel Anderson, Lieutenant-Colonel Sam. Hughes and Major Gaudet. Colonel Gibson was

absent. Sir Charles Ross attended the meeting and presented his rifle for inspection. Major Gaudet had made some experiments with it in Quebec prior to that time. A discussion took place, and they agreed that a number of tests should be made in Quebec, after which some decision would be come to by the committee. But on that very occasion, when Sir Charles Ross appeared before the committee and when the committee decided to investigate the subject, the first thing they did, before making any special investigation, was to decide that six alterations would have to be made in the mechanism. So that we had this man who had never been in the business of manufacturing rifles before, this embryo contractor, going to the minister with a rifle of such a character that the board, on which the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) sat, declared that before they would bother making any test of the rifle at all six changes would have to be made in it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Sir Charles Ross carried the rifle all through Africa and did very good execution with it during the African war.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Of course I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. No doubt Sir Charles Ross carried it through Africa, and it was so worn out that it required at least six improvements to make it fit to be tested in Canada. However, I presume these changes were made, though on that point I find no exact report. At all events the officers did meet in Quebec and then came back to Ottawa. Then they came to a decision and made a report. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia said tauntingly that he would not read this report in the way the hon. member for Sherbrooke read it, that he would not pick out only what suited him. Well, I accept the minister's statement, and no doubt it is because the opinion of the board, which I am about to quote, suited him so well that he omitted to quote it. The board, in its first report, points out that there was a tremendous objection to this rifle from the point of view of endurance. This they would regard as a very serious matter, but Sir Charles Ross promised to remedy it. They went on to say :

The board do not profess to pronounce upon the question of a complete remedy of this objection, but having called attention to it, assume that due precaution and provision with reference thereto will be taken, in the event of the rifle being adopted.

Is it any wonder that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia should have left this out? Had it not been so eminently satisfactory to him no doubt he would have read it. Then the board continued :

This is all the more important inasmuch as, in comparison with the Lee-Enfield, there is not the leverage in opening the breach which the mechanism of the latter rifle affords.

That is the report. Would any sane man, guided wholly by patriotic motives, say that that was a report giving an unqualified approval of an unknown rifle? Colonel Anderson was unable to be present at the meeting of the board, but he wrote a letter in which he pointed out that if a contract should be entered into with Sir Charles Ross for a number of weapons, strict specifications should be provided. He wrote as follows :

If a contract is entered into with Sir Chas. Ross for a number of weapons, it should be under a strict specification and detailed drawings as well as a sealed pattern. The specifications should contain in full details respecting materials to be used for each part, tempering, finishing, etc.

There was something practical which would appeal to business men. Do not enter into a contract unless you have drawings and specifications as well as sealed patterns. Yet we find that the contract with Sir Charles Ross was drawn with such skill that it does not contain the slightest reference to drawings or specifications.

There is one letter and this letter is the only recommendation of the Ross rifle which was given up to the time the contract was made. I am not prepared to say that nobody ever said a word in favour of it, but after careful research I have been unable to find any trace of any individual who had a good word to say, much less give unqualified commendation, with the exception of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). That hon. gentleman, at the very beginning, when the other members of the committee were most reserved, when they pointed out that certain defects were very serious and trusted that the minister would see that Sir Charles Ross carried out his promise to remove them——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where has the committee pointed out serious defects?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am perfectly willing to do my best to enable the hon. gentleman to understand, if possible, something about a rifle, but I do object being called upon to repeat what I have said two or three times, particularly at this hour of the morning. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) in his letter said :

On active service in South Africa I chanced to take several straight pull action rifles from the Boers. Though the action was weak.

I presume the action referred to the rifle. My hon. friend went on to say :

The Sir Chas. Ross rifle has all the advantages of the other with none of its drawbacks. It locks its resistance lugs at the forward end of the bolt; it is the strongest rifle I have

seen; is least likely to get out of order and the simplest to dismount and put together.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I asked the hon. member to point out where the other members of the committee had reported defects in the rifle.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I suppose it would take less time to read the clauses over again to the hon. gentleman than to have him jump up and interrupt me so often. I was interrupted so often in the Public Accounts Committee by the hon. gentleman this session that I thought he would be weary by this time. Well, if he will kindly listen I will read, solely for his benefit, the words used by the committee.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What page?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Page 196 of the report of the Public Accounts Committee.

The chief objection or difficulty which was found in connection with the tests to which the Ross rifle was subjected, was brought out in the 'endurance test.' While in firing 1,300 rounds out of each of the rifles, the Lee-Enfield stood the test quite satisfactorily. It was found that after heating, the breech of the Ross rifle closed with more or less difficulty, the action being very stiff, with occasional jamming, besides which a possibility of 'double loading' exists.

Were this an inherent objection to this rifle independent of details of mechanism, the board would regard it as a very serious matter, but Sir Charles Ross states——

——and so on.

The board do not profess to pronounce upon the question of a complete remedy of this objection, but having called attention to it assume that due precaution and provision with reference thereto will be taken, in the event of the rifle being adopted.

This is all the more important, inasmuch as in comparison with the Lee-Enfield, there is not the leverage in opening the breech which the mechanism of the latter rifle affords.

Now, at this hour of the morning, I trust the hon. gentleman will have a little regard for the feelings of myself and other hon. members. And I will be happy to explain unrevised 'Hansard' to him, so that when he comes to address the House he may be able to say something of interest and profit concerning the Ross rifle. In the meantime, I ask him to have a little forbearance——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member made a——

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, I do not surrender the floor——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I wanted to show the hon. member up, and to show his utter distortion of the facts.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has the floor.

Mr. NORTHRUP. We have later the report, which was wholly non-committal, of Colonel Anderson, with specifications and drawings, and the unqualified commendation of Colonel Hughes. What was done next we know nothing. The minister tells us that he revised the contract, making twenty drafts of it. And then we have the contract between the Ross Rifle Company and the Crown. Before coming to this, however, there were certain tests made in Quebec. And, in this connection, I think I may say that the counsel for the Ross Rifle Company did not help his case by his conduct before the committee. I do not think that his treatment of Major Pym and General Cotton was of a kind that should have been tolerated before a committee of this House. I do not think that in reference to the tests made before the contract he was altogether fair and correct in his statements. He referred to the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield being subjected to a charge of 35 tons. It seems that, by the terms that were agreed upon by the committee, there was to be such a test, but when they got to Quebec they did not make such a test. Yet Mr. Nesbitt put it that, having agreed that such tests were to be made, and the fact that men of such standing as General Otter and Major Gaudet reported in favour of the rifle, showed that they must have been made. Whereas he must have known, if he knew anything about it, that such a test was not made. The report said:

A cartridge loaded with a charge of 40 grains of cordite, calculated to produce a pressure of 22 tons per square inch was employed. Thermo. 70 F.

1st round.—Percussion cap blown out. Action very stiff and considerable force exerted by hammering with heel to open breech.

2nd round.—Same result. Sir C. Ross declined to allow rifle to fire further excessive charges. Locking lugs examined after firing and found unaltered. Total rounds fired 1,441.

Now, I want to be perfectly fair. The Ross rifle was subjected to a test of 22 tons, but the Lee-Enfield to only 17:69 tons. But the Lee-Enfield came through the trial prefectly unharmed. So, though a great deal was made in the committee of the additional strength of the Ross rifle, it proved nothing. It was subjected to a heavier test and went to pieces, and the Lee-Enfield was subjected to a lighter test and came out all right. This does not afford a basis for a comparison favourable to the Ross rifle.

Now, the contract was made, and I suppose that this is one of the things the minister is proud of, the record of which he would wish to have engraved on his monument when he is called upon to leave this world and pass to another where war is no more. There are just a few comments

I would like to make on the contract. First, there is the reason given for the contract being made, and that reason is set out on the face of the contract. Let us see if in this there is a justification for this expense. The preamble says :

Whereas, it is considered in the general interests of Canada that the rifles required by the government for the purposes of militia and defence should be manufactured in Canada, and whereas the contractor has proposed by himself or his assigns to undertake the establishment and operation of a suitable factory in Canada for the manufacture of such rifles.

Now, are they manufactured in Canada? I do not propose to waste time discussing that. We may bandy words across this floor, but the fact remains that there is not a man in Canada but knows exactly whether those rifles are manufactured in Canada or not. Certain words have a certain meaning. When we speak of a rifle factory in Canada, in order to have our rifles manufactured within our own borders, the ordinary man knows what that ought to mean. It must mean that we can manufacture rifles independent of any foreign power.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. As we manufacture cotton, for instance.

Mr. NORTHRUP. My hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean), like the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), apparently cannot see the difference between a rifle factory and a cotton factory. I suppose that in case of difficulty cotton would not be contraband of war, and that we should be able to bring in cotton. But we certainly could not bring in arms. The government does not establish a cotton factory as it establishes an arms factory, in order that we may be independent of other countries. How can we be independent in this manufacture even if one essential part of the rifle is manufactured outside our own borders? It is all very well for the minister to say that the bulk of these things made outside came in in the shape of forgings. That makes no difference ; if you cannot manufacture your rifle wholly in Canada, there is no object, from that point of view, in having it manufactured here. The hon. gentleman says that we are not supporting the navy of Great Britain because we have not control of the expenditure, but we will help the down-trodden Englishmen by making a contribution by having arms manufactured in Canada instead of England. But I think it would pass the logic of the minister to show how the down-trodden Englishman is to benefit by having arms manufactured here instead of in England.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The stock of the English rifle is imported from Italy, and, I believe, the stock of the American rifle also. I think there are some other parts of the English rifle that are manufactured in Belgium.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I can quite understand that it might be advisable, if England does not raise the wood necessary, to import the stocks. But I can understand also that it would be easy enough to have a sufficient quantity of them on hand. And, as an hon. gentleman beside me suggests, wood would not be contraband in time of war. But when we have only one little factory for the manufacture of rifles, it must be self-evident that the manufacture in Canada is of no value unless practically every bit of the rifle is made here—and on that subject there was no dispute before the committee. The gentlemen examined before the committee rather fenced as to the extent to which the manufacture was carried on in Canada, but it could not be denied that, up to a certain point, the parts were manufactured and brought into Canada. But there is no part of the Ross rifle that is made in Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The steel is not made in Canada.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Then, if the whole rifle is not manufactured in Canada, literally or substantially, what is the justification or advantage of having a factory here at all ; what is the use of it, when the factory could be put out of business in twenty-four hours?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The steel may be made here.

Mr. NORTHRUP. When these articles are made here, and with another and a wiser government in power, it might be well to start a factory. But until these articles are made here——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then the hon. gentleman would have waited until every particle of steel and all the materials could be made in Canada?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I would have waited until so much of the component parts could be made in Canada that there was a reasonable certainty that the remainder could be made in a short time. I think then the establishment of a factory would be justifiable.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And the hon. gentleman's own friends started a cartridge factory, and until this much-abused government came into power every single thing that entered into the manufacture of those cartridges was imported. To-day the shells and a great many other things, practically all are made in Canada.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Quite possibly.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But still this government established a cartridge factory. What was the good of it?

Mr. NORTHRUP. If my hon. friend cannot understand the difference between making a start, doing a little work, and starting at the top and manufacturing the whole thing, making a complete rifle, I do not propose to enlighten him. It is perfectly clear that when this contract provided that they were to manufacture in Canada it provided for something that has not been secured. They were to be provided at a price not greater than the price of similar rifles in the English market. What is the truth about the price of the rifles? I suppose the minister took some steps to find out the proper prices before fixing on the rate of $25. In the report of the committee I see just what he did, and it is fair to say that he took about as much care in that as in any other matter in connection with the contract. He went to Col. Pinault and to D. A. McDonald, the storekeeper, the judge of the clothes for the volunteers, and this matter was referred to them. They say:

In accordance with your verbal instructions of the 7th instant, we, the undersigned, together with the chief small-arm armourer (an expert in this branch of mechanics) have made a careful inspection in every detail of the above rifle, with a view of determining its approximate value as compared with the Lee-Enfield.

The fact that the 'Ross' rifle is a special patent and not to be purchased in the open market, makes its market value more or less a matter of speculation. However, taking into consideration its many advantages and improvements over the Lee-Enfield, as detailed in the armourer's report attached hereto, we are of the opinion that the value of the rifle manufactured in reasonable quantities would be as stated by the armourer, viz., $25.

Next is the armourer's report which is as follows:

I have the honour to report, for your information, that I have carefully inspected the above rifle in all is details, and I find it superior, in my opinion, in every way to the Lee-Enfield.

He had evidently been reading a letter from Col. Hughes, you see.

I consider the straight pull a decided advantage and the resisting power greater than that of the Lee-Enfield. The magazine, back and fore-sights are also a decided improvement; the pistol grip, too, an important change; in fact the whole mechanism of the rifle is more simple in its construction for cleaning and repairing purposes.

I would consider this rifle might be manufactured in reasonable quantities for, say, the sum of twenty-five ($25) dollars, and would be a fair value. This rifle cannot be obtained in the English or any other market. Even were this rifle placed in the open market today, I am still of the opinion, in view of the material improvements, it could not be supplied at a less figure than above mentioned, viz., $25.

Here we have an armourer drawing, I suppose, $2.50 or $3 a day and the Deputy Minister of Militia who probably knew as much as he of the manufacture of rifles, as the minister, and Col. McDonald, equally blessed with information; these gentlemen sit down and deliberately make a valuation based on the extraordinary superiority of the Ross rifle over the Lee-Enfield which had not been established and assuming it to have all the advantages ever claimed for it, they think $25 a fair value. We had bought rifles before, we had bought rifles in 1896 and I think there has been a misunderstanding as to what we paid at that time. We then bought 40,000 rifles, 20,000 from the War Office and 20,000 from small arms manufacturers. We paid for our War Office rifles £2 17s. 3d. It is all very well to talk about $20 but we did not pay anything of the kind. We got with the rifles cleaning rods, for which we pay 8½d., we got a bayonet for which we paid 7s. 4d., a scabbard for which we paid 2s. 4½d., we got an oil bottle for which we paid 12s. 3d. a hundred, and other sundries.

When I speak of this rifle costing £2 17s. 3d. I am putting it against the Ross rifle as it is supplied to us. Why can we not have a fair valuation of rifle against rifle and bayonet against bayonet, take the rifle at the price given for it and the bayonet at the price given for it. If we take the Ross rifle with bayonet and all complete I judge the cost will be $35 or $36 and here we pay £2 17s. 3d. which included 5 per cent for the packing and the total cost of departmental expenses for inspection.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I quoted the prices of the rifle from the trade. The statement the hon. gentleman has just read is not correct.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is absolutely correct.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not correct.

Mr. NORTHRUP. My authority is better than that of the minister a good deal and I challenge the minister to go to his books in his department and disprove my statement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The vouchers are there and I can produce them. The figures I gave are absolutely correct, the rifle cost about £4.

Mr. NORTHRUP. We paid £4 for the rifle?

SIR FREDERICK BORDEN. That is what I said.

Mr. NORTHRUP——to the trade. I said that we bought 20,000 from the War Office and 20,000——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman refused to distinguish them. I

say it is not fair to compare the price paid the Ross Rifle Company with the price charged by the War Office.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am going right on to give the two——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not if I had not called the hon. gentleman's attention.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am going right on with it, I had it here, and why should I have it if I did not intend giving it? I think the minister is rather presumptuous when he says I did not intend to go on. I say the rifles bought from the trade cost £4, sword and bayonet 11s., scabbards 2s. 2¼d., so that it came to £4 13s. 2¼d., and adding 5 per cent for departmental expenses and inspection it came to £4 18s. 3¾d., or $26.29, so that the average price of the 40,000 would be $20,70.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The average price is not fair, it is the price to the trade that must be considered.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The average price is fair for this reason: It would be most grossly unfair for me to say the government should get rifles from the Ross Company as cheaply as from the War Office. It is equally unfair to compare the price to the Ross Company with the price paid to the trade in England.

Sir. FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Certainly most ridiculously unfair. If the minister will tell me of any private factory in England which the government furnishes with all the land it requires and all the working capital needed, I will admit that it is fair to compare the Ross prices with those of such a factory, but until he can do so I say it is unfair.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The only difference in England is that the War Office pays in advance the whole amount.

Mr. NORTHRUP. A letter was read this afternoon in which the trade offers to supply the rifle referred to with an advance of only 10 per cent of the amount.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not correct.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The letter was read and it is absolutely correct.

Mr. FOSTER. I have seen the letter and it is absolutely correct.

Sir FREDERICK BDRDEN. It is not correct.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It was read and it will not do for the minister to deny everything of which he knows nothing.

Sir. FREDERICK BORDEN. I dispute that anyway.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The minister showed how much idea he had of the price of rifles when he added the duty. He says that the rifle would cost $17 and he adds to the cost the amount of the duty. He knows that would not pay the duty and that it would not add to the price if it did. We only pay the duty to ourselves, from one department to another. The question is what it would cost the country one way or the other, and if it would not cost the country any duty in one case then it is preposterous to add the duty in comparing prices. The American government has a rifle which some people think is quite equal to the Ross rifle. I have here a statement, and I think the minister will understand it, which shows the cost to the American government. This is an official letter to the Secretary of State stating that the cost of a rifle to the American government is $14.90, and if it only costs the American government $14.90 to make a rifle it seems to me that we can hardly be said to have secured a rifle on as reasonable terms as the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence has claimed, because we pay Sir Charles Ross $25 and you allow all his material free entry into the country, make him a present of the land and advance him heaven knows how much money. I will come to that later on. I think I have shown that the preamble of the contract has not been carried out, that the rifles are not manufactured in Canada and that they are not as cheap as they could be got in England. Whereas in England we bought our bayonets for 11 shillings—they only cost the War Office 7s 4d—but buying them from the trade we get them for 11s., which is a shade over $2—the Americans get their bayonets for $1.49 apiece.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I thought 11s. was more than a shade over $2.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It would be under $2.25.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think 11s. is nearly $3.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Taking into consideration the minister's price of $5.12, 60 cents on the dollar would not be considered a very great difference. We find by the correspondence of Colonel Cotton that the Ross rifle is not adapted to the bayonet.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not true. There is no rifle with a bayonet in England. The bayonets are made in a different place altogether—made by different people.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am not saying that the bayonet was made in England, but the bayonet goes with the rifle in England.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If you choose to buy it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. We did buy it with the rifle.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We did not buy it from the same place.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I never stated that we bought it in the same place. I am pointing out that the rifle and bayonet can be made so that they can go together because they do go together. The correspondence of Colonel Cotton shows that the Ross rifle is not adapted to the bayonet.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not correct.

Mr. NORTHRUP. That is in his correspondence and I can show that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, some one was stupid enough to ask if the Lee-Enfield bayonet would fit the Ross rifle.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It was not a case of Lee-Enfield at all. I will find it later.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) asked the question.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I was speaking of the contract. Let me go a little farther with this contract. I have only got through the preamble. The contract provides that the government shall receive 12,000 rifles between the 1st January, 1903, and the 1st January, 1904. Then it is provided that subsequently any rifles that the government shall require shall be bought from this company. So that the contract is an absolutely perpetual contract. The government were not bound to buy any number of rifles from this company and that is the only defect in the contract as far as I can see from the contractor's standpoint. Every other thing that the contractor could conceive of was in the contract except that, but I suppose that perhaps the minister thought that owing to the exigencies of parliamentary life he dare not put any specific quantity in the contract; so that from year to year the contractor would have to rely upon the goodness of the minister and have to stand in with the minister to secure the extension of his contract.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. What was the essence of the contract?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Cash, I think.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I admit that was a very important part of it, but I would like to ask my hon. friend if he considers that the essential part of the contract was that the contractor was obliged to sell rifles or whether the essential part of the contract was that the contractor was obliged to manufacture rifles for the government.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The contractor was not obliged to manufacture rifles unless they were ordered. If the government ordered rifles he had to manufacture them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. It is not an ordinary contract of purchase and sale?

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is not an ordinary contract, I must agree; it is the most extraordinary contract that I ever saw in my life.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Do not be funny. It was not an ordinary contract of purchase and sale?

Mr. NORTHRUP. No, nobody will claim that. To go on with this contract, it is admitted that the contract is a perpetual contract, the price being $25, but that may be raised as provided by the contract. Then there is another extraordinary clause. I wonder if this is the particular clause upon which the Minister of Militia and Defence bases his claim to bright, green recollection in the memory of his fellow countrymen after he is gone? It is as follows:

> Provided, however, that in case of war, actual or threatened, or any national emergency, requiring, in the opinion of the government, the immediate supply of additional arms, the contractor, upon receiving any notice or demand from the government for any number of rifles specified to be urgently required in view of this proviso, shall, within thirty days after receiving such notice or demand, notify the government in writing of the number of rifles which he will undertake to furnish in accordance with such notice or demand, and the government shall not, under any circumstances, be bound to purchase from the contractor in respect of any such notice or demand any number of rifles in excess of the number which the contractor so notifies the government that he will be able to supply.

I think my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) had that clause in his mind when he asked me if this was an ordinary contract. We might imagine the jester of a European monarch suggesting in his monarch's ear after the fifteenth course at dinner such an absolutely absurd provision as this. If war breaks out with the States and if we are short of arms the government has the right to call on the contractor to state how many rifles he can furnish and then, after he has thirty days to make up his mind about it, by which time in all probability the Americans will have swept the country, he is to tell the government how many he can supply and then the government are not bound to buy any more from him than the number he has named. No wonder the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence is proud of this monument he has erected in the hearts of his countrymen.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is very funny.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is the funniest thing I ever saw in my life. Then there is the provision that the government has to pay $25 for each rifle. But here is another

extraordinary clause. I have not the faintest idea what it means, but it is here:

The price for all rifles herein contracted for or to be supplied pursuant to the provisions of this agreement shall be payable upon delivery; provided, however, that after the establishment of the said factory and supplying of the plant for the running of the same the contractor shall be entitled to payment in advance of delivery of moneys actually expended upon the rifles or parts thereof or fixtures therefor to be delivered in that year.

You have to give the contractor every dollar he has put in, only in no case is the payment to exceed 75 per cent of the price of such rifles. The meaning is perfectly clear. The rifle is sold for $25, the contractor is entitled to 75 per cent of $25, which is $18.25. Looking at the reasonable profits on this rifle and looking at what it costs the American government to construct its rifle and at what it costs the English government to construct its rifles, we see that $18 would more than furnish the contractor with all the working capital he requires. How was this thing really worked out? Colonel Wurtele was examined and we found out from him. I told the minister that I thought the examination was perfectly absurd and I stand by it. Here is what took place. The contract provides that this 25 per cent is only to be paid on the certificate of the contractor who is to satisfy the government inspector of small arms. The contract, therefore, is dependent solely on the government inspector of small arms. The government had an inspector of small arms there, Mr. Gaudet, and Mr. Gaudet was instructed to take charge of this inspection. Mr. Gaudet was sensible enough to know that he could not discharge the duties that were imposed upon him; he knew that no man living could. When Mr. Gaudet found he was charged with the duty of examining in order to certify the 75 per cent he objected, and at page 235 of the report it will be found that Mr. Gaudet says:

After careful consideration, it is found impossible, under this system to carry out the instructions received, in guaranteeing that the percentage laid down in the contract shall not be exceeded, for the following reasons:

2. The shipments of materials received consists of barrels, receivers and sundry components, far too numerous to mention; to comply with the contract, it is necessary to know the relative value of each component to that of the finished rifle. Similarly, as regards wages, it is necessary to establish the amount which should be expended on each component, in addition to materials, to produce rifles costing not more than $25 each. If the contractor pays more for materials or wages than is necessary, to produce rifles costing $25, the department will be paying a higher percentage than authorized by contract, and thus the invoices or statements produced are inadequate and of little value in determining the amount of advances.

It was the same way about the labour; if the labourers were idle and did not earn 100 cents on the dollar of their wages the government would be paying too much. He says:

The result of this misrepresentation is that an unauthorized advance of $8,000 on fixtures has already been made. What has happened in the case of this special clause, will unavoidably occur again, as I am not conversant with the law relative to the interpretation of contracts, nor have I the advantage of knowing what the parties intended by the present agreement, and repetition of such mistakes may cause trouble to the department. The surest way of precluding a recurrence of such errors, is that the contracting parties, who know the exact meaning of the terms to which they agreed, should themselves furnish interpretations and instructions for the guidance of those concerned.

8. It will be clear from the foregoing that the duties and responsibilities devolving on the inspector are greater than they appear at first sight, and are perhaps in excess of what was intended by the department. For reasons stated above, I beg to be relieved of the responsibility of recommending advances, and that these as well as the interpretation of the contract be dealt with at Ottawa.

There was an honest intelligent man who saw he could not follow out the conditions of this contract, and therefore he asked to be relieved. The government at once took a Col. Wurtele who was at that time in the employ of the Ross Rifle Company. He was not paid by the government it is true; he owed no obligation to the government, he was simply an employee of the Ross Rifle Company and he may be a worthy and excellent man, but according to his own evidence he took the invoices simply and whatever was on their face went. He never heard of a commission for cash, he never heard of trade discounts and inasmuch as every one in business knows, it is as certain as the Ross rifle factory is in Quebec that Sir Charles Ross would never pay cash without getting his trade discounts. We have it as plain as can be that when the government advances 75 per cent on the value of the rifles which means 100 per cent of the value of the goods up to the 75 per cent, Sir Charles Ross is getting perhaps 100 per cent more than he should get if the real truth were known as to the trade discounts he receives. In the same way when Col. Wurtele looks at the wages account he simply sees how much wages is paid and if any man is idle the government loses, and if any man does inferior work the government is losing also. You have absolutely no check in the world either on the value of the material supplied or on the value of the work done. That would be bad enough in all conscience, and that went on for years until the Auditor General had his attention called to it and perhaps it would be interesting to see what the Audi

tor General did about that. In the Auditor General's reports for the fiscal year ending 1907, I find an order in council, which was passed in consequence of a letter from the Auditor General addressed to the Deputy Minister of Militia, dated, Ottawa, June the 3rd, 1907, which winds up in this way:

Let me call your attention to clause 8, where provision is made for the certificate of the inspector of small arms as to the amounts expended by the contractor and upon which the advances have been made, and permit me to say that, while the progress estimates are certified to by the inspector he has informed me that he is not certifying of his own knowledge but on the strength of a certificate made by Mr. Ernest Wurtele, a chartered accountant at Quebec. Now, Mr. Wurtele, may be competent to make the certificate on behalf of the contractor, but as he is not in the employ or under the control of the government his certificate cannot be accepted under the Consolidatel Revenue and Audit Act. If this arrangement of certificates has been made with the consent or on the instrutions of the department and advances made on the strength of these certificates aggregating over $800,000 I must say, that it is not only unbusiness-like but also illegal and no certificates of this nature will be knowingly accepted by this office.

And so we have over the signature of the Auditor General of Canada that under this contract the Minister of Militia deliberately went ahead, overrode the terms of the contract itself and illegally, without any justification whatever paid out over $800,000 to Sir Charles Ross on the certificate of an employee of Sir Charles Ross. Was there ever such a business transaction in this or any other country? Here is this government first agreeing to advance 100 per cent of the value of the goods, all the goods cost, up to 75 per cent of the value of the rifles, and it leaves it to an employee—I care not how honourable Col. Wurtele may be—it leaves it to an employee of Sir Charles Ross who makes out a certificate: amount of material so and so; amount of labour so and so, and the government promptly paid on that certificate to the tune of $800,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The same man is doing the work now.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Ah, yes, the same man is doing the work now, and the government is paying so much more and the same man is doing it because while your inspector of small arms should do the work you drew your contract so stupidly that you gave that officer work that he could not do, and as a sane honest man would not attempt to do. Then, you put the duty on an employee of the Ross Rifle Company, and when you were held up by the Auditor General and you could not pay on his certificate, then in order to carry on your payment to your friends you bring that employee of the Ross Rifle Company over to the government, give him $5 a day and he does the same work as he did before, but this time he does it at the expense of the government. And that is considered a fair business-like way of looking after the interests of the country. And since the minister has been good enough to interrupt me let me see how Mr. Wurtele came over to the government. He came over under a memorandum from the Minister of Militia to council dated the 12th September, 1907, which, after reciting the circumstances, reads as follows:

That Lieutenant Colonel E. F. Wurtele, R.O., was consequently employed for the work and that officer has certified to all progress estimates, which have been paid to the Ross Rifle Company since the contract was entered into, before such progress estimates were authorized for payment.

That is, Col. Wurtele has authorized every single payment up to date says the minister in the order in council. Is that true? The first payment that was made was made on May 26th, 1903, and if we look at the report of the Public Accounts Committee, page 230, we will find Mr. Gaudet was the man who certified to that.

Ross Rifle Works, Quebec, Canada.

Payment application No. 1.

On account of certificate of expenses No. 1 for $91,000, I hereby apply for the payment of $25,000 on account. I hereby certify that I have produced fixtures and material with duplicates of receipted bills attached hereto, for the inspection of the acting inspector of small arms.

I also certify that I have insured the said fixtures for the benefit of the government and deposited the policy with the Bank of Montreal of this city.

(Sgd.) CHARLES L. ROSS.

I hereby certify the above to be a true and accurate statement and recommend payment of the $25,000 on account.

(Sgd.) F. M. GAUDET,
Major,
Acting inspector of small arms.

Quebec, March 24, 1903.

On the 25th of March, 1903, Major Gaudet sends the certificate to the department, and on the 26th of March, 1903, as appears by the Auditor General's Report, $25,000 was paid. So, when the order in council states as the reason for appointing Major Wurtele that he signed every progress estimate since the contract began, I have proved from the files brought down by my hon. friend that, at all events, the first $25,000 was not paid on progress estimates, and I do not know how much more. The reason why Major Wurtele was appointed is thus stated by the order in council:

That before the payment of any such progress estimate, it became apparent that this

provision of the contract could not be satisfactorily carried out because it was undesirable that such payments should be made upon the certificate of the contractor and because of the labour verifying every item thereof, which would devolve upon the inspector of small arms, would seriously interfere with his usefulness as such.

So Major Gaudet made a report showing that the reason he objected to certify was that no honest man could do it, and therefore he asked that the authority be taken at Ottawa for ordering the money to be paid. I say that the order in council brought in by the Minister of Militia recites, not the fact as set out in Major Gaudet's report, but another reason altogether. Surely, if there were nothing else in this contract, this in itself would be sufficient to justify suspicion—that we find in one minute of council two statements which are utterly foreign to the facts set out in the documents brought down by the Minister of Militia himself. The contract also provided that all tools and machinery and raw materials could be brought into this country free of duty. It also recited that any finished parts used in such rifles could be brought in free of duty, showing that at the very time the contract was made the minister understood that finished parts would be imported. It seems to me that if the minister had been anxious to have the rifles manufactured in Canada as soon as possible, and had allowed the unfinished parts to be brought in free of duty, he would have required the duty to be paid on the finished parts to encourage their production in this country.

Now, how did the contract work out? Advances, of course, were called for by the Ross rifle people almost at once. We have in the Auditor General's Report, at page Q—104, a statement showing what the advances were. There is one interesting statement, however, which I would like to give the House, and which, I think, will be surprising to some of the members. I spoke of the valuation being $25. In addition to the rifles we purchase, we have to purchase a great many component or multiple parts, and my information leads me to believe that a great many of these have to be purchased. By a subsequent contract between the company and the government it is arranged that the price to be paid for the component parts added together would be $31 instead of $25, but another inspection increases that to $32. Then advances were made, and for a long time not many rifles were produced. Up to the end of the year 1905 about $600,000 had been paid and only 136 rifles had been delivered. The minister may have thought that was a business transaction, but it seems to me that it would strike the ordinary man that there was something radically wrong with a contract which, made in March, 1902, required 12,000 rifles to be delivered in the following year, whereas the statement brought down by the department itself shows that up to the end of 1905 $600,000 had been advanced and 136 rifles had been delivered.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman will be glad to know that 41,200 have been delivered now.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I would be glad if I thought that the rifles were what the minister tells us they are; but, having the reports of officers and men all over the country who have suffered from the use of these rifles, I am obliged to conclude that the less we get of them the better off we shall be. At the end of the next year 14,000 rifles had been delivered and $800,000 had been advanced.

Something was said this afternoon about the immense amount of wages that were paid by the Ross Rifle Company. I am not in a position to say just what wages they do pay, because I have never been in their employ; but I find a statement, on pages 101, 106 and 126 of the last file brought down, which shows that from the 14th of December, 1906, to the 8th of March, 1907, the total Bill for superintendence and labour was $40,140; from the 8th of March, 1907, to the 16th of August, 1907, it was $42,421; and from the 16th of August, 1907, to the 30th of August, 1907, it was $2,521, making altogether about $85,000 paid for superintendence and labour from the 4th of December, 1906, to the 30th of August, 1907. During these eight and a half months they were supposed to be manufacturing, and I give the figures for these months, because they are the only months for which the returns seem to be brought down. I wish just briefly to recapitulate two or three other points which will show how this contract has been carried on. Very shortly after the contract was made it became necessary to decide what to do about drawings and specifications. They had neither specifications nor drawings, and any hon. member who will take the trouble to read the blue-book will find out how pathetically Colonel Panet kept writing to Montreal to Colonel Gaudet, begging him to see the Ross Company and have them consent to supply drawings and specifications. The pleadings of the Militia Department were most piteous, showing how completely it was at the mercy of the contractor. Finally they agreed upon specifications, but conditional on the minister allowing the contractor to bring in what he liked free from the United States.

Mr. TALBOT. Would the hon. gentleman repeat the figures he gave for the wages last year?

Mr. NORTHRUP. On page 101 of the latest file brought down in April last, I

found the accountant's certificate to the order of 24th December, 1906, for superintendence and labour from the 15th March. It goes down from week to week from the 15th March to the 16th August, and the sum total is $42,421.32. On page 106 from 14th December to 8th March superintendence and labour $40,140.86. On page 126, from 16th August to 30th August, $4,474.18. That would be really three weeks. While this was $4,474.18 I only gave it at $3,528 because two of these weeks overlapped. At the bottom of one of these which I gave before, we find the week that comes up to the 16th August. It struck me as odd that the same week should be in the one place as $1,904 and the other as $2,258—apparently the same week.

After the difficulty about plans and specifications, there came the difficulty about gauges. The department wrote the Ross Company, as soon as they realized that difficulty, that the company must supply the gauges. Major Gaudet was of the opinion that the company should supply the gauges, but the company did not supply them, and after a time the government yielded and gave a contract to the company for these gauges. The contract price was $32,000, and that price was given in the face of the letter of Major Gaudet pointing out that, since there had been no test, he could not give any idea as to whether the price was reasonable or not. The gauges were contracted for on the 14th April, 1903, and they were to be supplied within eight months from that date and there was a clause providing as follows:

Terms—One-half in four months of the acceptance of this tender upon establishing to the satisfaction of the department that fair progress had been made in the manufacture of the gauges and furnishing certificates that the value of the material then in our possession to be used for this work, and the cost of labour in connection therewith, together amount to at least half the total cost of the gauges when completed.

It seems hardly credible, but not a single gauge turned up in the eight months. More months went on and then some material was supplied. Then apparently some 160 gauges were actually supplied. After this the rifle was changed from No. 1 to No. 2 and the gauges were of no use and so no more were got. Practically the result therefore was that the government paid for a lot of gauges which they never received, which were not even made. The total number was to be 489. Not one was supplied until months after the contract had expired. Eventually 162 were supplied. Then when the contract was put an end to, it was put an end to verbally so that it is impossible to know the exact date, and for aught we know the company may have gone ahead manufacturing gauges after the rifles had been changed. They claimed that they were to supply 489, they did supply 162, and said they had ready for delivery 197, yet the government never saw them. Then the company claimed that they had a number of gauges amounting to 130, for which the drawings were made and the material supplied, so that although the government only received 162 out of 489, they paid $26,000 on a $32,000 contract.

Then there was a dispute about some cocking pieces. The government as usual yielded and paid the company a couple of thousand dollars. Then there was a dispute about the sight. A new sight was asked for, the government yielded, and put up $15,000 for a sight. But perhaps the coolest thing of all was a letter from the Ross Company stating that they wanted to stow away some 9,000 rifles and asking for storage room. The government, desiring, of course, to be reasonable, said they would furnish storage room, but the cost of transportation each way would be at the expense of the company. Here is the letter which was written by Col. Cotton:

March 30, 1905.

The Ross Rifle Company made a proposition to the Militia Department to the effect that the department should lend storage room for about 9,000 incompleted rifles, Mark I, until brought forward for completion. These rifles to be transported to and from at the expense of the Ross rifle factory. To facilitate the movement of these rifles, it was decided by the minister to accept an offer of the company to make 400 boxes each to contain 10 complete rifles and to purchase such boxes at the price each of $1.50.

But after getting the minister to agree to buy 400 boxes at $1.50 each, the company came back and said the boxes at that price would not be satisfactory, but that boxes at $2 each would suit. So the minister paid $2 each for 400 boxes to transport 9,000 incompleted rifles for storage until it would be convenient for the company to complete them. That illustrates the way the business was carried on.

Let me call attention to this other fact. The government has spent enormous sums on inspection in addition to the purchase price of these rifles. It takes a great deal to have rifles inspected. You have to put up buildings, heat them, pay salaries, &c. By the time the 50,000 rifles are delivered, the government will have spent at least $150,000 for inspection alone. They have paid over $125,000 to date in connection with the inspection, in which I include the various items of salaries, heating, &c. Here are the details:

Travelling expenses..	$ 1,500
Salaries of inspector's staff..	45,823
Materials for inspection..	3,390
Heating, lighting, rent, &c..	2,188
Extra parts, gauges, &c..	53,029
Total..	$124,942

This is the expenditure up to last March in connection with inspection. So it will come to $150,000 by the time all the rifles are delivered, so that we must add $3 to the price of the rifles there.

Now, talking about heating and lighting, there was a rather odd occurrence in the committee. The Ross Rifle Company claimed quite a large bill for heating and lighting the premises. This was referred to Colonel Cartwright, and if you take the trouble to refer to pages 364-5 and 373 of the report, you will find in full what I will give only briefly. Sir Charles Ross said to the government, in effect: You have been occupying a part of my premises up to 1st May, 1905, and after that date, you occupied more. We have to heat the premises and we want you to make us some allowance. So he put in a claim for $1,746 up to 1st May, 1905—I bring this matter up because it illustrates the way Colonel Cartwright did everything in Quebec in connection with the Ross Rifle Company. He seems to have figured up a certain number of cubic feet that were lying around loose, and, where the company claimed $1,746, he came to the conclusion that they were entitled to $2,247. They claimed for the period after 1st May, $2,614, and he found, by his method of calculation, that they were entitled to $3,166. Their total claim was $5,233, but Colonel Cartwright thought that their bill should have been $6,604. And the government paid them $2,294 and they were mighty thankful to get it. And to make matters more humorous—as the minister seemed to like to look at things in that light, if you will look at the evidence of Major Gaudet before the Public Accounts Committee, you will find that he was asked when he left, and he said he was in the Ross rifle factory up to July 1, 1905. He was asked how much room the government occupied there, and his reply was that it was a little space, 'not bigger than this platform,' referring to the platform in the Public Accounts Committee. So, we have Major Gaudet, who was in charge, and must have known the facts stating that the space occupied was very small. And it must have been, because up to 1905, only 136 Ross rifles had been delivered, so that not much room could be required.

Now, there was another little matter to which I should refer in connection with the history of this affair, and that is the test of rifles at Regina. It was rather an odd thing, because it was done two or three months after the contract was entered into. At pp. 238, 239 and 241 will be found the record of the facts. There is a peculiar letter at page 373, to which I would call the attention of the House. This rifle was taken up to Regina. Those who have read the report will remember what took place. Two rifles were taken there. One was taken for examination, but was blown up, and so they sent for another. It was clear that they found fault with the rifle, but it was pointed out that all they had done was to test it for accuracy and that they knew nothing about its endurance. They wanted a sample to be made and put into the hands of the troops, and they decided that it would not be satisfactory until tried by them. A letter appears from the Minister of Militia, of which the following is a portion:

May 16, 1904.

Dear Colonel White,—I am in receipt of a letter from Sir Charles Ross, dated 12th instant, from which I make the following extract:

In the summer of 1902, the Northwest Mounted Police made a test of my rifle at Regina, with the result that its adoption was decided upon. I inclose you a copy of the report. A pattern was then sealed, which met with their requirements.

The minister comes to the conclusion that the man must be crazy to write such a letter. The committee had not approved the rifle, there was no sealed pattern and he must be dreaming. The only explanation I can make of the examination in Regina was that it was done that some such letter might be written and some department might be induced to purchase rifles for the mounted police, because the contract was made in March and this did not take place until the following summer. And there is an odd letter from Sir Charles Ross at page 470 of the last file brought down:

Now the state of affairs I found would, if discovered by the attackers of the government, have given them unadulterated joy, and would have been a really effective weapon not only against the whole department but against the government itself.

What was the state of affairs, I wonder, that he found when he came back?

Now, Sir, I have many points on which I would like to speak, but at this late hour I will be merciful to the House.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. gentleman need not be 'here, here,' unless he likes. Certainly, I should not if I did not have to. There was one matter that it seemed to me the government was singularly careless about, and that was particularly impressed upon me when Mr. Wallace Nesbitt was here. To my mind, nothing was plainer, in the examination by Mr. Nesbitt before the committee, than that the object was to lay the basis of a lawsuit against the government for damages in consequence of the way they had interfered with the manufacture of his rifle. The whole line of questioning, the suggestions to the witnesses, the line taken by Sir Charles Ross undoubtedly was: You agreed that I should manufacture a certain rifle, you agreed to a certain sample of a sealed pattern. The government had a sealed rifle, but they had no more than got it sealed than changes were

made. Sir Charles Ross requested the first change. If you look into the correspondence, you will see that quite plainly. He wanted a change of a sight and a change of a cocking piece and receiver. Changes were made by him and also by the government. And how did it work out practically? So many changes were made that Mr. Nesbitt gave us before the committee a list, which is printed here, of over eighty changes that were made. Changes were made before the rifle was adopted at all. Sir Charles Ross asked for the three I spoke of. Then the government made others. Then this committee, of which my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is so distinguished an ornament, made fifteen changes, and when these changes were communicated to Col. Cartwright he wanted another. And the changes made in 1904 to Mark I. made Mark II. They went on and changed Mark I, they made change after change. There is one report of Major Pym made in December, 1906, in which he gives about 11 different changes that the Ross Rifle Company had agreed to. There were 8 or 9 more that they thought good but they wanted to know who would pay for them. So we find that many changes were made. The exact circumstances under which the changes were made we do not know. The government contend it was the fault of the Ross Rifle Company and the Ross Rifle Company that it was the fault of the government. But it is clear that when so many changes were necessary the government was too precipitate in entering the contract. It is not necessary to accuse the minister of graft or the contractor of stupidity. It was simply that two men, one of whom had never been a manufacturer of rifles and the other a minister who did not know anything about the manufacture of rifles, attempted at the expense of the country to evolve something they did not understand. The result has been what we might expect, complaint after complaint, and if the case ever got into the courts it would be difficult to say which should be blamed most, the government or the contractor. When they blundered in that way, they changed Mark I and they changed Mark II, change after change was made in Mark I and surely, seeing that, a wise minister would have sat down and decided the kind of rifle he wanted before giving further orders. And yet in March of this year an order was given for 10,000 more rifles. What are the terms of the contract? The rifles are to be of such a kind as the minister may approve of on or before July 15. That was the contract, an order was given for 10,000 rifles and the minister himself did not know what kind of rifles he was going to have. That again is an illustration that justifies us in denouncing the management of the department in connection with these rifles. Just about this time in the month of May a contract is given to the company

for 52,000 bayonets at $5.25 apiece. What is the House to think of a contract for bayonets at $5.25 that in England sell for 11s. while the Americans make them themselves for $1.49. Tenders were asked for. How? Letters were sent to the Ottawa Car Company and the Ross Rifle Company to see if they would tender. Why were these letters not sent to the Chinese laundry companies? Then there might be a dozen peanut stands in the city that would have tendered. Every one knows that they are as likely to tender as the Ottawa Car Company and it seems to be in view of the experience of the government with the Ross Rifle Company, every promise falsified, nothing ever done on time, to make such an outrageous bargain as $5.25 for bayonets, practically without competition is but another illustration of the manner in which this whole contract has been carried out.

I shall yield to the hint of my friend and not occupy the time of the House further. I only wish to say in conclusion that no one can read the evidence taken before the committee and brought down to this House without being impressed with one fact at all events, that if the Minister of Militia or his department, I know not whom to blame, had deliberately tried to prevent any member of this House ascertaining anything about what is going on through a perusal of the files, they could not have adopted a more ingenious way of jumbling them up than they did. The first file brought down contained some 1,152 pages. The first letter in order on that file might be dated 1900 and the next 1905, the next 1906 and the next 1903. A kindergarten could not have more completely jumbled up the files. A letter and the answer of the next day might be 500 pages apart. It was almost an impossibility to ferret out anything from the file. I call the attention of the House to that fact and wish to have it understood by ministers that when files are brought down in compliance with an order of this House they should be brought down in something like reasonable shape and in chronological order. Those who have had occasion to look into the Ross rifle files have had to spend five times the time that should have been required, owing to the lack of order in the files. Any one could see from the files that there is more in this matter of the Ross rifle than the minister would imply when he attacked the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) as being disloyal because he is dissatisfied with this rifle. If the minister is right, if the rifle is the best that could be got, and is really a good satisfactory rifle, let us all join hands in making it a popular as well as an effcient rifle. But when I find reports, as I find them, for I have under my hand here 16 or 17 reports from military boards from Vancouver to Halifax, board after board, carefully meeting, taking evidence and sending

in their reports in every case condemnatory of the Ross rifle, I cannot but feel that all honour must have gone out of Canadian life if all these men have been suborned or all our influence used improperly, when they all attack the Ross rifle; and when I find the solicitor of the Ross rifle stating before the Public Accounts Committee that whenever he met an English officer he met an enemy of the Ross rifle, I think he made an unfortunate statement for the Ross rifle. It could mean only two things, either that he was rightly an enemy, because he should be, or wrongly an enemy because he had been improperly approached and biased. If every English officer is rightly an enemy of the Ross rifle, the sooner we get rid of it and blame the government for introducing it, the better, and if on the other hand, every English officer has been suborned, prejudiced and biased by improper means, so that he is what he should not be, an enemy of the Ross rifle, I for one would lose all confidence in the future of this empire, for I have always understood that an English officer was the synonym for a man of honour. I do not think that is the explanation, I believe that the English officers from their experience for the Ross rifle is well known in England and their knowledge of what has gone on in Canada honestly and conscientiously believe that the Ross rifle is not the rifle it is represented to be, not the rifle the people of this country want, and a rifle of which it may be said that the sooner we get rid of it, the better it will be for Canada.

On motion of Mr. Sam Hughes the debate was adiourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We will go on with this to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.38 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 22, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 172) to incorporate the Dominion Lumbering and Power Company.—Mr. Hall.

USE OF TOBACCO BY YOUNG PERSONS

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 173) restraining the use of tobacco by young persons. He said: This Bill makes an attempt to meet the call which, to a greater or less extent, seems to prevail in many quarters for legislation upon the subject indicated in the title of the Bill, the use of tobacco by persons not of mature years. I cannot pretend to hope that the Bill I am presenting will satisfy those who desire legislation which would absolutely prohibit the manufacture and consumption of tobacco in some particular form which is supposed to be more than ordinarily deleterious. To try to meet in some part, at all events, the evil which is complained of, I am proposing by this legislation to make it an offence punishable by fine, to sell or to furnish to a young person of either sex under the age of 16 years, tobacco in any form for the consumption of that young person himself or herself; and also to make it an offence on the part of any person to sell, or give, or furnish to a young person under the age of 16 years any cigarettes or cigarette papers for the use of that young person or otherwise. The prohibition accordingly will be upon the furnishing to a young person under 16 of cigarettes for any purpose, and equally upon the furnishing to such young person for his or her own consumption, of tobacco in any form. Then I propose to supplement that prohibition by inflicting a penalty upon the young person himself or herself who commits any offence against the enactments in this measure; a penalty in the first instance, upon conviction, of a reprimand; for the second offence, a penalty not exceeding $1; and for the third or subsequent offence, a penalty not exceeding $4. I thought that some form of money penalty of a comparatively small amount would be, possibly, as far as it would be proper to go in the way of punishing the child himself who committed an infraction of this statute. I have also inserted a clause in the proposed Bill giving any constable or policeman authority under by-law to seize upon and summarily forfeit any tobacco which he finds a young person under the age of 16 years about to smoke, or actually smoking, in any street or public place. There is a clause providing for the case of automatic machines for the sale of cigarettes or tobacco in any form which may be used by persons under the prohibited age, and a provision exempting persons who may be employed in trade from the prohibitions of the Bill; also a provision as to the presumption of age, throwing the burden upon the person accused, if he or she appears to be under the age of 16 years, to prove the contrary.

That is the outline of the Bill. I have this further to say, that legislation upon the subject already appears in the statute-books of the greater number of the provinces. I think there is no legislation on the subject in the province of Quebec or in the province of Manitoba; but in each of the other provinces of the Dominion there is

legislation of some nature with regard to this subject. With regard to age conditions, the provisions of the different provincial Acts differ among themselves. There is no provision in any of the provinces that I am aware of making it an offence on the part of the young person himself to purchase or to consume tobacco, although in some instances there is a provision for the summary seizure of the contraband article. There is, however, since the views expressed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Lord's Day legislation in the province of Ontario, room for question whether legislation of this character may not be ultra vires of the provincial legislatures as an encroachment on the domain of criminal law, and in that view, as well as in the view of the fact that the legislation is in the different provinces of such very diverse character, and that it is applied to different ages, it has been thought better that there should be some legislation of general application to the whole of Canada. For that reason this Bill has been prepared, and I now present it and beg to move its first reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGE—MR. BURROWS, M.P., AND TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. T. A. BURROWS (Dauphin). Before the orders of the day are called, I feel it my duty to refer to certain statements in reference to myself that appear in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of May 20, more particularly as these statements were made after I had given my statement on the subject to the House. In the 'Telegram' of that date I find several glaring headlines, this one at the top of the page:

Burrows' possessions.

Limits acquired by Burrows, 1586 square miles.

Then at the bottom of the page:

The Burrows' possessions would span half a continent.

Below this there is a diagram showing a heavy red line on the north side of the Canadian Pacific Railway stretching from Winnipeg to Montreal. Below this there is the following statement:

As stated by H. B. Ames in the House of Commons yesterday, the selected timber limits secured by Theodore Burrows, M.P., brother-in-law of Hon. Clifford Sifton, would if placed end to end, form a continuous strip of thick timber one mile wide stretching from Montreal to Winnipeg.

In other words if Mr. Burrows' limits were flung out in a strip one mile wide it would take an express train two days and two nights to pass from one end to the other.

I want to characterize that statement as absolutely false. It is a slander. Any man who gives currency to it, be he a member of parliament or a private citizen is liar and a slanderer. I do not own half the area of timber stated above and which it is alleged I own, and I have already proven that in this House. I intend to refer to only a few of the statements made in this paper. Here is another false statement:

Since June 6, 1905, Mr. Burrows does not appear to have tendered, at least not under any recognizable name.

I say that statement is false and if the man who makes it took the trouble to look at the records he would have known it was false. This newspaper gives my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) credit for having made that statement although I have not noticed it in the report of his speech, but if he did make that statement I have to say that it is absolutely untrue. I have tendered since that time in my own name on timber limits 1282 and 1312. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) was very diligent in hunting up the records and having done so he should be fair enough not to make statements like the above all of which are untrue and have them published all over the country to my detriment and injury. I feel inclined to apologize to the House for taking up time in referring to these slanderous statements and I would not do so were it not that an occasion of this kind is the only opportunity a public man has to defend himself. Although a great many very unfair and very untrue statements have been made about me during the last six months I have not taken notice of them, and hon. gentlemen will agree with me that I have not intruded on their patience by making personal explanations. All these false statements are made deliberately to do me injury, personally and politically. However, here is another statement contained in an editorial in this newspaper of the same date, and which says:

His (Mr. Burrows') first method was to send in a tender in the regular form with a space left blank for the amount of money tendered, and two or more certified cheques, one large enough to cover the bids already in, and the other against the contingency of late tenders being received. This was the method usually employed by T. A. Burrows himself.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that that statement is absolutely untrue. In any tender which I ever put in, I inclosed the exact amount of my tender and no more. In any tender put in by me it will be found on examination that I specified the amount of my tender. Another statement in this paper is as follows:

On one occasion a berth of 500 square miles was knocked down to the Big River Lumber Company, in which Burrows owned a half interest, for $6,000.

That statement, Mr. Speaker, is also incorrect. The Big River Lumber Company never secured a limit of 500 square miles; they secured a limit of 250 square miles and paid $5,000 therefor.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC SUPPLIES BY AMERICAN ROUTES.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Before the orders of the day, I wish to call the attention of the government to an article published in the British Columbia 'Saturday Sunset' under the title 'A question of vital importance to Vancouver and western Canada.' I wish to ask the government whether they have taken any action with regard to this particular matter and whether it is their intention to do so? The article says :

A question of vital importance to Vancouver and Western Canada.

Does the business community of Vancouver realize the seriousness of the situation which will confront this city from the policy which there are good reasons to believe, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will adopt in using Seattle as the port of departure for Prince Rupert?

Has it yet been borne in upon Vancouver business men that this may become a most critical question for this city?

It is understood that Vancouver stands to lose all the benefits which should accrue to this city from the construction of that line and that we stand in imminent peril of losing the permanent trade of the territory that will be developed in the north.

We have already seen large orders for timber supplies placed in Washington and Montana, while our own mills and logging camps stand idle. No secret is made of the fact that Seattle will be used as the Pacific port of departure for all supplies originating in Eastern Canada for Prince Rupert. From Montreal to Chicago is a haul of about 800 miles over the line of the Grand Trunk Railway. From Chicago the Grand Trunk Railway has traffic arrangements with the C. B. & Q. to St. Paul. At this point it will deliver its freight to the Great Northern for Seattle. It should deliver it by Canadian lines through Vancouver .

Simply and solely because of the traffic and trade, the stimulus to business, that it would bring to Vancouver.

And now we are about to see British Columbia wing-dammed and the trade and other benefits all sluiced into Seattle. We have seen one such exhibition. We saw Seattle grow big and rich and prosperous out of our Canadian Yukon gold fields, while Vancouver beat time and awaited another chance. . .

The special treatment which should be meted out to the Grand Trunk Railway should be a peremptory demand that the Grand Trunk Railway accord to Canada the same consideration which it receives from Canada.

That consideration should be the handling of every pound of freight for Prince Rupert over as many miles of Canadian railways by Canadian workingmen as possible, and the Grand Trunk Pacific and its contractors should be compelled to transport all their supplies entirely through Canada.

Canadian workingmen's interest.

To bring a train of twenty freight cars through from Montreal requires twenty-four crews of engineers, firemen, trainmen and switchmen, a total of 168 men, to bring one train to this port. That train will consume——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman will see that to read an article of that sort is practically a discussion of the general question and that would not be in order. If the hon. gentleman has a question to put about the matter it would be proper for him to do so, but it is hardly proper at this stage to read a long statement from a newspaper.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will not continue, I was about finished. The article merely goes on to show the importance of the freight being carried through our own country.

Mr. SPEAKER. A question may be asked at this stage but no discussion can be entered into and the reading of a long newspaper article of that sort is practically raising a discussion of the whole question. If the hon. member has a question bearing on the matter he should put it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I put the question in the first part of my speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member repeat his question?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask the government what they intend to do with regard to this matter, and whether the Railway Commission has sufficient power to control the shipping of freight so as to secure its going through Canada, for instance by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Do the government intend to take any action in the matter?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). It is admitted with regret that Seattle has grown rich at the expense of Canadian cities owing to the fact that our friends opposite assisted in killing a project to build a railway on all Canadian soil to the Yukon.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid the minister is introducing a controversial question.

Mr. FIELDING. He is simply answering a question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no controversy about that. .

Mr. GRAHAM. There can be no dispute about that fact.

Mr. HENDERSON. Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. GRAHAM. As to the question of freight being shipped through on Canadian lines I imagine it is largely contractors' material that is being shipped and it is a difficult matter at this stage to control the route over which such freight shall be sent. It is hoped and confidently expected that when the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed and even before that, the facilities afforded by Canadian railways shall be so superior that people of their own accord will ship goods over Canadian lines instead of over the American lines.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister observed the report of the Department of the Interior in regard to the Yukon in which it was announced that 80 per cent of the trade of that country is in the hands of Canadians?

STRIKE AT BUCK STOVE WORKS.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) a question based upon a very short statement that I have and which it will be necessary for me to read. The statement is that:

There is a strike of workers at the Buck Stove Works in Brantford and recently forty workers were sent up for trial by Magistrate Livingstone for peacefully picketing. The evidence was that the men were in twos in the neighbourhood of the very extensive premises of the company. They spoke to no one, were perfectly orderly, moved on when told and had been advised by Mr. J. G. O'Donoghue that they had a legal right to peacefully picket for the purpose of obtaining or giving information about the strike.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is doing very much the same as the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) was doing. We have introduced rules to prevent controversial matters being taken up at this point. Questions of importance may be asked of the government but if the habit is going to be introduced in the House of reading statements, which is practically the same as entering upon a discussion, the rule would be an utter nullity.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. These men have been placed in jail for picketing and the question is as to the opinion of the Minister of Justice on the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Without fee of course.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I think that I must disclaim any responsibility or duty in the premises to advise the gentleman in whose behalf my hon. friend has brought this matter to the attention of the House. I have no doubt that the law will be correctly interpreted by the courts before which they come and that any grievance they will have will be adequately redressed.

SUPPLY—THE ROSS RIFLE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding for the House to go into Committee of Supply and the proposed amendment of Mr. Worthington thereto.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the hon. member for North Toronto, (Mr. Foster) what I am going to do now. My first step is to draw closer to my leader in the hope that I may be able to induce him to see the error of his way and later on induce the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) to withdraw the motion which he has placed before the House or to turn around and support me in assisting to vote that motion down. With reference to my leader, I may say at the outset that I wish to correct a false impression which has been insidiously created, or attempted to be created, by gentlemen who have been supporting the views laid down by the hon. member for Sherbrooke. In fact, the hon. member for Sherbrooke himself stated that one reason why this important matter of the Ross rifle tragedy had not been brought by the Conservative party in a formal manner before this House and the country was that the leader of the opposition chanced to be of the same name and of the same family as the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden). In so far as the coming First Minister of Canada, the present leader of the opposition is concerned, in his suggestions to the Militia Committee of the Liberal-Conservative party—a committee of which I have the honour to be chairman—his requests have invariably been to probe to the bottom any matter concerning the militia expenditure of this country, or concerning anything arising from the expenditure of public money or the conduct of public affairs in connection with that department. He has given the same encouragement to inquire into the affairs of that department as he has to investigate other departments. I shall have something to say upon that subject later on. There is one thing that the hon. member for Sherbrooke is noted for, in which he stands pre-eminent, and that is the magnificent smile that he has. He is smiling now, but before I get through I purpose endeavouring to show that smile on the other side of his face. I purpose endeavouring to show what his conduct has been in the treatment of this matter. He may say that the Militia Committee has never done its duty. It rests with the hon. gentleman or with any other hon. member who discusses this question fairly and squarely to show wherein there has been anything neglectful or improper on my part in looking after the militia interests

of this country. Long years ago, when the Conservative party went into opposition, the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles Tupper spoke to me and asked me to take general supervision of the militia affairs of this country. I consented to do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Lightened the task of the minister!

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I mean from an opposition viewpoint—as far as criticism by the Conservative party is concerned, and I had the honour of being asked, when the Conservative party was in power, of occupying the position of Minister of Militia in this country. Sir Charles Tupper asked me, in opposition, to take general supervision of the militia affairs of this country and I consented to do so on the distinct understanding that, in so far as practicable, questions bearing upon the militia should be removed entirely from the arena of party politics. When Mr. R. L. Borden was appointed leader of the opposition I had the same understanding with him—that, as far as possible, matters affecting the militia would not be thrown into the arena of party politics unless it were absolutely necessary. You may search the records of the United States in vain, you may search the records of Great Britain in vain, of France or any other civilized country on the face of the earth; to the hon. member for Sherbrooke belongs the unique distinction of having first brought into the arena of party politics the discussion of the weapon or the arm that we may be called upon to use. Millions upon millions of dollars have been expended in Great Britain in changing rifles, in testing rifles; millions upon millions have been expended in the United States, as I shall show, in testing and changing rifles and I challenge the hon. member for Sherbrooke, with all his detective instincts, to produce one solitary instance wherein a member of parliament in Great Britain, or of Congress in the United States, or any representative of the people, has been found base enough to stand in his place, as this hon. gentleman has stood for two sessions, and endeavour to create personal animosities at the expense of the arm of the country. There are ways and ways of criticising these matters. The little defects—I use the term 'defects' advisedly—that have cropped up and shown themselves in connection with the Ross rifle from time to time, were being removed one after the other and the report to which reference has been made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, the criticisms of those wiseacres in England and the criticisms of others in various parts of the country were not the means of calling attention to these defects, because they had been discovered and remedied by the Canadian committee before these reports were received in this country. However, the hon. gentleman told us last night how he had been sitting impatiently all session in order to get strewing the earth with the fragments of this Ross rifle and with the remains of the hon. Minister of Militia and incidentally with those of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton. Well, Sir, the mountain has laboured and brought forth a mouse, stillborn. Whether it was due to the fact that the parentage and the medical attendance were one and the same person or not I give it up, but it is the sorriest object I have ever seen presented to the people of a free country. I regret very much that on the present occasion I have to take issue with the Conservative party, but it is not the first time I have done so. One thing that I do remember having heard the late Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat say was that next to the approval of his own conscience he regarded the honest opinions of his fellow men. That is exactly the position in which I stand. But much as I regard the approval of my fellow men, I regard the approval of my own conscience very much more. In matters of politics, I am prepared to follow my leader in non-essentials, but in essentials I claim the right to follow my own bent, and I am prepared to abide by the consequences. I do not deny that it gives me a good deal of tribulation not to have my friends in the Conservative party stand with me; but on other occasions when I have differed from them, I have had the endorsation of the people of my own county. I have learned that my scalp remains on my head, not by grace of the hon. member for Sherrbooke or of any other set of men in this country.

On two notable occasions I have differed from my party. One of them was the occasion of the Manitoba School Act of 1896 when my good friend the present member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) sought with his mellifluous voice to induce me to give up the line of conduct which I had laid down for myself and take another line. I did not choose, as some other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House did, to follow the bad leadership on that occasion of the present right hon. First Minister, nor did I choose to follow the leadership of the present member for North Toronto. I took the line that there should be no separate schools imposed on Manitoba either then by the Liberal-Conservative party or six months after through the instrumentality of the First Minister. I took the stand that the people of Manitoba should be left free to take their own course, and, Sir, I faced the best gentlemen that could be sent by the First Minister or by the emissaries of the Conservative party who wished to destroy me, and I had the endorsation of the people of my county, and to-day I have the endorsation of the people of Canada along that line—at least the endorsation of any whose endorsation I care to have.

Another occasion on which I differed from

my party was in the year 1898, when the Yukon question was before this House. The Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Conservative party at that time, conceived the idea, the patriotic idea, of having an all-Canadian route into the Yukon. His idea was to have the road start from Kitimaat Harbour and pass up through Canadian territory behind that strip of Yankee territory and into the Yukon country, I will not be contradicted by Sir Charles Tupper nor by any other man later on, for I know whereof I speak. With a broad spirit of patriotism Sir Charles Tupper approached the Minister of the Interior of the day, the Hon. Clifford Sifton, and induced Mr. Sifton to make that a plank in the platform of the Liberal government of the day. The question came before the country. The proposition did not commend itself to the present member for North Toronto; it did not commend itself to the Toronto 'World;' it did not commend itself to certain other gentlemen in the Conservative party. The agitation broke out and Sir Charles Tupper had reluctantly to bow in order to hold his leadership of the party and oppose his own project. I know whereof I speak. I chanced to be in Australia at the time. When I returned to Canada I found to my regret that Sir Charles Tupper had seen fit, in order as he thought to hold his party together, instead of breasting the storm, to turn around and oppose the project. The last time Sir Charles Tupper ever addressed a Conservative open causus in Ottawa—it is no secret, because he has himself told it publicly—in his own home down on the banks of the Ottawa, he stated that in the past the Conservative party had made two mistakes. One of them was a trivial affair, the other was that it had not loyally supported the Liberal party in pushing an all-Canadian route into the Yukon. I have seen the country, Sir, both on the Manitoba school question and on the Yukon question, come to endorse the stand I took in differing from my party on those occasions, and I have seen the best men of my party acknowledge that in stepping out from my party on those two questions I was right. I have no fear, Sir, that in six months or a year from to-day, possibly a much shorter time than six months, the universal sentiment in the Conservative party will be that I have taken the right line on this matter, and that the gentlemen who have followed the lead of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, misled by his little tittle-tattle of newspaper yarns throughout the country, will discover their mistake. At any rate, I am not losing any sleep over the issue; I am standing by the dictates of my own conscience.

Now, Sir, the question of a rifle is before the people of Canada. The hon. member for Sherbrooke has been instrumental in various ways in endeavouring to create sentiment against the government on this matter. If it were merely a question of creating a sentiment against the government, I think from my record in the past I could be trusted to do my duty for the Liberal-Conservative party to nearly as great an extent as the hon. member for Sherbrooke. Ask the Liberal-Conservatives in any constituency in the Dominion of Canada, and they will tell you that wherever my services could be of avail, they have always been at the disposal of the Liberal-Conservative candidate, and I can say without any egotism that the Hon. J. P. Whitney has on more than one occasion stated that I am possibly the only member of parliament who on all occasions has been ready in season and out of season to do his duty for the Ontario Liberal-Conservative party. What is the record of my hon. friend from Sherbooke? What has he done for the Liberal-Conservative party? In 1904 did he not bring members on the government side of the House and demand that the Minister of Militia give him the position of principal medical officer of the militia force of Canada? Did he or did he not? He dare not deny it.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What does the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I ask the hon. member for Sherbrooke did he or did he not demand of the Minister of Militia that he be given the position of principal medical officer of the militia of the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I did not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. All I have to say is that the hon. gentleman admitted it to me in the presence of Dr. Daniel, the member for St. John.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. That is absolutely untrue. He did not utter these words.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) also said the same thing publicly, namely, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Worthington) had demanded from the Minister of Militia the principal medical officership for the Dominion, and then when he could not get it, threatened he would go back to Sherbrooke and run in the Tory interest. Then there was a sort of bargain made, and he agreed to take the position of principal medical officer for the province of Quebec. But the Minister of Militia, with his usual lethargy, was so slow in getting the appointment through, that the hon. gentleman was elected about the time he got it. Then we all remember that the Minister of Justice of that day (Sir Charles Fitzpatrick) had an Act passed amending the Act relating to the independence of the members of parliament in order to allow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Worthington) to draw out his pay of $1 or $1.25 per day, every day of his life-

time, in the position he holds in the province of Quebec. This is the gentleman who has the assurance to cast an imputation on my loyalty to the Liberal-Conservative party. Would or would not the hon. gentleman have been prepared to accept another military medical position, one at Victoria, since he has had a seat in this House? We know he would. And he forsooth is the man who drags the Liberal-Conservative party through the mud and mire in connection with this question of the Ross rifle. Later on I shall dissect the causes and motives of his action.

I do not object to criticism of rifles or criticism of any kind. A man in public life who thinks he is above criticism had better retire. I am always ready to meet my critics and give them a Roland for their Oliver. But we find various classes of critics. As far as the Ross rifle is concerned, there is no doubt room for some criticism. In fact there has never been a rifle issued yet that was above criticism. And whenever there has been a change of rifles, there always has been criticism and hostility to the change. When Colonel Dennison of Toronto was down here with his little operatic company playing in a theatre, one of the comedy hits was a statement that certain soldiers, in firing at the enemy, had missed, and fortunately missed, for they happened to be firing on their own friends. And when the thing came to be investigated, it was found that they were armed with the new rifle which accounted for their fortunate bad shooting. The hon. gentleman was present and his mouth almost split open with laughter because he thought the joke was on the Ross rifle. But as a matter of fact when the piece was written, the change had been made in the British army from the Martini to the Lee-Enfield, and the opposition was so strong to the change, that plays were written belittling it all over the British empire. I have never yet seen a change from one rifle to another which has not created wide dissatisfaction, unfair criticism and hostility. The soldiers, who have been accustomed to using the one rifle, will always find something to condemn in the new.

As a critic I myself am always anxious to get a crack at the enemy, but I am one of those who like to be sure of their data before going ahead. Nevertheless we cannot all examine into the details of every case, and in politics we have to be led by sentiment in many of these matters, and that is why the Liberal-Conservative party to-day finds itself committed to the motion submitted by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington). These men are absolutely honest and deserve every consideration, and I do not see why I should have the slightest feeling against any member of our party who deems it his duty to vote for this resolution? I know what their sentiments are and what their actions would be if this thing came up six months from to-day.

We have had the criticisms of the honest riflemen of the country, but taking the sum and substance of the criticisms which the hon. gentleman laid on the table yesterday, what do they amount to? A lot of tu'penny-ha'penny little things that would not be regarded as of any importance. Foresight screw loose, back sight out of shape and so on. Let me give the criticism of honest riflemen. They say that for rifle shooting, you must have a heavier barrel. Well, we have got that now. I shall not charge the hon. gentleman with dishonesty because I am not sure whether he knows that the United States have a short rifle and a long rifle. The English have a short rifle and a long rifle. And at not one of the important matches in England or the United States is the short rifle used. Why then should the short rifle of Canada be put in competition with the long rifle of other lands? At the Palma match at our range last year, which the right hon. the First Minister honoured with his presence—I was sorry not to have my hon. friend the leader of the opposition there—not a short rifle was used. The Yankees since 1903 have had the short rifle but they have used the long rifle, England uses the long Lee-Enfield, and so do the Australians. Why was the hon. gentleman not honest enough to say that for target purposes the short rifle is never put in competition with the long rifle? I appeal to my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) who, thirty or forty years ago, knew something about rifle shooting.

Mr. FOWLER. Before you were born?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. That is the time you won that Fenian medal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is right. I appeal to my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) to state whether in those days he used his cavalry carbine in competition against the long Snider. These riflemen criticise the light barrel for target purposes; they criticise what I may term the abominable back sight on the rifle, and very rightly. But the back sight is one of the fads introduced in imitation of the Boers. The Mauser rifle, which was used by the Boers, had this lever sight. The sight hinged and worked from a lever back. It seemed to answer for field purposes; and consequently it was adopted, not only in England, but for a time in Canada and the United States. In Canada it has been discarded and also in the United States and its life will be short in England. The honest riflemen criticise the fastening of

the barrel and the receiver. One of the criticisms made by a few of the critics has regard to the attachment of the barrel to the receiver and it is a very judicious criticism. The old attachment in Mark I was on fine thread. In Mark II it was changed to a large single coarse thread and that has been found in odd cases to work loose. It has been abandoned. Then the safety catch is another of the objectionable features. And speaking on this one thing, the hon. member for Sherbrooke said it was criminal on the part of the Minister of Militia to allow it to go before the people.

I was pointing out what the people of the United States have been doing in rifle matters. In 1900 they modelled their first short Springfield rifle. In 1901 it was adopted; in 1902 it was perfected. And in 1903 it was put into the hands of the troops. I have here their latest issue of instructions and I commend this to the Minister of Militia. These instructions were issued on March 3, 1904, revised April 18, 1906, and reissued on February 14, 1908. They are entitled: Instructions regarding the use of the United States service rifle. Although the rifle has been in the hands of the troops all these years, though it has been perfected from time to time, nevertheless we find instructions issued in regard to the safety catch in these words. I quote from the Instructions:

Precautions.

If it is desirable to carry the piece cocked with the cartridge in the chamber, the bolt mechanism should be secured by turning the safety lock to the right. In this position it is important that the safety lock be kept turned fully to the right, since, if it be turned to the left nearly to the 'ready' position and the trigger pulled it is possible that the sear may not engage the cocking shoulder. Should this happen the rifle will be discharged upon turning the safety lock fully to the ready position. Under no consideration should the cartridge be left in the chamber.

Identically what is pointed out if the safety catch in old Mark II does not engage properly. But, unlike the American rifle, the Canadian rifle—the Ross rifle—has amended this defective safety action. The English government have a safety action on the old long Lee-Enfield which is absolutely dangerous. And here is the instruction in the new work of the United States government, showing that on the 14th of April last, their safety catch is still absolutely unsafe, whereas as soon as we found any difficulty in the safety catch of the Canadian rifle we amended it, and it is as safe to-day as if the rifle were not loaded. So the only real criticism that was made against the safety of the rifle, so far as the safety catch is concerned, has been exploded. Let me point out that, before the safety catch in the Mark II Canadian rifle could do any harm, the rifle must be loaded, the safety-catch must be pushed in only half way, the trigger must be pulled so as to disengage the sear, and the safety-catch must then be released again. You must go through all these unlikely performances before an accident can occur in the Canadian rifle. In the American rifle they still have the danger, all must, and do, warn their soldiers against it.

Now, there is another criticism made, honestly made, and one worthy of note, and that is that the sights on the short barrel are so close together that one cannot get proper range in firing. That is known the world over.

But there is a critic of another class to whom I shall refer. He is a gentleman who is after personal preferment, possibly gain of some sort, or, possibly, after the scalp of his neighbour, with no fair justification. This is the class of critic you will sometimes find—whether in this case or not, we shall see later on. Before proceeding further, I desire to give a little history of rifles. And I may say that had this motion presented by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) been couched in somewhat different terms, if it were expressed in a little different tone or by any other man, it might have had some encouragement from me. For, I feel that the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is more or less open to serious condemnation for his apathy—not to apply any harsher term—in trusting, as he has done, in the past, to his ordnance officials to too great an extent. He failed to send out instructions, similar to those I have shown in the American book, as should have been done in the case of an issue of new rifles. At all events, as responsible head of the department, the minister must be held answerable for this. I think the minister should have given more personal supervision to this important matter; he should have made sure that his ordnance officers, of one class and other, knew their business. I do not think they did know their business. I have no desire to injure any man, but I have no hesitation in saying that the gentlemen who have been in charge of these matters have not always been up with their business. I will go so far as to say that many have strong personal animus and may have been endeavouring to kill this rifle. That should not be tolerated by the minster. Had I anything to say about the matter, the head of such an officer would soon drop in the basket. If I saw such work as has been going on here, such confidential reports given away as have been given away, and encouragement given to destructive criticism, drastic action would have been taken; and, if that had been done, the matter would have gone along much more smoothly. I condemn the minister for not giving out instructions when the rifles were issued. He is now issuing these instructions when it is practically needless. He

should have done what was done in the case of the Lee-Enfield. When that rifle was put in the hands of our soldiers, as commander of a regiment, I received positive instructions that the rifles were not to be left in the hands of the soldiers even over night. The rifles were to be placed in the boxes, shipped to the central armoury of the regiment, and taken out by an experienced armourer, and placed in the racks. We had to go to considerable expense, in our regiment, in order to carry out these instructions. Not a man, not even the company armourer was allowed to take out one of these rifles. If anything went wrong with a rifle it was handled as carefully as eggs and sent to the official armourer sergeant. No such instructions as these were sent with the Ross rifle. At once the critics got after the rifle. Instructions were given by the Master General of Ordnance to have all the reports of faults sent to the department. The rifle was torn to pieces, the foresight was taken off, the backsight taken to pieces, the bolts dismounted and not put back properly, and so on. It was no wonder the rifles met with mishap in these minor matters.

Now, in justification of the few changes that have been made in the Ross rifle, I wish to run over some of the changes that have been made in the Lee-Enfield—not to go back to the Enfield, or the Snider, or the Martini, all of which have been official in my own time. Mark I of the Lee-Metford rifle was adopted in December, 1888. If any hon. members are curious to get the full details, I have them here in the official Red Book issued by the British War Office. Then came the Lee-Metford Mark I* which was issued in January, 1892. The Lee-Metford Mark II was issued in April, 1892. The Lee-Metford Mark II* was issued in April, 1895. The Lee-Enfield Mark I, was issued in November, 1895; Lee-Enfield Mark I* in 1898, about the end of the year. These are all long rifles, and all are practically different marks of the long Lee-Enfield. Then came out the short Lee-Enfield. There have been one or two marks of the long Lee-Enfield since. Then there was the Mark I short Lee-Enfield issued in 1903, and there have been two different Marks since then to my knowledge, and I am told, three or four more. That is, in the long and short Lee-Enfield the official arm of the British service, we have ten or twelve distinctive issues and distinctive marks. The changes that have been made in some of these are shown in the official red book. In one change alone, that is from Lee-Metford Mark I* to Lee-Metford Mark II, the first issued in January, 1892, and the second in April, 1892, the changes made in the rifle, as tabulated here, item by item, at pages 314 and 315 of the red book of the British army, are no fewer than one hundred and twenty-five in number.

In other words, in that one change alone from the Lee-Enfield Mark I star to the Lee-Enfield Mark II, there were more important changes twice over than have taken place in the Ross rifle from start to finish. The history of the Ross rifle is simple. A number of years ago Sir Charles Ross, a young fellow in the old country with more enthusiasm than judgment, to my mind—I refer now to his risking his own financial interests in this rifle—an enthusiastic soldier, invented a straight pull rifle which is practically the same rifle as has been adopted by the Swiss and Austrian governments. We hear a great deal about the splendid service of the Swiss nation, and their rifle is practically the same as was first invented by Sir Charles Ross. I will not go into details of the rifles introduced here, but I will refer to the reports made on the Springfield, Lee-Enfield, and the reports made by the British War Office at Woolwich in connection with the Ross rifle, and show that the Ross rifle compared favourably with any rifle in the experimental stage of its career. Sir Charles Ross carried one of these rifles through the South African war. That rifle is to the front, and it is in splendid preservation, after having served through the South African war, just as the Ross rifles that are in the racks all over the country to-day are in splendid condition, and are ready to take the field at a moment's notice. I may point out here that the highest record for shooting that ever was made by any rifle was made by one of these rifles taken out of the rack in the city of Quebec the other day, taken out by the enemies of the rifle, and handed to a soldier, Lieut. Mortimer. He made with that rifle the magnificent score of 35 aimed shots to the minute, and every one of them hit the target, a thing that never was paralleled in the history of the world. The highest score up to that, I think, was 25 or 27. I think Wallingford made 27 with the Lee-Enfield at one time. But Mortimer hit the target with the Mark II Ross rifle 35 times in one minute, firing Mark II, a score that has never been equalled. He made 34 in a minute with Mark III, when the rifle was on trial for adoption. Now let me give you the result of trials of the rifle for adoption, and if we can see that the Ross rifle has come nearly up to the standard of the test of other rifles, in its experimental stage, surely there is no great disgrace to the Ross rifle, and no great cause of condemnation. I have here the United States report sent me by the Secretary of War, the report for 1901. It speaks of the board having made a test of the new United States rifle, and goes on to say:

> Rapidity with accuracy—At the third shot, a cartridge fed from the magazine, one cartridge going into the chamber and one partially out of magazine.

Then it speaks of jamming:

> It was noted that the clips were a little weak and bent when the cartridges were be-

ing forced into the magazine. The second and third clips were hard to operate. At the fifth clip there was a delay, due to difficulty of operation, of about 10 seconds. During the firing of the sixth clip a jam occurred. The second cartridge wedged forward, the rim being out of the channel.

Now comes rapidity at will, that is, an unaimed fire from the hip:

Jammed after the second shot, one cartridge partially in chamber and next wedged between upper cartridge and receiver.

That is the rifle which was officially recommended by the board of United States officers for adoption in their service. The first test was repeated on account of the failure.

Cut-off worked out almost entirely.
(a) repeated; cut-off worked out again completely.
(b) Repeated again; first shot caused cut-off to work partially out, allowing bolt to catch cartridge in magazine.
The cut-off was pushed in and another shot fired; this also caused the cut-off to work out.
After another shot, bolt just passed over head of upper cartridge. This was tried twice more, with the same result.

Now we come to the endurance test. Speaking of the firing:

At the first push of the bolt forward two cartridges started to feed forward, the lower cartridge being in advance with head out of guide groove.
During the firing of the second clip, when cartridges were pressed down, the next to the top cartridge clipped forward so that the head of the top cartridge was in rear of the head of the one below it, and when the bolt was pushed forward the two cartridges were carried forward together, causing a jam.

And so on page after page of this book speaks of the jamming and blockading of this American rifle. At the end of the report we find the following:

Conclusion—The board is of the opinion that the arm has successfully passed the test to which it has been subjected, the minor difficulties which were experienced being only what might reasonably be expected in the case of a new gun that had not been previously tested.

There is the official report of the board of the United States government on their splendid new rifle, said to be the best rifle in the world. Next, I come to 1902 where we have another report. In 1903 we come to another official test. On page 11 of the report of the Secretary for War, we find section 26:

As a result of the tests a good many changes were embodied in the arm, the most important of which were the following:

Then come six important changes and several minor changes made two years after it had been officially adopted, but I will not trouble the House by reading them. Now we come on to the test after it had been perfected for two years, and was found by thousands in the hands of the troops:

First lot of 100 cartridges fired from the magazine; time, 6 minutes. When charging the magazine with two of the clips the cartridges stacked; that is, the second cartridge remained directly above the first, along the right wall of the magazine, and all five cartridges could not be inserted.
Third lot of 100 cartridges fired from the magazine; time, 8 minutes. For the last 50 shots the bottom cartridge could not be fed from the magazine, as it was caught between the rib on the follower and the right wall of the magazine.

Then we find page after page of trials, and page after page showing defects in what is claimed to be the greatest rifle in the world to-day. In 1904 we find in the report of the Secretary of War a description of a change of the rifle, making the twist in grooving one in 10 inches, after various experiments. Coming down to 1905, four years after it had been officially adopted, what do we find there?

Changes made in four important features allowed only 34,000 finished arms to be assembled during the fiscal year.

He goes on to name them, four important changes, with several minor ones made in that year. On page 19 and following pages of the report of the Secretary of War for 1905, and even down to 1906, on page 20, we find this in the official report of the Secretary of War for the United States on this splendid rifle, the greatest in the world, that had been in the hands of the troops for five years:

Reports of the breakages have been received, but no trouble is anticipated from the parts made of the proper material. Other minor defects have also been developed, but corrective measures have been applied, and it is believed that the new musket will go into the service practically perfected.

Here is the report of the government of the United States and here is the line of conduct pursued by patriotic men in that country. They all settle together as to what changes should be made in the rifle, they agree as to the defects, and having determined these defects, they are properly remedied. They are laid before the board and they are remedied, but there are no pyrotechnics, no efforts to blast men's reputations or to drive men out of public life and no attempt to make political capital out of a question of this kind. In the report of 1907 what do we find?

The minor defects mentioned in my report of a year since have been overcome, and, with the exception of the weapons in the hands of the troops, the greater part have been rechambered for the model of 1906 ammunition.

So that they had to rechamber every rifle that they issued in order to meet the requirements of the service in that country.

That, Sir, is the record of the United States rifle. What is the record of the Canadian rifle ? Mark I was issued ; certain improvements were made in it. Mark II was issued. Certain changes were made from Mark I to Mark II which did not turn out to be very advantageous. These were changed back again from Mark II to Mark III. The old lever backsight has been abandoned and a return has been made to the form presented in old Mark I. The thread attaching the barrel to the receiver in Mark II has been abandoned and a return made to the thread in the old Mark I. This is the Whitworth thread. When Sir Charles Ross presented his rifle to the committee it had a double trigger action, it had a gathering pull and a final pull. That was in the rifle which he presented for adoption. We have abandoned the single pull and returned to the double trigger pull as presented in the original rifle. We have also returned to the long barrel so that it may be better adapted for shooting purposes. We have also done what the United States people have not yet been able to do and what the English people have not yet been able to do ; we have an absolutely perfect safety catch which acts the moment the sear is released from the cocking piece bent and insures its safe reengagement. There are some small changes, such as screws, bands and swivel straps, which are of no account. Last year, in my address to this House, I went with considerable detail into the difference between the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield rifle. I do not know that it is necessary at this time to repeat that comparison. There are important differences but they are involved in the one great principle of the straight pull. That is only two motions, in loading and firing, simply pulling the bolt back and pressing it forward again, as against four motions in what we call the lever or rotary motion rifles. The two nations that use straight pull rifles are the Austrian and Swiss nations. The other nations largely use the rotary motion. Fault was found by the hon. member for Sherbrooke yesterday with regard to the report of the United States government on the Ross rifle test at Springfield. I think I have made it absolutely clear that the report upon that rifle is satisfactory, taking into consideration the report of the same committee upon their own rifle. There have been fewer changes made in the Ross rifle since that date than in the American rifle. I have known a number of gentlemen high up in the Ordnance Department of the United States and had they not adapted, two years before, Sir Charles Ross appeared before them, the new Springfield rifle, the chances are a thousand to one that the United States government would have adopted the principle of the Ross rifle for their national arm.

I now come to the question of long and short rifles. The question of the backsight is the crux of the whole situation and the cause of the whole dissatisfaction with the Ross rifle. There is, I am free to say, in the lever backsight, an abominable sight to the Ross rifle. No man can make good scores consecutively with it. The sight will jump four or five degrees when the recoil comes. With the lever sight there is a straight reaction and a shock which frequently jars the springs holding the sight in its position and a change of three or four degrees would make a difference of 200 or 300 yards in the sighting of the rifle. The South African war was responsible for the fad of the lever or Dutch pattern sight. After the South African war the British government changed to the short barrel, adopting what they call the Dutch pattern sight and discarding the bayonet. But, they have got over that. We have seen the effect of the short barrel. The Russo-Japanese war showed the effect of the long barrel on accurate shooting. They found out that the short rifle was no good for accurate shooting. In all the matches held in England last year, at Bisley and everywhere else, there was not one short rifle in use, and in the great matches of the United States last year there was not one short United States rifle in use, although the new United States rifle has an initial velocity of 2,700 feet to the second and in that way it is supposed to overcome the defect of the short barrel. The Lee-Enfield barrel (short) is twenty-five inches long, the American rifle is twenty-four inches long and the Ross short rifle twenty-eight inches long, a little longer than either and, to that extent, better adapted for good shooting. That it has been successful in making a good shooting rifle I might refer to the fact that last year in Toronto Mr. Mortimer took the first prize in the aggregate matches even with the old lever sight, and I might also state that at the Ottawa ranges Ommandsen and Wallingford, the two noted English riflemen, made most magnificent scores. Ommandsen named his shot every time but he did not have the lever backsight on. He had the Sutherland sight. He named every shot. He said : I am going to make a bull at such and such a spot and he fired and made the bull. He hit the target in every instance at the exact spot that he had named. But, he admitted that holding the short barrel is much harder on the men. It calls for the exercise of much greater physical force to hold the short barrel down to position than if it were a more substantial and steadier barrel. There is a return in Mark III to the long rifle, first, on account of the accuracy of shooting, second, it is better adapted for the bayonet, and third, it has been shown that the important feature of warfare is no longer masses of men and troops but that the result depends largely on accurate

shooting. In warfare to-day the effort is made to fire at individual men when one sees them. You rarely ever get a chance to fire at large masses of men. The great advantage of a rifle of this kind is that a sharpshooter can get his position and pick the gunners off the guns as far as they can be seen, and they can do it at 3,000 yards without much trouble.

We have, therefore, decided to return to the use of the long barrel. One was sent to British Columbia and it has given great satisfaction. I have letters and telegrams from various parts of the Northwest urging that the long barrel, Mark III, be rushed through immediately so that it can be used at Bisley and in the rifle matches this year. One of the highest scores ever made in Canada was made last Saturday at the Ottawa ranges, Mortimer scoring 102. Major Sutherland in the first shot made 97, and Major Hutcheson firing over the ranges first time of firing made 96 out of 105. It may be asked what use is this fast shooting ? I will tell you. The rule in warfare as regards the rifle is that you want to get the maximum of energy with the minimum of time and the maximum of effectiveness. The Ross rifle in the hands of Mortimer at Quebec a few weeks ago—when this whitewashing expedition was sent down there according to the member for Sherbrooke—was subjected to a public trial and the public trial was made because the 'Star' and its satellites in Montreal would have described it as a hole and corner affair if the test had been private. The famous man of the Montreal 'Star' stood there with his mouth wide open as if it were stretched when he saw four shells in the air at a time when the Ross rifle was being fired. Mortimer has made his record several times with a Ross rifle and he made it with this despised Mark II taken out of the rack there, and that record is 35 per minute aimed fire. The record of the Lee-Enfield with Wallingford, the most famous shot in the British empire, is 27, and the record of the United States rifle was 24, and this year it is 25. Here is the contrast: Ross rifle, 35 per minute aim fire ; Lee-Enfield, 27 per minute aim fire ; United States rifle, 25 per minute aim fire. Then, firing at random, at the enemy in the dark for instance; from the hip or the side unaimed fire. The United States rifle has gone as high as 35 to the minute ; the English rifle, I believe, has never exceeded 27, while the Ross rifle has gone as high as 50 to the minute unaimed fire, showing that in every respect the Ross rifle is infinitely superior in its rapidity of fire. At Quebec the Ross rifle fired 150 rounds, made 147 hits, 34 of which were bullseyes and all the rest close around the bull, in five minutes and one second, and they started with the magazine empty. That has never been approached in rifle shooting before.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the meaning of the magazine being empty?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If a man starts with the magazine full he has five shots advantage, and with the magazine empty he has to put in five shots or ten, as the case may be, to get ready to fire. I understand that the English and American records were made with the magazine loaded. I thought the British and United States tests were conducted with the magazine starting empty and accordingly we tested the Ross rifle with the magazine empty, but I have since found that the British and American tests were with the magazines full, which would have made a few points more in favour of the Ross rifle in the comparison. However, we need not bother about that, as the record of the Ross rifle is pretty good as it is. Another record is that a Ross rifle fired 300 shots recently at Quebec and made 294 hits, aim fire, at target, 101 being bullseyes, and that was done in 14 minutes and 11 seconds, a record which no two rifles together have ever approached before in the world, and half of them were single-fire.

Mr R. L. BORDEN. What range?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Close range. The supposition is that the enemy is rushing at close range and that was the object of the test. If an enemy should rush at close range then the effectiveness of a rifle is as to how many shots you can pump into the enemy when he is approaching you in the rush which commences from 50 to 100 yards. That is where the effectiveness of the magazine rifle comes in, or otherwise a single fire rifle would be just as good as any.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the time?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. 150 rounds, 147 hits, 34 bulls, in five minutes and one second, starting with the magazine empty. Then there were 300 rounds fired, 294 hits, 101 bulls in fourteen minutes and eleven seconds. The records of any two rifles in the world put together have never come up to that. The advantage of the Ross magazine is its great rapidity. The Ross magazine differs materially from any other magazine rifle. There are what may be called two types of magazine rifles, the clip and charger loader and the single cartridge loader. The cartridges are all placed in an iron fixture called a clip, and are put into the rifle and are fired shot after shot. The charger type slides them all into the magazine at once. The second class, or slow loader, places cartridge after cartridge in the magazine. One class is a quick loader and the other a slow loader, as in the British rifle where you load shot by shot. The Ross rifle differs from both in that by a lifter piece worked by the left hand you can depress the bed of the magazine and catch the cartridges all loose,

throwing them into the rifle, and by working the fingers on this lifter piece a couple times the cartridges are all placed in position so that it is not possible to have it jam. When the Ross rifle jams it is owing to the fact that the soldier is not sufficiently trained in the use of this lifter piece. I will explain how the jam occurs in the rifle. In the British and Canadian cartridges there is what is called the head of the cartridge, where the end of the cartridge projects out beyond the side. In the Mauser rifle the cartridges have not this projection. When the top cartridge head comes behind the head of the second cartridge and is shifted forward by the bolt, it pulls the lower cartridge with it. That often occurs. It occurred in the Lee-Enfield at Quebec. We had the Lee-Enfield firing there, but I have not given the figures for it because the men who fired the Lee-Enfield at Quebec were experts only in the sense of ordinary listed men and not in the same class with Wallingford and Ormandsen, who made the records in the British army. Therefore, in fairness to these men I am taking the standard rifle record made with the British rifle by these experts. When a jam occurs with a Ross rifle the only way it can occur is because the soldier did not arrange the lifter piece properly. Mortimer fired 300 rounds with the Ross rifle and there was no jam at all. Now, I want to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to this: There was Sergeant O'Brien, one of his own men with his musketry instructor certificate, and he had never been instructed in the proper use of the working of that finger piece until he fired in Quebec at the experimental tests. He did not understand the working of it and he got confused, and yet that man is a splendid fellow and I am told one of the best musketry instructors in Canada. The minister should see that his instructors all over the country are trained in the use of the finger piece, so that soldiers under them will have some chance to know the strong point of the rifle. I need not deal with the magazine further than to say it is well known that the Ross rifle has the most rapid magazine of any rifle. It is easy of manipulation and it is very useful in night attacks. I have on other occasions made a comparison of the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield.

Our good friend the member for Sherbrooke assumed an entirely different tone this year from that of his last year's speech. I do not know the reason of that. Possibly he has had uphill work all over the country; for I know that the best men in the militia service to-day stand by the Ross rifle and are going to stand by it without any doubt whatever. Last year he had an air of confidence and assurance, and I may take the liberty of looking for a motive for his action. We knew that there were certain minor defects in the Ross rifle, and that these defects were being remedied, just as our friends in the United States have been remedying the defects in their rifle. Let me point out the defects in the United States magazine rifle, which is famous as the most perfect rifle in the world. The official book No. 1923 'description and rules for the management of the United States magazine rifle,' issued on the 4th of February 1908, at page 41 mentions the parts which are most liable to require repairs.' These are the bolt-stop, the cocking-piece, the lower band swivel and screw, the safety-lock, the stacking swivel and screw, the stock and the striker. It speaks of the stock being broken at the small of the butt. In the whole history of the Ross rifle there have been only two rifles broken at the small of the butt, and these were broken maliciously. There have been only two rifle stocks broken along the barrels; and when the men who broke them were brought before the committee and stated that they were broken by a fall, they were laughed at. Then this United States report goes on to tell how to replace broken parts, mentioning the butt-plate, cap-pin, the front sight, the lower band swivel screw, the stacking swivel screw, the trigger pin. These are not fatal injuries. It then goes on to point out the injuries that do not render the parts unserviceable. These are: the bolt, the butt, the plate, the butt swivel, the cocking piece, the extractor, the floor plate, the guard. With regard to the bolt it says:

The entire flange at front end may be broken off, except a small portion on the opposite side from the extractor hook which is required to hold in connection with the extractor hook the empty case while it is being drawn to the rear for ejection. If automatic ejection be not considered, the entire flange may be dispensed with.

Then it says:

The parts not essential, or only so to a degree, are the ejector, safety lock, cut-off, bolt stop, sleeve lock, floor plate, magazine spring and follower.

It goes on further to say:

Complaints have not infrequently been received that a main-spring was too weak to perform its office, when the fault rested with the soldier, who in sighting inadvertently raised the bolt handle with his hand before pulling the trigger, and thus caused the force of the spring to be expended in closing the bolt, instead of in exploding the cartridge.

All cams and bearings should be kept slightly oiled to prevent wear.

When firing many successive rounds care must be taken that unburned grains of powder do not collect and pack in the locking lug recesses of the receiver, as this will interfere with the perfect closing of the bolt. Such accumulations can be blown out from time to time, or, when packed, removed by a knife or the screw-driver.

If we had to do this with the Ross rifle, there would have been a rebellion in the

country long ago. This book goes on to say :

Except when repairs are needed, the following parts will constantly be injured if allowed to be dismounted by the soldier for cleaning; and when repairs are necessary, they should be removed only by a company artificer, or some one familiar with the handling of tools and delicate mechanisms, viz.: bolt stop, cut-off, safety lock, sleeve lock, front sight, lower band and stacking swivel screws.

From start to finish the book gives details of breaks and smashes which are liable to occur in the Yankee rifle, which is regarded as the most perfect rifle in the world to-day. I have already indicated from this official book more defects in that rifle than are recorded in all this bundle of so-called expert reports on the Ross rifle. How are these reports furnished? The master general of ordnance issues to the various officers in the country an order for reports, and the officers pass on the order to the privates and tell them to point out all the defects they can find in the Ross rifle—a condition of affairs that is not to be found in any other country in the world. Most of these reports are reports of privates to their subaltern officers, and from the subaltern officers to seniors ; and when the seniors were brought before the committee last year, one after another said : ' I know nothing about the rifle ; I am only going by the reports made to me.' What are these reports ? They refer only to the class of defects regarded by the Americans as trivial.

Now, Sir, the reason I have been so persistent in following this matter up is this. I could not conceive it possible that any man could start an agitation on so little data, and I have looked for the motive at the bottom of it all. What have we found? Mr. Nesbitt, before the committee on Public Accounts, made a solemn declaration that he had been approached years ago by representatives of the leading manufacturing firms in England who tried to show him the utter impossibility of conducting a manufacturing establishment like this in Canada, and that we must buy our rifles from the English factories or let them take this factory over. Other attempts are known to have been made on experts in rifle matters, in order to chloroform them to discard the Ross rifle and to bring pressure on the Minister of Militia to induce him to adopt the Lee-Enfield.

These efforts were made from time to time and in various ways. I might point out, in connection with so many of the defects discovered in the rifle, that it was rather strange how many came to the light in Halifax; and just about the time the news could be spread from town to town, the agitation against the rifle began all over the country. It was pointed out yesterday that the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) was six months behind the General of Ordnance in pointing out the defects, but evidently they had been looking for someone to lead the agitation. I want to point out another matter. I did not learn this from the Minister of Militia nor did I ever ask him about it, but I ask him now whether the request was ever made to him, or whether a letter was ever obtained from him by a representative of a British rifle company, to the effect that in case the Ross Company chose to go out of business, the conditions of the contract with that company would be continued? Was the hon. minister ever asked to give such a letter or did he ever give such a letter or was he ever interviewed by any gentleman representing a rifle company in England in connection with this matter?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have no recollection of ever having given any such letter, but I have no objection to say that I was asked on one or two occasions whether, in the event of the Ross Company withdrawing from business and some other company purchasing it, the government would be prepared to continue the contract with the purchasers. I said that of course that would depend on who the successors were, but I could see no difficulty, if the new company were capable of carrying on the business, as the only object of the government was to have its business properly done.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I never asked the Minister of Militia that question before, but I received my data from across the water. I was told that it was done by a gentleman who is supposed to have influence.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I presume the hon. gentleman is referring to me. Might I ask him if he is?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I referred to 'a gentleman who is supposed to have influence,' and not to the hon. member for Sherbrooke.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I am asking the hon. gentleman to reply. Let him either put up or shut up.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know that I am called on to do either. I do not know that I need reply to a gentleman who has been hawking around the department, showing the commercial instinct as strong as he has been showing it. He referred to commercial interests yesterday, but he himself is a man who has shown a very keen sense of commercial interest by hawking after the Minister of Militia and others for appointment from time to time. Since he speaks of commercial interests, I think it only fair to myself that I should say I had the honour of being offered the highest military positions from the Conservative party in days gone by and that I refused. I was offered the Deputy Ministership of Militia and the Adjutant Generalship of Canada,

and I never had to hawk after these position.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think I ought to say that the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) is not the gentleman to whom I referred. He never discussed with me the question as to the successor to the Ross Rifle Company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Oh, no, the agent has a much greater man. I might as well be frank and say I understood it was a gentleman from Montreal, a multi-millionaire, the representative of the Vickers-Maxim Small Arms Company. I got word from across the water that that was done.

Mr. FOWLER. By cable ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It came at all events. When this notice was put on the paper a year ago, I looked for a motive. I thought it very strange that an officer who had served with me in South Africa, fighting the battles of the empire, under the same commander, should not have come and spoken to me on the subject.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What have you got to do about it ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am just coming to that. It was strange that a gentleman, a member of the great Conservative party, following the same noble leader, would not have come to me and said something to me about it. Now I come to what I have got to do about it. Soon after the notice was put on the paper last year, the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) notified me that Dr. Worthington had something terrible against me. He is going to expose you, said Mr. Bergeron, and your grafting in connection with the Ross rifle. And he asked : Is it not possible for you to pay back the money?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I thought you knew Bergeron better than that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What right had any member of the Conservative party to hint about graft?

Mr. FOSTER. You are hinting at it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am meeting charges made. It was insidiously whispered in the saloon and the back lanes that the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) was going to drive me from public life. The hon. gentleman's friends said: Sam. Hughes is to be exposed in graft and driven from public life. That is why the matter was fought to a finish by me in the Public Accounts Committee and the hon. gentleman and his friends driven to the wall every time. And whenever he raises his voice against the Ross rifle, he will be driven into a corner. He should have known that I could not be so easily stampeded. He was within seeing distance on more than one occasion—but perhaps he was not in a position to see much—when better men than he failed to stampede your humble servant. He should have known therefore that one such as he could not stampede me. He saw that in another land than this. It will take a much better and bolder man than the hon. gentleman to stampede your humble servant. He has failed in his agitation. He has failed most signally. I have telegrams from different parts of the country demanding that the Mark III Ross rifle be placed in the hands of our militia for shooting this year. I take this opportunity of urging on the minister all due diligence in placing that rifle—which is now perfected as nearly as possible—in the hands of our soldiers. I have no doubt that the rifle is still open to improvement. No doubt there is still some slight imperfection. There is now—I would not call it a defect—but a very slight imperfection, but the material at hand did not allow of our making the improvement. In the next issue however that improvement will be absolutely carried out, and we shall have a rifle the most perfect and complete in the world.

I shall not refer to defects further than to say this. I have been told by militia officers that the reason that they have been against the rifle was the reports furnished them by gentlemen in connection with the government at Ottawa. I shall not refer in detail to the accidents supposed to have taken place at St. John, Eastman and Lethbridge. At St. John the accident was a trifling affair. The cocking piece and a small spring had flown back and struck the man in the face. The rifle was not rendered unserviceable but was perfectly serviceable the moment the spring was put in place again. The Eastman rifle had been tampered with. The sear had been tampered with and the bolt dismounted, the retaining washer had been left out in putting the parts in place again. Evidently whoever took the parts out was, like the boy with a watch, unable to put them back into their proper places, and to this the accident was due. It was not due to any defect in the arm itself. But it is very strange that the accident should have occurred in a locality so convenient to the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington). The hon. member referred to my reports of the Springfield tests. All that I have to say is that I have read to the House the reports of the Springfield tests of the American rifle, and I leave the House and the country to judge whether the Lee-Enfield is worse than the Ross rifle at Springfield. In both cases defects have been developed.

I shall not take up time discussing at length the cost of the rifle. On that subject, I have but a few words to say. I have the report of the British War Office showing that their rifles, in the preliminary stages, were paid for at the rate of £5 5s, and £5 18s. for others. This would repre-

sent a cost of upwards of $30 for the rifle in Canada, or $5 more than the Ross rifle costs to-day. I might point out that as late as 1904, the new short rifle was put into the hands of the soldiers in Great Britain at a cost of £4 11s. 4½d., which would represent a cost of at least $28 in this country.

My good friend from Sherbrooke yesterday, as one gentleman remarked, had nothing to say and said it very badly. So far as the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) is concerned, he also had nothing to say, but he said it very well. He made the best of a bad job. I was sleeping most of the time, but I understood that the part of his speech that I did not hear very distinctly was also very good. I would like to correct him in one point. however. He spoke of the Ross rifle being tested with forty grains of cordite giving an explosive force of twenty-two tons. I think he will find that nearer to thirty or thirty-five tons. But that is a matter of detail which does not greatly concern us here.

I may point out that the Ross rifle has been in the hands of the soldiers of this country for some time and that over 50,000 of them have been issued. No rifle ever issued to troops has been subject to the criticism, the adverse, interested criticism, to which the Ross rifle has been subjected. And yet, Sir, it stands before the country to-day the peer of any short rifle in existence. The long Ross rifle is but recently out, only a few having been issued, but, so far as issued, they are meeting with favour on every hand. The slight defects, if you may call them defects, that were found to exist in Mark II are already overcome in that rifle. These defects I pointed out in the short barrel, the light barrel and the imperfect safety catch. I have already pointed out that, in the American rifle, they have an unsafe safety catch, whereas in Mark III Ross rifle we have overcome that difficulty absolutely and have an absolutely safe safety-catch. We have also introduced a few minor improvements, such as strong trigger guard and double trigger action. The old trigger action in Mark I is the best. It is the one we wanted from the beginning, but we could not get it adopted. But now we are getting into line with other nations and adopting it. We might have been the first to use it. With these improvements, Mark III rifle stands unsurpassed, unequalled, in the world to-day.

I have been charged further with toadying to the Minister of Militia and toadying to the Liberal party. One gentleman makes it a cause of criticism that I cross the floor of the House and actually sit down and talk to hon. gentlemen on the other side. Well, I have seen my leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) do that. I have even seen the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) do that. And for myself, I may say that, when I want to talk to a gentleman, I am not afraid to talk to him in daylight. I do not go sneaking around the departments; I do not condemn a fellow member for walking across the floor and talking to a minister on business or on any subject. So, I do not accept censure from the very men in the Tory party, some of whom are accustomed to go to the departments of this government, sneaking round, asking favours and appointments—and getting them. Some of these are among the men who are attacking me in connection with this Ross rifle. I am not afraid to let the world know what I am doing. I have never found it advantageous to play the hypocrite. I am not under any obligation to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) or the whole Liberal party. I have treated them as gentlemen, but when they have gone astray I have not hesitated to let them feel the weight—whatever it might be, heavy or light—of my indignation. I have been a loyal follower, so far as I could be, of the leader of the opposition; and so long as the Conservative party takes a straight line I will follow it. But, as I have said, I owe no allegiance to any man that affects my allegiance to my own conscience. So, when the Conservative party departs from the course of right as they have done in this case, as they did on the Yukon question, and as they did on the Manitoba school question, I will not follow it. I owe allegiance to my own conscience first and to my constituents second. I am not afraid to stand on my record. And, should I choose to come back to parliament, after the next election, you will find the electors of Victoria and Haliburton will not hesitate to back up your humble servant. I do not know whether the hon. member for Sherbrooke will be able to say as much regarding his constituency. At all events, I will be able to look the hon. member for Sherbrooke, or his constituency, or my own constituency of Victoria and Haliburton in the face, without fear that it can ever be shown that I have played the sneak, trying to track down, or injure or ruin the reputation of a fellow member. If any member wished to attack me, he should have been loyal enough to come to me. He should have come and said to me: I understand you have been caught grafting and I have the data here against you; prepare to defend yourself and get out of it as well as you can. But I had to learn from the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) of the complaints that the hon. member was bringing this year and last year. I reasoned with the hon. member for Beauharnois. For weeks after, I could not convince him that I was not in it up to the neck. I explain this to show why I was so persistent in fighting this matter out in the Public Accounts Committee last year and this year, and why I propose fighting it out to the bitter end.

Mr. GEORGE W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) who has just taken his seat has enjoyed the singular and unique experience of receiving the plaudits of the party to which he is usually opposed in this House. They have received him with a good deal of enthusiasm. The right hon. premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself has done him the honour of remaining in the chamber—contrary to his usual wont—during the whole of his speech.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He knows a good thing.

Mr. FOWLER. Then, either he does not always know it, or the hon. gentleman (Sam Hughes) is not always good, because the Prime Minister seldom remains in the House when the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton is speaking. Sir Frederick Borden has also remained during the whole of the remarks of the hon. member. We find, Sir, that a momentary gleam of intelligence, fleeting it is true, has lighted up the face of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), so greatly did he appreciate it. Among the rank and file, why, they were so enthusiastic that even the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Johnston) could scarcely forebear to cheer ; and when that hon. gentleman cheers Tory speakers we know that he has very strong party reasons for it.

Now the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam Hughes) has given us a historical sketch in which there may have been some fact, but there certainly was a great deal of fiction. I should judge, reckoning on a basis of a thousand parts, about one part fact to 999 of fiction, which after all, is about as near the facts as the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton ever gets. He has told us that so greatly was he honoured by his party, so much did they appreciate his services in connection with the militia of this country, that Sir Charles Tupper, when premier of this country, was anxious to obtain his services, not only as adjutant general but also as Deputy Minister of Militia.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. No, I did not say that, Deputy Minister of Militia in 1891, when Sir John Abbott was Premier.

Mr. FOWLER. Then they recognized his tremendous services a little earlier than I thought they did. That of course will go to the country. He more than intimated that he could have been Minister of Militia, a much higher position, I assume, in 1896. Well, Sir, we have only the hon. gentleman's word for that, that is all we have for it.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. No, there are men in this House to-day who know it.

Mr. FOWLER. I venture to say that there is not a man in this House who will say so, except the hon. gentleman himself. Now the hon. gentleman has seen fit—I do not know why he did so—to make an attack upon the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington). It was not necessary, surely, for him, in the defence of his intimate friend, his bosom companion, Sir Charles Ross, and his rifle factory, which is largely the creation, I should say, of Sir Charles Ross and the member for Victoria and Haliburton—it was not necessary, in order to defend this rifle from the hallucination in the minds of the people that there was anything wrong with it, that he should attack the hon. member for Sherbrooke. Was the hon. member for Sherbrooke outside his rights as a member of this House, as a representative of the people of this country, in making a criticism of this rifle ? Has it come to this, that a man exercising what he conceives to be his public duty in the interests of his constituents, who criticises a rifle that has been put in the hands of the militia of this country, shall be charged with all sorts of improper motives because he makes this criticism, and because he happens to touch the feelings of my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton ? It is very easy, Mr. Speaker, to attribute motives to people. The hon. gentleman has a somewhat diseased imagination in attributing motives.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fowler) is the greatest expert in the House in that sort of thing.

Mr. FOWLER. Then I will justify that statement of my hon. friend in a minute by attributing a few to him. I say it is easy for a man to attribute motives to another, but he should be very careful lest the circumstances surrounding his own case should make him particularly liable to reprisals. Now I do not propose to attribute any motives to the member for Victoria and Haliburton, because he has told us that he alone of all the men in this country is independent. He looks only to the welfare of his country. Party ties have no effect upon him, they do not bind him in any way, he is ready to snap them at a moment's notice. He looks only and solely to the welfare of the country.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. He has never formed a coalition with the enemy.

Mr. FOWLER. We are not so sure about that, either. Now I want to show that the circumstances surrounding the hon. gentleman's case would lead a person who was not of a specially suspicious mind to suspect some of the motives impelling the hon. member to give his most strenuous support to this Ross rifle. What do we find to be the fact ? What singular coincidence has occurred ? We find that not very long ago, in a previous session, the hon. gentleman took occasion most strenuously to endorse the Ross rifle. He was fierce in his denunciation of any one who would venture, who

would dare to criticise it. That was in an evening session of this House when the militia estimates were under discussion. The next day there was a meeting of the Dominion Rifle Association held in the city of Ottawa, and at that meeting the Minister of Militia rose, as I am informed—I was not there, the hon. gentleman may correct me if I am wrong—rose in that meeting and nominated the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton as president of the Dominion Rifle Association, and the hon. gentleman having the recommendation of the Minister of Militia, was elected by acclamation. That is one post that the hon. gentleman obtained through the recommendation of the Minister of Militia.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. How long had he been senior vice-president ?

Mr. FOWLER. As long as his chances for being president were nil. He was put in as vice-president just as Mr. Roosevelt was put in as Vice President of the United States, in order to shelve him so that he might never be president. But for the kindly recommendation of the Minister of Militia, he would never have become president of the Dominion Rifle Association.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it is only fair to say that when the then president of the Dominion Rifle Association, the immediate predecessor of the member for Victoria and Haliburton, was chosen, that was Colonel Gibson, he was nominated by the then Minister of Militia, a Conservative, Sir Mackenzie Bowell. I knew that to be the fact, and it seemed to be only a proper return for the Minister of Militia of the Liberal government to suggest the appointment of a distinguished soldier and member of parliament on the Conservative side. That is the way he was nominated, not in payment for support of the Ross rifle; because my hon. friend is the leader of that particular party, and I am his supporter.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Militia I have no doubt is quite correct in what he says, I am not imputing any motives, but I am pointing out these strange coincidences that have occurred. Here we have another fact, the fact that this hon. gentleman holds a considerable number of offices under this government, although he is supposed to be in opposition. Now I want to compliment the Minister of Militia on that fact. The Minister of Militia is an astute gentleman, and he realizes to the full the value of the services which the hon. gentleman for Victoria and Haliburton could render to this country, and therefore he made the pay proportionate to the value of the services. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton is a Brevet Colonel, no longer displaying those diminutive letters, Lieutenant, but C-O-L. It is full Colonel now, mark you. He is president of the Dominion Rifle Association. That is a position which is not directly in the gift of the administration, but indirectly very much in the gift of the administration. Then, the hon. gentleman has received, at the hands of his generous friend, the Fenian medal. There must have been an awful struggle in the hon. gentleman's mind when he had the opportunity of getting this medal because you know the Fenian raid took place a great many years ago and the hon. gentleman had been trying to convince his myriad of lady admirers that he was still young, in the eligible ranks, that he had not become a veteran; but, you see that he got the medal for service in the Fenian raid in 1870, an event which took place 38 years ago and he must have been more than a babe in arms at that time or he could not have done so much for his country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will tell the hon. gentleman that I was entitled to the Fenian raid medal of 1866.

Mr. FOWLER. Better still.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, if I had applied for it.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, the hon. gentleman is very much older than I thought.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. One would think him about 45. If the hon. gentleman was at the raid of 1866 he would be very young at the time. He would be like a witness who said that he had been farming all his life and when asked what he did the first year he replied that he milked. The hon. gentleman is also a member of the committee—he is chairman, no mere, ordinary, one-horse member, but he is chairman of the committee on small arms.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why do you not say he is president ?

Mr. FOWLER. Same thing.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want to keep the hon. gentleman absolutely right.

Mr. FOWLER. I know how sweetly these high sounding titles sound in his ears and therefore I should not have minimized it by calling him chairman instead of president.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member for Sherbrooke should have primed you better.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman is chattering so that I want to say something to him. He said that the mountain had laboured and brought forth a mouse. He was referring then to my hon. friend from Sherbrooke. It would seem to me to be fair to say that the mouse that was brought forth was the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How clever.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman at length has come out in the open. He has been in hiding to some extent but at length

he has been brought forth. He said that it was stillborn. That does not apply to the hon. gentleman because he is very far from being stillborn. It would be better perhaps and take up less time of this House if he had been. Not only is the hon. gentleman president of the small arms committee, but he is also on the general staff, on this top-heavy staff that we have. What was he put on for?—as a make-weight to keep it down? Again recognizing the fact that the hon. gentleman's real services were not of very much value. The hon. gentleman is on as 'unpaid' getting full value for the services which he renders the country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I had the honour of being put on that staff by Lord Dundonald, and these words were placed in there in my own handwriting.

Mr. FOWLER. My hon. friend would have us believe that Lord Dundonald had tremendous influence. He had not even enough influence to save his own head let alone put a crown on the head of the hon. gentleman.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I may say that my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was not put on without my consent. Lord Dundonald did not run the militia of this country as is pretty well known.

Mr. FOWLER. Pretty well known.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Agriculture was running it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Occasionally he helped.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has enjoyed a very great number of honours at the hands of this administration and these have been chiefly dispensed by the Minister of Militia and Defence. He has been made a brevet colonel, he has been given the Fenian medal, although I fancy the hon. gentleman would be about a thousand miles away from the Fenians.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not come from Kings and Albert.

Mr. FOWLER. You never would have been allowed to come from Kings county here. They elect a better class of men. Better come again now.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman just tell us how he got out of the militia? I am sure it will interest the House.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, the records will show. If my hon. friend can find anything against my record in the militia he can produce it. I do not make nearly as much of it as the hon. gentleman does in the 'Parliamentary Companion,' where he takes up a page and a half, but in the official record he does not take up half so much space. I will give you the space that he takes up: A page and a half in the 'Parliamentary Companion' which he writes or supplies himself; a line in the official record. That is the position of the hon. gentleman with respect to his records. He has seen fit in this House to attack the record and throw insinuations upon the motives of a man who, as far as the official record shows, occupies a very much higher position in connection with the militia of this country. While I am on that point I might as well refer to it. The hon. gentleman's record can be found at page 286 of the Quarterly Militia List of the Dominion of Canada, corrected to the 1st April, 1908, so that my hon. friend cannot say that it is not quite up to date. Here we have the following record:

Hughes, Samuel: Fenian Raid, 1870; general service medal with one clasp.

That is for the Fenian raid of 1870.

South African war, 1899-1900.

Now, is not that a shame? The war would not have been ended in South Africa if he had not gone. And look at all the obstacles that were thrown in his way! Who threw these obstacles in the way? It must have been the Boers; they knew that he would end the war if he got out there and therefore they made it difficult for him. But, with that splendid courage that surmounts all difficulties, all obstacles, casts them aside as if they were mere chaff in his way, that hon. gentleman did at length arrive in South Africa and after he had convinced Roberts and Kitchener that he knew it all, they took his advice and the war ended. Let us compare the record of the hon. member for Sherbrooke with that of the hon. member for—I was going to say South Africa—Victoria and Haliburton. Let us compare the record of the hon. member for Sherbrooke as it appears in this same official record. It takes up ten lines of the record. Ten lines of the official record to show what the hon. member for Sherbrooke has done; one line of the official record to show what the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton has done! Oh, what an ungrateful country Canada is. What a cold step mother it has proved to the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, not recognizing the tremendous, the splendid services which he has rendered to the country or the great honour and glory that he has brought upon Canada. Why? It has not recognized the fact, although others have recognized it, that the hon. gentleman is the bosom friend of Chamberlain, the bosom friend of Roseberry. He gives them pointers. He devises Chamberlain's scheme of protection for Great Britain, of tariff reform. That scheme was framed solely upon hints which Chamberlain had received from the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton in the many interviews that he had with him. He was also on exceedingly intimate terms with the great poet Rudyard Kipling, and, just in that connection, I would like to read

a little poem, said to have been written by Rudyard Kipling in which the hon. gentleman appears as the central figure. Mr. Speaker, with your kind permission, I will read this poem :

The gallant Sam enjoys a fight,
At Fabre's farm his fame was bright,
He drew his sword and waved it high
And yelled ' Now watch the Dutchmen fly.'
The foe was frightened half to death
And ran till he was out of breath.
No single moment did he lose,
He knew the voice of Colonel Hughes.

So you see that the hon. gentleman has been sadder——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. gentleman pardon me? I want to correct him on one point. He has not told the House that all these statements in the militia lists are written by the men whose names appear there. I have never required to write my record in the militia list but now that my attention is drawn to it I may do so. I am not ashamed of my record. I do not need militia lists to show my record. I may say more than that. I was not hiding at Fabre's Farm.

Mr. FOWLER. There cannot be a stronger confirmation of the hon. gentleman's statement that he did not write this in the militia list than the very fact that it only occupies one line. I think the House will agree with me that if that record were written by the person himself it would take at least two pages.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Pretty nearly that.

Mr. FOWLER. He says he was not in hiding at Fabre's Farm and I do not know what he refers to. I was not at Fabre's farm and therefore I could not hide there. But if there were some bales of hay there —good hay from Three Rivers at $30 a ton warranted not only to keep out an ordinary Mauser bullet but a cannon ball—I would not have been able to get behind it you know—they say some people did. Now, I was speaking a while ago about the tremendous number of honours and dignities that have been conferered upon my hon. and gallant friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). He seems to have had some what of a pull—whether a straight pull like the Ross rifle or a crooked pull it is not for me to say. Anyhow the result of his pull, whether it be straight or crooked, has been very much better than the result of the straight pull on the Ross rifle. He has told us that there are only a very few defects and these only trivial defects in the Ross rifle. Well, it seems to me that the accidents which have occurred would not be regarded as trivial by the persons who suffered them. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was shooting at a mark beside another man, and if a portion of the magazine of the other man's rifle blew out and hit him in the eye he would not consider it a very trivial thing. It is not very considerate of the hon. gentleman to speak in this light tone of accidents of that kind to the militiamen of this country. Of course the hon. gentleman has waded so much in bloodshed and gore; he has seen so many thousands and millions of men slaughtered and has slaughtered so many himself, that a mere trifling accident of that kind would appear small indeed to him. He says there are few defects in the Ross rifle but we have spent a great deal of money on that rifle and we have put it in the hands of the militiamen of our country and we will see what these defects are. He spent at least half an hour of his speech in commendation of the magazine of this rifle, and here I want to say this : That I propose to give the report of Colonel Lessard, Brevet Colonel Lessard, C.B., also a South African veteran and adjutant general to-day of the Dominion of Canada. Of course that is a position that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) contemptuously refused.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. Colonel Lessard was in South Africa. He also had a career there, he was mentioned in despatches, he was honoured by the British government with the title of Companion of the Bath. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is such a democrat that he would have refused such a title ; probably he would refuse knighthood for his services, but he has said nothing about that in the autobiography he has given us in Parliamentary Companion. Colonel Lessard is making his report to the master general of the Ordnance and he says :

About 20 per cent of the rifles were damaged during practice.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If you are honest you will read what goes before that and you will see it is not Colonel Lessard's own opinion.

Mr. FOWLER. I am reading Colonel Lessard's report. He says :

I have the honour to state from the reports of the officers commanding ' A ' and ' B ' Squadrons, Royal Canadian Dragoons, relative to the Ross rifles at present in their charge.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is right.

Mr. FOWLER. Every one knows he did not fire all these rifles himself. What has that to do with it any way? Did Colonel Lessard issue a false report ? I cannot understand the point my hon. friend is trying to make :

About 20 per cent of the rifles were damaged during practice, the following being the principal defects: the retaining lugs on the bolts

are very weak and a number of them broke off (about 4 or 5).

And this is what Colonel Lessard in his report says about the magazines that my hon. friend has spent so much time in lauding to the skies.

The magazines were useless.

Useless, and this was mark 11 rifle, not mark 1 which has been discarded. The magazines were useless although we had spent over half a million dollars for these rifles when only 136 of them had been delivered.

The magazines were useless. In almost every case when the magazines were ordered to be used the cartridges jammed at the second shot.

It was not a case here and there but as Colonel Lessard says in almost every case the cartridges jammed at the second shot.

There seemed to be a weakness on the platform spring. The leaf of the back sight in nearly every case had to be adjusted after each shot and seemed to be very easily injured.

There is the report of Colonel Lessard and it is not dated back in 1905 but it is dated the 29th of July, 1907. It seems to me that it requires a tremendous amount of nerve both on the part of the Minister of Militia and the member for Victoria to stand up in this House and attempt to defend the character of the Ross rifle. Now, Sirs I have here the report of General Cotton. He was a colonel when this report was made but I guess he is a general since. These promotions in the militia take place so rapidly to-day that one hardly knows how to style a man when you meet him. It is generally safe to call him a general because it will never offend him but if he happened to be a general and you called him a colonel you would incur his everlasting antipathy.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You should not forget that I promoted you to be major.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman had better not chatter so much ; he seems to be afraid.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton is not afraid of anything the hon. member for Kings and Albert can say directly or indirectly, and he might just as well understand that right here now.

Mr. FOWLER. Who's afraid ? The bold and gallant soldier from Victoria and Haliburton. Who's afraid. I would not want the hon. gentleman to be afraid. To think that the gallant member is afraid. Of course not, perish the thought.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I may take the hon. gentleman for Kings in hand some day.

Mr. FOWLER. This is what General Cotton says and this report is dated the 8th of October, 1906.

Most of the defects are those of which we are aware, but some further rather startling weaknesses have shown themselves.

That is strong language. The hon. member for Sherbrooke, in any denunciation he has ever made of this Ross rifle, has not used any stronger language than that of these two distinguished soldiers. General Cotton and General Lessard are both, I think, on the general staff, the same staff to which my hon. friend has been appointed in an unpaid position.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) enjoys a certain amount of distinction in this country as a marksman of notoriety—I was going to say of note. On one occasion he went down to the butts, bearing on his manly shoulders one of these Ross rifles. On his arrival there he undertook to show the ignorant militia men who did not appreciate a good thing when they saw it, the wonderful advantages of the Ross rifle as an arm for target practice. So he fired eight shots, and in doing so gathered up the nicest little nest of goose eggs one could imagine—eight good, full, round goose eggs; he never struck the target once. He fired at six hundred yards at a nine-foot target, about the size of barn door, and a double door at that. Here was the gallant soldier who had come from South Africa with a belt full of Boer scalps, but who couldn't hit a barn door at six hundred yards. Now, against the hon. gentleman's commendation of this Ross rifle I am going to put the statement of another marksman, a marksman of international reputation, a man who for the first time won for Canada the much-coveted Queen's prize—Sergeant Hayhurst, the sergeant instructor of musketry of the 13th regiment, with headquarters at Hamilton, a regiment which the Minister of Militia has described as one of the best infantry regiments in Canada. Sergeant Hayhurst gives an exhaustive report on the Ross rifle, practically every line of which is a condemnation of it. This is what he says of the magazine :

As to the magazine there is no question but that it would be much improved by the introduction of the clip feed in place of the hand feed. I found after careful practice that more cartridges go on the ground than into the magazine, and this would be much worse under the excitement of even rapid fire, not to speak of action.

Which, Mr. Speaker, would you prefer to take, the commendation of the goose-egg marksman or the commendation of the Queen's prize marksman. Sergeant Hayhurst goes on to say :

Stock—There is much that could be improved in this feature particularly the fitting, selection of material and strength.

This report is dated when ? The 20th of December, 1907, only a few months ago. They have been working at this Ross rifle since 1902, more than five years; and yet these are the criticisms made of it by one of the foremost riflemen of Canada. Still the Minister of Militia will stand up in his place and say that he wants no better monument to perpetuate his memory than the fact that he was the godfather of the Ross rifle, an honour which he of course shares with the member for Victoria and Haliburton. Sergeant Hayhurst says further :

Of the many rifles I have examined the fitting was very bad, and the wood was frequently crossgrained and spongy where it should have been straight and sound especially at the small of the butt, a weak point.

Many people do not stop to consider how important it is that a good arm should be given to the militia for the defence of the country; for let us hope that it will never be used for anything but the defence of this country or of some other part of the empire, never for offence; because we are a peace-loving people, notwithstanding some statements made by the Minister of Militia at a banquet at Montreal; but we must take with a certain amount of consideration remarks made at a banquet, particularly near the conclusion of the banquet. Then, listen to this beautiful piece of irony by Sergeant Hayhurst, who is not only a clever marksman, but has a fine command of English and a fine sense of humour, something which my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton entirely lacks. This is what he says:

In conclusion, I would say that with all of the bad faults and many of the weak features removed and strong durable parts introduced in their place a very fine serviceable rifle would result, but which for a fine accurate target shooting rifle would still be inferior to the present Lee-Enfield barrel with good sights and ammunition.

Take all the bad parts and all the weak features from the rifle, and introduce new, strong and durable parts in their place, and you will have a very fine and serviceable rifle. That is what Sergeant Hayhurst says.

Now, I want to refer to some shooting which took place at Eastman, where a certain accident occurred. I was surprised, absolutely surprised, to hear the Minister of Militia make the remark he did with respect to the tampering which he alleges had been done in connection with that rifle:. I was surprised because the Minister of Militia is usually not that kind of a man, he is generally a very fair man in debate, and therefore I was the more surprised when he went out of his way to make an insinuation against the hon. member for Sherbrooke and practically to accuse the hon. member of tampering with this rifle.

Mr. FOWLER.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. Either by himself or at his instance. Does the hon. member say oh, no ? I am very glad that the statement he made was in the heat of debate, when he warmed up on the subject, and did not quite measure his words. Are we to understand from him that he makes no reflection on the hon. member for Sherbrooke with regard to the tampering ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My words speak for themselves. I said that the file had been tampered with.

Mr. FOWLER. He went much further. He said it had been tampered with by the hon. member for Sherbrooke and his friends.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. I think so.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I certainly did not intend to say it had been tampered with by the hon. member for Sherbrooke. I may have said it had been tampered with by some of his friends.

Mr. FOWLER. I am very glad to know that my good opinion of the hon. gentleman's fairness is restored. But I think the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) did make that assertion. He made the very strong insinuation that this tampering, as he calls it, was with the knowledge and consent of the hon. member for Sherbrooke.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have no doubt the hon. member for Sherbrooke is quite capable of knowing it.

Mr. FOWLER. That is on a par with the statement the hon. gentleman made before. Having gained by reading, experience and observation some knowledge of human nature, I can understand how one man might be jealous of another man in the same profession, and how that blind unreasoning jealousy—because nothing is more blind and unreasoning than jealousy—should lead him to great lengths in the statements he might make trying to damage the character of the other. Here we have two Canadian soldiers going out to South Africa. We have one coming back with a splendid record, having gained mention in the highest terms in the despatches, having been commended for his gallantry under fire, and the other coming back accelerated by what is known as a kick. In a certain class of minds, you naturally find a certain amount of jealousy, but it is unfortunate that it should lead a man so far as to cause him to make the insinuation which the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) now makes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. gentleman refer to me as having come back without having been mentioned in these despatches ? The record shows that I was

mentioned in the official reports of Lord Roberts and General Warren. I have had more mention in the despatches than any other Canadian in South Africa. All the hon. gentleman has to do is to go to the library and he will see it for himself. I characterize the conduct of the hon. gentleman as cowardly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. The expression is unparliamentary.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not want him to withdraw it at all because such a characterization coming from the hon. gentleman is rather an advantage. It is strange how people, who are so free in making insinuations against others, will wince when they get a little hot shot themselves. With what equanimity the same person can make the meanest insinuations against another, but just let him feel a little of the gall himself, and see how he winces. I was speaking about this accident at Eastman, and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam Hughes) said that my hon. friend from Sherbrooke would be quite capable of tampering with a rifle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have every reason to believe it.

Mr. FOWLER. Meaning what? That this gentleman would tamper with a rifle to be used by a rifleman at the absolute risk of the life of that man. It would mean that if anything serious resulted, if death should result, the hon. member for Sherbrooke would be guilty of murder. That is a pretty serious accusation to make, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Backed by the Minister of Militia.

Mr. FOWLER. That this gentleman, directly or indirectly, by himself or by friends at his instance, so tampered with one of these rifles that it would blow up the first time it was used and endanger the life, not only of the man who pulled the trigger, but of every one near this man at the time he was firing. The rules of parliamentary debate prevent me applying to the gentleman who would be guilty of that conduct the only term it would be proper to apply to him. What are the facts? At the time this accident occurred, the hon. member for Sherbrooke was twenty miles away. He had not been to the place where the rifle shooting was done for months or years before. He knew absolutely nothing of the matter, and the evidence shows as well that there was no opportunity for any one to tamper with that rifle. The man who had possession of it was the man who used it. That man was Captain Seale, a strong Liberal in the county of Brome, a supporter of the Minister of Agriculture. The unfortunate man who was injured was a Mr. Harold Peabody, who happened to be a Conservative. And this man Peabody was lying down and firing alongside the man who was using the Ross rifle. He knew that this rifle was defective. He knew that there was danger. He knew that serious accidents had occurred before, and he gave expression to his fears, but was laughed and jibed at, and told that the reason he was afraid of the Ross rifle was because he was a Tory. Well, the sequel proved there were strong grounds for his fears. Lying down within five feet of where the Ross rifle was fired, while Captain Seale was pulling the trigger it exploded, injuring the hands of Captain Seale and the temple of Mr. Peabody. That is what happened at Eastman, and to say that this rifle was tampered with for the purpose of causing it to explode is the most outrageous statement that any member of this House could be guilty of. I am surprised that even the known recklessness of the gallant and hon. member for Victoria should have led him so far.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 151) respecting Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Crawford.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). At the request of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennnox), I have agreed to allow this to stand. The hon. gentleman has gone away.

Mr. SPROULE. He could not be here tonight.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that progress be reported on this Bill.

Progress reported.

BELLEVILLE, PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 20) respecting the Belleville, Prince Edward Bridge Company.—Mr. Porter.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). When this Bill was up the other evening the question was raised by me as to the provision about the road arrangement. It struck me that, possibly, that ought not to be legislated on here.

Mr. PORTER. I take it that my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) refers to the last clause of the Bill, providing for an agreement between the city of Belleville and the Bridge Company. For many years an agree-

ment between these two has existed by which the city used for city purposes that part of the bridge between their gravel bed and the street, the city keeping that in repair, that is, putting the gravel upon it, for the use of it. That necessitated the making of a new agreement every year. At the city's request the company agreed to put in this clause to make a permanent agreement between them. It does not affect any other interest than that of these two, and both parties assent to it. Therefore, I cannot see that it can do any harm.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was not objecting to the matter of it, but the question that arose in my mind was whether the province would not take exception to our legislating about an agreement concerning a roadway in a city which is a purely municipal matter.

Mr. PORTER. It is the municipality that makes the agreement, and it is purely for the advantage of the city. I am sure the local legislature would not object. Personally, I would not have any objection to the clause being struck out of the Bill, except that I would like to protect the interest of the city of Belleville in the matter. All parties interested having consented, it seems to me there is no ground for objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. I suppose there is really a question about the whole Bill being within the jurisdiction of this parliament. I think the mistake was in bringing the original Bill here years ago. As all the parties interested seem to be agreeable, I do not wish to raise any objection.

Mr. PORTER. I was absent when the Bill was under discussion before. But I have read the debate which took place on the two occasions, and in answer to the objections made as to this being a purely provincial matter and not within the jurisdiction of this parliament, I would point out that, even if this Bill were withdrawn, we should still have the same legislation as now exists, which is legislation by this parliament. This does not add to what has been done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) leaving the tolls as they are in the printed Bill ?

Mr. PORTER. As they are in the last Bill. These have been agreed upon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems a pity to charge a boy or a bicycle ten cents, the same as an automobile.

Mr. PORTER. The history of the bridge shows that there are very few bicycles passing. This was a compromise. The Bridge Company were asking for an increase of toll on single carriage, horse and driver. But there were so many of these going over the bridge, that it was thought that this would be too large an increase. It was thought that if they were given an increase of five cents on a bicycle, the number of which going over the bridge was small, it would appease them to some extent. Everybody is satisfied, and, so far as the bicycles are concerned, it will not materially affect anybody.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SASKATCHEWAN POWER COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 153) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there not an agreement to have this Bill stand ?

Mr. GRAHAM. An amendment was suggested by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. FIELDING. The amendment was with regard to the clause providing for a hearing by the Governor in Council. I suggested that the hearing might more properly take place before the Minister of Public Works who might report to the Governor in Council, because it is not usual for the Governor in Council to give hearings. I called the attention of the promoter of the Bill to it, but did not present it as an amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood my hon. friend to say that he was communicating with some friends in Saskatoon to ascertain if they were quite satisfied with the Bill in its present form.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was not the mover (Mr. McCraney) who said that.

Mr. SPROULE. No, it was the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) who objected to that clause allowing four years to commence operations. And, he is absent tonight. But he could not have received word from Saskatoon in any case. Perhaps the Bill should be allowed to stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The promoter (Mr. McCraney) stated that he had communication from the city of Saskatoon agreeing to the terms of the Bill. They were quite satisfied, with the conditions surrounding it, that the provisions of section 3 would amply safeguard the city of Saskatoon.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. member for Grenville thought that their attention might not have been drawn to the feature of it which practically locks up the enterprise for four years, during which, it may be, nothing will be done towards the development of this power which would be a valuable one to the city if developed.

Mr. KNOWLES. So far as the objections of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) are concerned, I would say that the dam of the river is in my own riding, and I am familiar with that part of it. But I am afraid that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. McCraney) did not under-

stand on the previous evening that the Bill was going to stand until a reply could be received from the city of Saskatoon.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the understanding I had from his observations, I understood that he would communicate with the city.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) had some communication, or sent some communication to ascertain whether the city council of Saskatoon thoroughly understood the Bill in the form in which it is now presented. He merely asked that it should stand until he received an answer. I suppose no one would suffer any detriment in doing that.

Mr. FIELDING. My amendment is not on the record but I find it in the 'Hansard,' as an amendment to subsection 2 of section 3. It was proposed that at a certain time a hearing should be had before the Governor in Council. I proposed that it should read :

At which application will be made to the Minister of Public Works for his approval of such plans; and the Minister of Public Works, after hearing such application, at such time or such other time as may be agreed upon by him, shall report to the Governor in Council, whether in his opinion such plans should be approved, and the Governor in Council may approve of such plans, &c.

I wrote the amendment hastily with the view of having the hon. member communicate with the law clerk of the House about it. I did not like to make this amendment in a hurried way at the table. Perhaps we had better let it stand. I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would suggest that we simply strike out the words 'Governor in Council' where they occur in section 3, and substitute therefor 'Minister of Public Works.'

Mr. FIELDING. That would leave it entirely in the hands of the Minister of Public Works with no reference to the Governor in Council. I have no objection to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It might stand until Tuesday, and in the meantime the law clerk could prepare the amendment.

Progress reported.

PACIFIC AND ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 138) respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

On section 1,

Mr. DYMENT. This only provides for an extension of time. It passed through the Senate Committee without any discussion at all.

On section 5—Amended to read as follows :

The company may build branch lines of railway so as to connect its line of railway with any railway bridge which may be built across the St. Mary's river at or near Sault Ste Marie in the district of Algoma.

Mr. SPROULE. The usual practice is to name the railways. There is no railway named here.

Mr. GRAHAM. The company may build a branch line so as to connect it with any railway bridge which may be built. It is difficult to say what bridge they want to connect with, but it will be with whatever bridge is built.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 167) respecting the Phoenix Insurance Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonald.

Bill (No. 170) respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCool

SUPPLY—THE ROSS RIFLE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding for the House to go into Committee of Supply and the amendment of Mr. Worthington thereto.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr Speaker, I will only detain the House for a few minutes to finish the remarks that I was making on the amendment to the motion to go into Supply. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) seemed to think that the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) had done a grievous wrong by making any criticism whatever of the Ross rifle and he said that in no other legislature in the world would criticism of this sort be permitted. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that in the mother of parliaments itself a vote upon the question of the character of cordite supplied to the army of Great Britain led to the defeat of the Rosebery government in 1895. That ought to be a good enough precedent for us to follow in this parliament. Of course I know that the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton has not a great deal of respect for Englishmen and what they do but still I thought that even he would admit that that is a fair precedent for us to follow in the Canadian House of Commons.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. gentleman mind quoting some authority?

Mr. FOWLER. I have just quoted the authority; that ought to be sufficient. The authority is the fact that the Rosebery government was defeated on the vote which I have mentioned——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Nonsense.

Mr. FOWLER—in 1895, which is the best possible authority. If a man who is a representative of the people felt that a rifle was being put into the hands of the militia of this country which would be dangerous for the militia to handle it would be a greater crime for him to keep silent than to speak. What are we here for? Are the Minister of Militia and the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton to be the only judges as to the arm with which the militia of this country shall be armed? If so things have come to a pretty pass. To say that an expenditure mounting into the millions shall be made by this government and that the members of parliament shall not have the right to discuss the subject of that expenditure is to take a position which is most extraordinary. I think that an argument of that kind needs only to be stated to be refuted; it carries its own refutation with it.

Now, Sir, the question of the cost of this rifle is a matter of some moment to the people of this country. It has been conclusively proved by the gentlemen who have preceded me in discussing this question from the opposition standpoint that the cost of the Ross rifle, even according to the data that we at present have, is about $33.25 per gun; whereas, the average cost of the rifle which it is going to displace, unless an indignant militia refuse to accept the arm, the gun which is supplied by the War Office and which is supplied by private individuals, is only $23.50 per gun. When I speak of the cost of the Ross rifle as being $33.25 I include the cost of the rifle, which is $25, the bayonet, which is $5.25, and the inspection which is $3 per gun, which is the amount according to the expenditure, although the Minister of Militia claims that the inspection costs $1.95 per gun. But, for 50,000 rifles they had a vote of $150,000 and almost the whole of that has been expended. Surely they will not deny that these rifles need a very great deal of inspection yet. The cost of the British rifle complete in all its parts, with bayonet and bayonet case, is $23.50, which makes a difference of about $10 on each gun. Some 60,000 of the Ross rifles have been ordered and this makes a matter of $600,000 of loss to this country. For what? For a sentimental idea. For some sentimental ideas $600,000 would not be too much to pay, but what is this sentimental idea? Let us analyze it. That guns may be manufactured in Canada? Are they? It has been conclusively proved, it has been admitted, that many of the component parts of this gun are not manufactured in Canada but are manufactured outside of Canada in a foregn country at that. Therefore, we are not paying out this $600,000 for a sentimental idea, but we are paying the $600,000 on account of a foolish contract that was entered into between the Minister of Militia and Defence and the Ross Rifle Company, or Sir Charles Ross, who, I believe, is the Ross rifle company itself. Is it worth it? That is what the people of Canada will ask. Apart from the question of the danger, which is, after all, the most important question, because you cannot compare a human life with the mere expenditure of money, but, apart from the question of danger to human life from using the gun, because it has been proved to be more dangerous in the hands of the man using it than to the party against whom it is directed, although I believe it did manage to shoot a man the other day in London, is it worth it that we should spend $600,000 for this purpose? That is what the people of the country are asking of this government. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton has assailed the officials of the general staff. He insinuated that they have been false to their duty, that they have given out some information that was in the possession of the staff to members of the opposition. I want to say, and I say it on the authority of the hon. member for Sherbrooke that it is absolutely untrue that any member of the staff, that any member of the Militia Department, has given out any information, any secret or private information whatever, to him with reference to this matter. What I say for my hon. friend from Sherbrooke is true also with respect to my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) who spoke on this question last night. It is a very unfair thing for any member of this House to make an attack of that kind on gentlemen who are not here to answer for themselves and on gentlemen who are of the character of those who compose the general staff of the Department of Militia. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton has told us that the best men in this country are in favour of the Ross rifle, are standing by it and will stand by it. Well, just let us see who are standing by the Ross rifle up to date. There is the Minister of Militia, one; there is the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, two; the manufacturer himself, three; and I suppose, when the vote is taken, the majority of the members of this House. The Minister of Militia stands by it—why? He has entered into the contract, he has made this contract, he has to stand by it. I think I have intimated fairly well the reasons why the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton is standing by it. It is very apparent why Sir Charles Ross, the manufacturer, is standing by it and the majority of the members of this House are

forced by political exigencies to stand by it. The government has entered into the contract.

Those members know in their hearts that it was an unwise contract, that it is an improvident contract, that the rifle is not a good rifle, that the rifle is a worthless rifle ; but they are compelled to stand by the party because the government they are supporting has made the contract and good or bad they must vote in favour of it. Let us see who are the people who condemn this rifle. They are the experts of the Woolwich Arsenal in England ; they are the experts of the musketry school of Hythe, England. These people ought to know something about whether a rifle is good, bad or indifferent, and they have in unmeasured terms condemned this Ross rifle. It has also been condemned by the experts of the Springfield armoury in the United States, who were asked to report on this rifle, and Sir Charles Ross was himself present in 1903 at the Springfield arsenal when the tests were applied to his rifle and when it was found to be wanting and defective. Thus we have the great experts of the United Kingdom and of the republic of the United States condemning this rifle. Then, in Canada, it has been condemned by General Cotton, the master of ordnance and by Adjutant General Lessard, a member of the general staff, both of whom have reported against it. The officers and men of the militia of Canada have reported against it. The expert shots of the Dominion have reported against it and among others Sergeant Hayhurst, one of the best rifle men in Canada. The Royal Northwest Mounted Police are opposed to it. On the one hand we have the Ross rifle condemned by the experts of England, and the experts of the United States, and the master of ordnance in Canada, and the adjutant general of the militia of Canada, and the Royal Northwest Mounted Police and the officers and men of the militia. And who have we in favour of the Ross rifle ? We have the Minister of Militia, the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) and the majority vote in this House which for the reason I have given, must sustain the action of the government in connection with the Ross rifle. I do not propose to detain the House any longer. I think the reasons given are amply sufficient why this resolution should be supported. I do not anticipate that those reasons will serve to convince hon. gentlemen opposite that they should vote against the government on this occasion, but when the great verdict of the people of this country is rendered and when the people have a chance to pronounce upon the question, I believe they will condemn the Ross rifle and the government in no uncertain terms.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I desire to say a very few words on this matter. Every one admits the absolute necessity of supplying the militia of Canada with an effective rifle, because our militia force without a proper arm would be absolutely useless. Therefore, the project to provide a proper supply of efficient rifles for the militia of this country ought to meet with the approval of all. The conditions which faced the Minister of Militia when he had to deal with this subject in 1902 were not free from difficulty. But, the very argument used by the Minister of Militia in support of his course and his explanation of the difficulties that have confronted him during the past six years, afford sufficient reason why he should have paused for a long time before he undertook to engage in the manufacture of a rifle and subject himself to the experience through which he says the English authorities have passed. It is asserted by the Minister of Militia that this was the rifle with which the Austrian army had been equipped since 1896, but the hon. gentleman did not make himself very clear on that point. Is the rifle Mark I which was selected by the Minister of Militia—which I understand to be practically the same as the sample rifle—is that rifle precisely the same as that which has been used by the Austrian army since 1896 ? That point has not been explained by the Minister of Militia. Now, the hon. minister took a proper course when he called together a board of the best experts of Canada for the purpose of determining whether or not this was a proper rifle, but before doing that it was most important that he should have considered whether he could procure within reasonable time for the militia of this country a proper supply of the Lee-Enfield rifles which are used by the British army. It has been admitted by the Minister of Militia that if it were possible to secure these rifles from the war department in Great Britain or to establish a manufactory in this country for their production, that would be the best course to pursue.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not think the minister admitted that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I understood.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He stated that was his desire, but I do not think he admits such is his intention now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say so. I said he admitted that if it were possible, there were certain advantages in having the militia of Canada armed with the same rifle as that supplied to the troops of the United Kingdom.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I thought you used the present tense, and said the minister 'admits.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not observe that the minister made any distinction

between the present and the past tense. The argument has been made by the Minister of Militia that there was great difficulty in perfecting the Lee-Enfield rifle in Great Britain, and the same argument was very properly put forward by my hon. friend from Victoria, who says that in Great Britain they have Mark I, Mark II, Mark III, and Mark IV for all I know.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Up to Mark X.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister therefore had before him the fact that a great deal of experimenting was necessary before any new arm to be adopted for the Canadian militia could be brought to a state of perfection. I should have thought that very circumstance would have caused the Minister of Militia to pause. He was embarking upon the manufacture of a rifle in Canada which his own board on inquiry had declared to be defective in certain respects, and notwithstanding this report the minister approved this rifle in the end without taking any steps, other than the report of Sir Charles Ross himself, to ascertain whether these defects could be remedied. That was a very unusual course for the Minister of Militia to adopt. He has read the report of that Board of Inquiry. It is not signed by all the members of the Board, but so far as I remember there is not a great deal of difference between the report of the main body of the board and that of the other members. They point out this :

> The chief objection or difficulty which was found in connection with the tests to which the Ross rifle was subjected, was brought out in the 'endurance test.' While in firing 1,300 rounds out of each of the rifles, the Lee-Enfield stood the test quite satisfactorily. It was found that after heating, the breech of the Ross rifle closed with more or less difficulty, the action being very stiff with occasional jamming besides which a possibility of 'double loading' exists.
>
> Were this an inherent objection to this rifle, independent of details of mechanism, the board would regard it as a very serious matter, but Sir Charles Ross states, that any difficulty in this respect can be effectually obviated, and the board submit herewith a memorandum (exhibit 'D') from him in reference to this point which in his opinion, affords an explanation of the unsatisfactory result of this test, and the manner in which the same may be overcome.
>
> The board do not profess to pronounce upon the question of a complete remedy of this objection, but having called attention to it, assume that due precaution and provision with reference thereto will be taken in the event of the rifle being adopted.

The English language could not be plainer for the purpose of placing upon the minister and the government the responsibility of determining that that defect could be remedied and would be remedied before the rifle was finally adopted. The report continues as follows:

> This is all the more important, inasmuch as in comparison with the Lee-Enfield, there is not the leverage in opening the breech which the mechanism of the latter rifle affords.
>
> The magazines of both rifles are unsatisfactory, and can be improved upon. The board recommended the adoption of the 'Harris feed system,' in the adoption of which there need be no difficulty.
>
> Speaking generally, the board believe that the Ross rifle has features which are a positive advantage over the Lee-Enfield, while it is contended by Sir Charles Ross that he can easily remedy any of the drawbacks which have been pointed out.

What reason, after all, was there for the government to abandon the Lee-Enfield ? What were the advantages of abandoning it and adopting the rifle which has been selected ? I do not desire to say one word which would reflect in any possible way upon the merits of the Ross rifle, and I do not think my hon. friend the member for Sherbrooke did anything more in his address than to read from the record page after page detailing certain defects which undoubtedly have been disclosed in this rifle. It is asserted that these for the most part have been remedied. Let it not be suggested for one moment that these reports are not important, because the Minister of Militia himself in the concluding part of his speech, speaking of the standing committee on small arms, said this:

> I believe these men are able, conscientious and determined to do their duty. Some of them are now at Quebec testing carefully an improved, I suppose it might be called, or a modified Ross rifle. As the result of what has happened; as a result of the reports which have been made, and information which has been gained, the contractor, with the assistance of members of the Militia Department, has thought it desirable to make certain changes, and before the manufacture of the new order for 10,000 rifles is begun this modified form of rifle will be thoroughly tested.

Well, it is of no use for us to say that these reports, which have been read in the House and which formed the principal part of the speech of my hon. friend from Sherbrooke, are not of much importance, in view of the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia has declared that owing to these reports a new, or as he terms it a modified, Ross rifle has been adopted and will be tested by the members of this standing committee before it will be served out to the troops of the country. It does seem to me that the reading of these reports to the House ought not to bring to the hon. member for Sherbrooke the condemnation which the Minister of Militia in the early part of his speech saw fit to mete out to that hon. gentleman.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the rifles now in store are not to be served out until the new rifles are ready ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I did not say that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because the rifles now in store are being distributed among the troops and will be used in the present camp.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I made no reference to anything of that kind, because I have no information on the subject. I was merely reading the hon. gentleman's language, and pointing out that in the new or modified form of Ross rifle which is now being tested, those changes have been made as the result of the very reports which have been brought forward in this House by my hon. friend from Sherbrooke. That is the language of the Minister of Militia in dealing with that subject.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In part.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, the hon. gentleman qualifies it by saying that there is other information.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I might point out, if the hon. member will allow me, that the only four important changes that have been necessary in the rifle are a return to four recognized in Mark I as first presented by Sir Charles Ross to the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not of course know about that. I do observe in some of the reports that in the first place there was Mark I. Some defects were found in that, and they were remedied, and Mark II rifle was brought out and supplied to the troops. In Mark II certain defects were found which had not been observed in Mark I; and Mark III, according to the statement just now made by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, is more or less a reversion to Mark I. But what I desire to point out is that the Department of Militia seems to have failed, so far as the evidence before the House shows, to have given much consideration to the defects pointed out by the committee in the first instance.

It would have been worth some further effort on the part of the Department of Militia and of the government to procure the Lee-Enfield rifle before this series of experiments were entered upon. Great Britain, according to the statements of hon. gentlemen who are authorities on this subject, has been experimenting on the Lee-Enfield rifle for a great many years. Why should not we take advantage of the experience of Great Britain in that regard instead of beginning a similar series of experiments ourselves?—because that is exactly the way in which it has turned out. We have been doing with the Ross rifle in the last six years exactly the same work which Great Britain has been doing with the Lee-Enfield in the last ten or twelve years. Was there any need of that? It would not seem so. The Minister of Militia says he was unable to induce the small arms companies of Great Britain to embark in the manufacture of the Lee-Enfield rifle in Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Might I point out that the Lee-Enfield rifle, as it was in 1901, when the adoption of the Ross rifle was first considered has changed completely. Practically a new rifle has been adopted in England since then. I think there have been two serious changes in the Lee-Enfield—not simply changes but new types, two marks, since 1900. We would have had to go on changing just the same even if we had adopted the Lee-Enfield.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not prepared to dispute matters respecting which the minister must be better informed than I. But it seems to me that the minister's statement supports most thoroughly the argument I have just presented. Instead of beginning a series of experiments on a new rifle ourselves, it would have been more prudent to avail ourselves of the experience of the past in Great Britain as well as benefit by the experience which Great Britain must continue to gather in the future. Undoubtedly the experience of Great Britain must be very much greater than any we could acquire with our comparatively small military force. Great Britain must naturally have a greater number of great men possessing expert knowledge in the manufacture and improvement of arms, who are applying themselves continually to the devising of changes and improvements. I should think that would have been better than to begin the task of doing all that ourselves upon a relatively small scale, without anything like the same number of experts, or men of the same experience in a matter of a highly technical nature, such as this.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Does my hon. friend mean by that that he would have favoured the establishment of a government factory for the manufacture of rifles ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would require a little more information than is before the House at present before coming to a decision. My hon. friend, for example, says he could not procure any manufacturer in Great Britain to start the industry in this country. But he did not inform the House whether or not he offered to any small arms manufacturer in Great Britain the same terms as those he offered to Ross Rifle Company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The negotiations did not proceed that far. I went to the Chamberlains who, I knew, repre-

sented the Birmingham Small Arms Company, and endeavoured to induce them to come here with a branch factory. They took time to consider and declined.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They might consider and decline the mere offer that they should come to Canada and establish a small arms factory. But they might consider and might not decline a proposal that they should come and establish a small arms factory on the same terms as those tendered to Sir Charles Ross. I am not passing any criticism on Sir Charles Ross in this connection. As a business man, he was perfectly justified in getting the best possible contract he could. But it seems to me that the terms were pretty favourable and such as would be likely to attract the attention of men in England engaged in manufacturing the Lee-Enfield.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I went so far as to state the probable number of arms we would require per year, and I also said I had no doubt the government would undertake to buy all its requirements from the small arms company if they would establish a branch here—those two points being similar to those in the Ross contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then of course there is the other consideration whether we could not have secured from Great Britain as large a supply of rifles at any time as we can get from the factory we have established.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We could not at that time get any.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would be inclined to think, if it were known that the government of Canada required a certain number of rifles per year for a certain period of years, there would not have been great difficulty in arranging with the English government for the supply of those rifles. I would think it would be much easier for the small arms manufacturers in Great Britain to undertake to supply those than for Sir Charles Ross, who had no factory at all, and who had to build a factory.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is what the Birmingham Company said they would do, but they would have to get the consent of the War Office before making a contract. They wanted to remain in England and supply us here. We wished to have the factory here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree that, in the case of this industry, as of any other, it is desirable to have the manufacture carried on in Canada as far as possible. But when you are dealing with a technical matter like this, a matter of so experimental and delicate a character, when your purpose is to obtain a perfect rifle, and when you have the experience of every nation in the world showing the extreme difficulty in obtaining such a weapon, it would seem more prudent to have availed ourselves of the work and experience of Great Britain than to begin the manufacture ourselves under a contract such as this. After all these reports, after all the criticisms and commendations, what do you come down to ? You come down to the one thing which I am capable of understanding, because it is not technical and seems to have been written by a man of good common sense and certainly a good marksman. I refer to the report made only in December last by Sergeant Hayhurst. He certainly does not seem actuated by any unfair motives. His commendation of the rifle in some respects can be placed against his strong criticism of it in other respects. For example, he points out that in using the Ross rifle he got an average of eighty-five at the shorter ranges and ninety-five at the longer ranges compared with ninety-three and one hundred and four respectively, when he shot with the Lee-Enfield. There is perhaps no great difference, but it is not in favour of the Ross rifle. Speaking of the results he says :

> You will notice in all my scores with the Ross some very wide shots, more particularly at the longer ranges. I also used the improved Ross in practice for one week at Bisley in 1906 and had a similar experience.

Then he deals with the question of sights. He condemns them pretty severely. He criticises the barrel. He speaks of the breech mechanism and gives some criticism of that, but he favours some of the elements of the Ross rifle in that regard. As to the magazine he says :

> There is no question but that it would be much improved by the introduction of the clip feed in place of the hand feed. I found after careful practice that more cartridges go on the ground than into the magazine, and this would be much worse under the excitement of even rapid fire, not to speak of action.

Speaking of the stock he said :

> There is much that could be improved in this feature particularly the fitting, selection of material and strength.
>
> Of the many rifles I have examined the fitting was very bad, and the wood was frequently cross-grained and spongy where it should have been straight and sound especially at the small of the butt, a weak point.
>
> In conclusion I would say that with all of the bad faults and many of the weak features removed and strong durable parts introduced in their place a very fine serviceable rifle would result, but which for a fine accurate target shooting rifle would still be inferior to the present Lee-Enfield barrel with good sights and ammunition.

Well, that is not a very strong commendation of the rifle, taking the summary of Sergeant Hayhurst as a criterion of the character of the rifle at the present time. And what has impressed me throughout the discussion and from the reading of the various reports which have been made

and the tests which have been had with the Ross rifle is that the Ross rifle may be a good rifle in many respects, but there is a great deal of doubt in the minds of those who have used it as to whether, in its present condition, so far as Mark I, and Mark II, are concerned, it is a rifle which will stand the rough usage which it must necessarily encounter in active service. And that would be the strongest criticism which I would have to make of the rifle from the evidence which has been presented, whether the testimony of witness or the documents brought down by the Militia Department. And, after all, that is what you want a rifle for—you want a rifle that will stand active service. If it will not stand active service and the usage it will get in active service, it seems to me that it is the duty of the Militia Department to see that the necessary changes are made, that a pattern rifle is provided such as will make future supplies of this rifle thoroughly serviceable to the troops of this country if they should be called to the field. You could not do a greater injustice to the militiamen of Canada than to ask them to take the field against a foe with a rifle by which they were handicapped. It would be a consequence to which we should all look with the utmost apprehension, with the utmost dread, that our young men, when meeting a foe, should be equipped with an arm which was not the equal of any arm in the world. But we cannot, apparently, feel very sure of that so far as Mark I, and Mark II are concerned. In fact, the action of the Minister of the Militia in accepting and now testing Mark III of this rifle, a modified form of the arm, is evidence enough that we have not been wholly successful up to the present time.

Now, with regard to the contract itself: In the first place, I do not observe—the minister will correct me if I am in error—that there were any specifications or drawings provided for. The quality of the rifle seems to depend altogether upon a certain sample rifle deposited with the minister, which is to be the standard according to which all future rifles must be manufactured. It is true that the sample may be improved from time to time and the contractor may be called upon to come up to the changes and improvements thus made. But there were no specifications and drawings. It may be that these are not necessary or usual, but one would suppose——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The company, of course, had drawings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, but they are not referred to in the contract or made part of the contract. Therefore, the contractor is bound only by the agreement to manufacture the rifle up to the standard of the specimen rifle deposited with the Minister of Militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Inspection is provided for.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that. But, if the rifle is inspected and found to come up to the standard, it must be accepted.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Which can be based only on specifications and plans. Inspection would be absolutely impossible without specifications and drawings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the difficulty about that is that the minister seems inclined to bring into the contract something that is not there. The proper way, if drawings and specifications are required, would have been either to attach them to the contract or to provide that specifications and drawings should be submitted by the minister, and that the contractor should be obliged to comply with them. That would have left a certain remedy in the hands of the minister which is not available to him to-day.

Then, another unusual provision of the contract, and one greatly in the interest of the contractor, is that the expenditure in manufacture up to $18.75 is to be advanced by the govrenment from time to time. I infer from the evidence that the rifle could not cost the manufacturer more than $18.75. The result of the provision of the contract to which I have just referred, which has been read and which I shall not repeat, is that the government pays for the rifle as it is being manufactured, and that, on its delivery, it pays the profit. This means providing a very considerable proportion of the working capital, a very favourable provision for the contractor.

Another provision is that in case of war, the government may serve a notice of thirty days after which the contractor shall say how many rifles he is able to supply. This seems absolutely illusory. I do not see that the country could depend upon that. Suppose war had been declared between Great Britain and some other country five or six years ago, what would have been our position ? In the first place, our troops would have been armed with Mark I or Mark II of the Ross rifle, and these rifles apparently would not have been perfectly serviceable, for defects are admitted and stated in the reports read before this House. But, passing from that, what would have been our position as to obtaining any necessary further supply of rifles ? How would we stand under this contract as compared with our position under some reasonable arrangement with the War Office ? If we had an arrangement with the War Office, we could apply

to Great Britain, who would certainly be the mistress of the seas, and who would be able to bring rifles to our shores. And it is beyond question that an arrangement could have been made for a proper supply within a reasonable time. What would be our position under the contract with Sir Charles Ross. I am not saying this by way of criticism upon him but by way of criticism upon the government for venturing to enter upon such a contract. We should require a further supply of rifles. We would give notice that war had been declared and would call upon him to state how many rifles he could supply. Under the terms of the contract, he could reply : I will supply 1,000 rifles within a year, and if he supplied that number in that time he would fulfil his contract.

Mr. FOSTER. He would have thirty days in which to make that reply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But suppose the government said : We want 50,000 rifles, he would have to state how many he could supply. We would at once be able to purchase the balance between the number he was able to supply and the 50,000 we require.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is exactly what I am saying. The minister is only adding point to my argument. You would be obliged to purchase from some other source.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But, so far as Sir Charles Ross is concerned, you would have no guarantee of an adequate supply of rifles in an emergency. That is the point. The contract by its terms failed to make any provision whatever for such an emergency as I have pointed out. If we could purchase 49,000 rifles and Sir Charles Ross could supply only 1,000, what advantage would it be to us? Why not purchase the whole 50,000 from the same source as that from which we would obtain the 49,000 ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is a provision under which he is obliged to work double time, if necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know that. But he is not required by the terms of the contract to supply any particular number of rifles within a specified time.

Now, as I have said, during the course of construction, we are obliged to pay up to $18.75, that is, 75 per cent of the price of the rifle. We are obliged to supply that from time to time. We are obliged to supply that upon investigation of the amount expended by Sir Charles Ross, an investigation which does not seem to me to be a very adequate one. The Minister of Militia corrected me last night when I referred to this investigation as having been made by an inspector ; it appears to have been made by an accountant. I was misled by a provision of the contract. In the contract it is provided that the investigation shall be made by the inspector of small arms. But apparently it has been found impracticable to make any such investigation by a mere examination of the material on hand. Therefore an alternative method has been devised, and a chartered accountant employed by the government goes through the books of the Ross Rifle Company, makes a certain investigation and report, and upon that the money is paid over. The contract was unworkable and the substituted arrangement is unsatisfactory. Then there was another important feature of this contract, and that was the grant of about 19 acres of land upon the Plains of Abraham to this company. I do not know what the land was valued at when it was granted, I do not know whether it had any particular market value or not. But I should imagine that it would become of great value in the not distant future. As this practically amounted to a complete alienation of the land, it would have been much more to the credit of the government to follow the usual and constitutional course, and to come to parliament for power to make that grant. The whole project would then have been open to discussion and perhaps to criticism ; whereas under the course which was pursued, a lease for 99 years at a rental of $1 per year, and perpetually renewable, was granted to Sir Charles Ross; so that by means of a perpetual lease the land has effectually passed from the ownership and control of the people of this country without any opportunity for discusion in parliament.

The question of the price of the rifle has been gone into very fully by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, and I will not deal with that again. It appears that the rifles purchased from the War Office in 1895 were purchased for about £2 15s.; the rifles purchased from the trade were of course more expensive. But so far as the price is concerned, we are certainly in no better position to-day, it is not pretended that under the contract we are to be in any better position in the future, than if we had procured these rifles in Great Britain.

Therefore, so far as this contract is concerned, it has not in any way improved the position of this country with regard to the armament of our forces. It does not improve the position so far as the character of the rifle is concerned. I would think that is a very moderate statement of the case. It does not improve the position of the country as to the cost of the arm.

The contract itself merely provides that we shall pay at the rate of $25 per rifle, and it is the intention of the contract that we shall pay to Sir Charles Ross exactly the same price as that which we would have been obliged to pay in Great Britain. It does not improve the position of the country in so far as assuring an effective supply of rifles is concerned. The Minister of Militia just now has answered me by saying that if we could not get them from Sir Charles Ross, we could at least purchase them from somewhere else. We could have done that if this factory had not been established. This, taking these three leading aspects of the case, I am not able to see how the position of the country has been improved by this contract.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the action of the government in entering into this contract, in the first place, without proper investigation of the character of the rifle, deserves the censure of this House. The government took a proper step in the first instance by establishing a board to make a certain investigation, but when that board disclosed certain defects in the rifle, the government absolutely failed in its duty in not continuing that investigation so as to become absolutely assured of its position before it entered into a contract which would bind this country for all time to come. Having regard to the fact that six years have since elapsed, and that during that time the defects that were then pointed out by that board do not seem to have been remedied either completely or satisfactorily, censure must certainly be laid at the door of the Department of Militia. It may be, as my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton has said, that this is to be attributed to some officers in the department. I pass no opinion upon that. But my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton himself, in speaking of the inaction of the department or of its officials, said that as a result every one was condemning this rifle from Dan to Beersheba. Well, if every one was condemning the rifle it was surely high time for my hon. friend the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) to bring the matter to the attention of the House, and to invite a discussion of the motion which he has presented. I venture to think that the situation to-day is not very desirable or satisfactory. We are paying as much for this rifle as we would have paid for the Lee-Enfield rifle. We will continue to experiment upon it in the future. We have not the same rifle as that which is employed by the British forces, we have not the benefit of the experience and knowledge gained by the British government in its experiments on the Lee-Enfield rifle, and in time of war we have absolutely no sufficient guarantee that there will be a necessary supply of rifles forthcoming. Under these circumstances, I think the matter has been properly brought to the attention of the House, and that the government, in dealing with the whole subject of the arming of our forces by this rifle, has not displayed the diligence and the knowledge of conditions that might properly have been expected.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). I feel like apologizing to the House for speaking at this late hour on a subject which has been apparently so well threshed out. But I am desirous of saying a few words on the subject of this rifle, with which I am personally cognizant, and also of reading a letter or two from some of the people who are interested in rifle shooting in our country. I do not propose to go into the merits of the contract entered into between the Ross Rifle Manufacturing Company and the government, nor am I going into the many questions that have been brought up by the hon. gentleman who moved this motion, and have been spoken to by the Minister of Militia, the member for Victoria and Haliburton and others. I want to relate a little experience I have had myself with the Ross rifle, and also with the Lee-Enfield. I have had considerable experience in shooting, and have been an active member of the Vancouver Rifle Association for some years, and have associated with riflemen on the coast for the last ten or twelve years. I want to say that there are no body of men who are more severe in their criticism of a fire arm than the riflemen; and when they, the formers speakers, speak of every Lee-Enfield as being a perfect shooting weapon, they speak as men who have not had as much experience in rifle shooting and in handling rifles. The good shots, who have won their position on the provincial teams then on the Dominion team, and from that to the Bisley team, trying and retrying rifles that are stored in the different armouries throughout the country. A good shot will come in and look over the rifles that are stacked, and he will select from the armoury a rifle to take out to the range. I have seen Lee-Enfields taken out of the armoury and tried on the range, guns that nobody would attempt to make any correct shooting with. After trying them I think every man who has used the rifle will bear out that statement. Many Lee-Enfields have been given out in times past and will be given out, as many Ross rifles will be given out. Many Mannlicher, many Krag-Jorgenson and many other rifles, no matter what the manufacture may be, which are not perfect weapons in every respect. So that, to condemn the whole Ross rifle outright on account of the bad shooting of one, or two, or three, or even one hundred or two hundred rifles, will not

be justified if a fair comparison be made between that rifle and other rifles. I am of the opinion that the government acted very wisely indeed in establishing a rifle factory in Canada. If it were to carry out the well established principle, laid down many years ago in Canada, that we shall endeavour to manufacture as many kinds of goods as we can for use in Canada, if it were to follow out the protection policy of our friends opposite, then there can be no argument by or on behalf of our hon. friends opposite against the establishing in Canada of a rifle manufactory. We, to-day, protect very highly indeed all kinds of manufactured goods. We are endeavouring to bring in manufactures; so that we are simply carrying out a well established principle of this and other governments in attempting to bring into the country all the manufactures we possibly can. Whether or not it was wise to have given the Ross Rifle Company a site on the Plains of Abraham is a question that I am not going to discuss, but I am of the opinion that the people down in the city of Quebec, who are directly benefiting by the establishment of that factory, were willing to see it established on the Plains of Abraham. So, I do not think that a very good case has been made out on that question. We want manufactures of all kinds in Canada and we want rifles to be manufactured in Canada. If we are ever to be a great nation, as we all hope we will be, we have to undertake all the responsibilities of nationhood and citizenship; so that, when we have established in the country the manufacture of rifles we have made one great step towards our own independence of any other country in supplying us with arms in case we should require them. I must, if I am not too bold, commend the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) for the very fair way in which he has handled this question. He asks: Why did you give up the Lee-Enfield? Why did you go into the manufacture of rifles? There is no more reason in the world why we should have clung to the old Lee-Enfield as there is why Great Britain should have clung to the original Lee-Enfield. I have shot with the old Lee-Enfield and I have seen guns of that make prefectly useless in so far as good shooting is concerned. It may have been a good weapon of offence and defence in the field, but so far as good marksmanship is concerned it was impossible. A great deal of the criticism that has been levelled against the Ross rifle has emanated from the marksmen of Canada. I tried the Ross rifle three years ago. I went to the butts along with some others and we tried the rifle out there. There was nothing wrong with the mechanism, there was nothing wrong with the magazine and there was nothing wrong with the shooting qualities other than this, and it is a point that I immediately brought to the attention of the Minister of Militia, that the percentage of clear cut marks in the target was less than the percentage of those that keyholed. Members of the House who are not used to rifle shooting will not know posssibly what that difference means, but if the rifle ball is the least bit, I might say, wobby, it will make a keyholed shape mark in the target, as the Lee-Enfield never does. It made a keyhole mark in the target and our shots did not take very kindly to the rifle on that account. However this, like everything else that is being tried, is a new departure and a government or an individual is bound to meet with criticism. If the government or the Department of Militia and Defence, on finding these defects, did not eliminate them they would be justly be targets for the most severe criticism. Mark I rifle, not being a perfect weapon, in so far as the experiments showed, Mark II was issued. The defects in Mark I were overcome by Mark II. Then the defects of Mark II were overcome by Mark III and that has been the history of any rifle that has ever been given to troops in any part of the civilized world. I want to read a letter that I have received from one of the best shots we have in British Columbia. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the province of British Columbia, per capita, has the best shots in Canada. The rifle team that comes down here to the butts at Rockliffe has done the best shooting during the last five years of any other rifle team in Canada. I speak of per capita. We have a man in our province who has been upon the Bisley team many times and we have also a King's prizeman. Major Duff-Stuart who was one of the original winners of the Palma trophy down at Seagirt is one of the men who favours the Ross rifle. This letter is from Lieutenant James Sclater, a gentleman who won the Grand Aggregate last year at the butts in the province of British Columbia and was also well up, not in the first twenty, but in the Bisley team for this coming year, although he is not on the Bisley team. Mr. Sclater is a well known gentleman in the city of Vancouver, having lived there for twenty years, he was for many years agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway and is now agent of the Western Fuel Company, the Macdonald Marpole Company, as it is called, and is a man of high standing in British Columbia. He writes me this letter unsolicited:

Vancouver, British Columbia, April 25, 1908.

My Dear Sir,—I wondered when I wired you yesterday asking for the new model Ross if you would understand. The message was suggested by Fred. Richardson, who is at present in the hospital here, who had been in communication with Sir Charles Ross concerning a trial of the new gun which I made here. This new model of the Ross is a crackerjack. You mark my words if in a short

time, when a few of them have been handed out and the men know what they are capable of, you do not see a demand for them from the militia from end to end of the country. There will be no more knocks, except from some prejudiced ones. I went out last Wednesday along with Duff Stuart and Mr. Studd, of the V.R.A., did not know how the rifle would shoot, or anything about it except that, from our previous experience of which you know, I had no faith in the gun. I was practically a man prejudiced against the Ross. I came away from the range an enthusiast in its favour. It was agreed that I would take two sighters at each range, and then shoot match conditions, with time limit on shots and all other ordinary restrictions. I made the following scores:

200..	33
500..	34
600..	31
Total..	98

and made a 'magpie' with my second last shot at that. With just a little more care I could have had my 'century,' for after I had finished my score I put on three more bulls-eyes just by way of practice. Show me any rifle that a man can do that with for the first time that is not a true weapon. Its straight shooting powers were a revelation both to Duff Stuart and myself. After I had finished the official scores, Duff lay down and put on 34 at 500 and 32 at 600 just as easy as rolling off a log. You ought to have seen the pleased look of wonderment and delight on his face as he plugged in bull after bull, as much as to say 'Well, isn't this easy.' He was another convert and Duff knows a thing or two about a rifle. Since then I have had the rifle out on the range twice and while I did not make 98 with it on account of the weather conditions which were totally against big scoring, yet I made top score shooting against the whole regiment on both occasions, and with no aids to sighting other than the plain sights used on the Lee-Enfield. With the Sutherland adjustable sights the new model ought to be unbeatable. If I continue to get the same satisfaction out of the Ross as I got out of the one owned by Richardson, I shall take it to Bisley and take my chances with them all. Of course I am not an expert on arms and can only speak of what I find. I am more than delighted to know that I am getting one of the new rifles.

Yours,
(Sgd.) J. SCLATER.

That in my opinion, is as good an argument in favour of the Ross rifle, and a good deal better than any that could be used against it by Sergeant Hayhurst who evidently sat down to write out a thorough criticism. I am not casting any aspersion upon Sergeant Hayhurst but I believe that if Sergeant Hayhurst takes one of these new rifles and lies down at the butts, with his sharp eye and steady hand he will make such scoring as he never made before. I believe from what Mr. Sclater says there is no better weapon made. Let me point out this further: the 'News-Advertiser' of Vancouver is the Conservative organ in that city and it is one of the sanest papers published in British Columbia, and their military writer in his article which appears in the Sunday issue has this to say of the Ross rifle.

On account of the many criticisms of the Ross rifle, it may be of interest to state that a new model of this rifle has been under test here lately. Staff Sergeant Richardson, the well-known rifle shot, of Victoria, who is at present in the general hospital here, convalescing from a severe illness, purchased one of the new Ross's, but owing to his sickness was prevented from trying it at the range. It was entrusted to one of the local shots for trial, and a most satisfactory result was obtained on Wednesday of last week. The test was made under the supervision of Major Duff Stuart, the adjutant of last year's Bisley team, who states that the rifle is one of the best shooting weapons that he has ever had in his hands. In the new model a radical change has been made in the barrel, which has been increased both in length and weight resulting in great accuracy in shooting power. The complicated sights of the original Ross have been abandoned, it being the intention, it is understood, of equipping the new model with the Sutherland sight. In the one under trial here, the ordinary 'H' sight with which the ordinary Lee-Enfield is equipped was attached, so that the results obtained may be fairly compared with those obtainable from a Lee-Enfield. At the 200 yards' range, the score was 33 out of a possible 35. At 500 yards two consecutive scores of 34 were made, and at 600 yards the scores were respectively 31 and 32, all being shot under match conditions. Lieutenant J. Sclater, who assisted in the trial, is so satisfied with the new model that he has ordered one from the Ross factory, which ought to be here in the course of a week. Other improvements than those mentioned above have also been made in the rifle, of which a detailed description will appear later.

I might go on for a considerable time showing the merits of the Ross rifle, but I do not think I could add anything stronger than I have read from the letter of Mr. Sclater and from the pen of the military writer in the 'News-Advertiser.' I say this: no matter what department of a government undertakes a new departure they must expect the severest criticism, and, if after five or six years we have succeeded, as we apparently have, in bringing a weapon to such perfection as the new Ross rifle has attained, then I say the money has been well expended and the government is to be commended for the undertaking.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Worthington).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Borden (Carleton),	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Cockshutt,	Perley,
Crocket,	Porter,
Foster,	
Fowler,	

Herron, Schaffner,
Lake, Sproule,
Lalor, Wilmot,
McCarthy (Calgary), Wright (Muskoka)—18.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth, Laurier (L'Assomption),
Black, Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Borden (Sir Frederick), Maclean (Lunenburg),
Boyer, Macpherson,
Brodeur, McCool,
Burrows, McIntyre (Perth),
Carney, McKenzie,
Cash, McLean (Huron),
Chisholm (Antigonish), Marcil (Bonaventure),
Copp, Martin (Wellington),
Crawford, Miller,
Cyr, Oliver,
Demers, Pardee,
Dugas, Paterson,
Emmerson, Pickup,
Fielding, Proulx,
Finlay, Pugsley,
Finlayson, Ross (Cape Breton),
Fortier, Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Girard, Smith (Nanaimo),
Graham, Templeman,
Hall, Tolmie,
Harty, Turgeon,
Johnston, Turriff,
Kennedy, Watson,
Knowles, Wilson (Russell),
Lachance, Zimmerman.—55.
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Talbot,	Bergeron,
Clarke,	Marshall,
Gordon,	Ames,
Carvell,	Northrup,
Loggie,	Elson,
Schell (Glengarry),	Lennox,
Tobin,	Monk,
Reid (Restigouche),	Ganong,
Telford,	Reid (Grenville),
Adamson,	Macdonell,
Brown,	Lancaster,
Gauvreau,	Boyce,
Delisle,	Clements,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Avery,
Michaud,	Daniel,
Rousseau,	Alcorn,
Desjardins,	Henderson,
Lemieux,	Haggart,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Paquet,
Galliher,	Roche (Marquette),
McLean (York, C.),	Morin,
Sloan,	Osler,
Guthrie,	Broder,
Bickerdike,	Barker,
Bureau,	Barr,
Caldwell,	Beattie,
Caron,	Bennett,
Conmee,	Blain,
Devlin,	Brabazon,
Dyment,	Bristol,
German,	Christie,
Grant,	Clare,
Fisher,	Forget,
Law,	Jackson (Elgin),
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Kemp,
LeBlanc,	Leonard,
Macdonald,	Lewis,
McColl,	MacLaren,
Ratz,	Maclean (York, S.),
Schell (Oxford),	Owen,
Sifton,	Pringle,
Sinclair,	Seagram,
Stewart,	Stanfield,
Wright (Renfrew),	Smith (Wentworth),
Smith (Oxford),	Staples,
Bole,	Thompson,
Beland,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Jackson (Selkirk),	Ward,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	White,
McCraney,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington).
McIntyre (Strathcona).	Chisholm (Huron).

Amendment of Mr. Worthington negatived.

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

Post Office—outside service—salaries and allowances, $2,353,139.25.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). There is here an increase of $286,800, which is made up as follows; post office inspector's offices, $12,000; railway mail service, $71,000; post offices generally, $203,000. The increase in the offices of post office inspectors is made up as follows; twenty-six increases of $50 each and one of $30, eleven additional clerkships, and one additional messenger.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What are the duties of inspectors ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The duties of inspectors are defined in the Post Office Act. Generally the inspector visits all the offices of his district, instructs the postmasters in their duties, looks after the accountant's branch in the several offices, and reports upon their condition to the department at Ottawa. He also locates new offices. He takes the place of the Postmaster General in his district, subject always to the decision of the Postmaster General.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Has he any authority over the time the mails go to different places in the country ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The inspector is bound to give attention to all these details. When a demand is made for an increased service, the Postmaster General refers the matter to the inspector, who makes a report to the Postmaster General, and then authority is given to him to open an office or otherwise to increase the service.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I wish to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General

and also to the attention of the Minister of Railways a matter which is of great importance to the constituency which I have the honour to represent. Some time ago a railway was constructed from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour. Previous to that time the mail left Charlottetown at six o'clock in the morning and was distributed by stage all along the route to Murray Harbour the day after it reached Charlottetown. I wish to read for the benefit of the minister an editorial which appeared in the Charlottetown 'Guardian' of the 15th of May, which will perhaps make the matter clearer than I could express :

Murray Harbour Railway.

There are many complaints of the inadequacy of the train service on the Murray Harbour Railway, and they appear to be well founded. The service is slow and not well arranged. Passengers desiring to leave points along this road and cross by steamer to the mainland under the present arrangements must stay over night in the city both going and coming, and on their return trip must spend not only the night but the best part of the following day here. If a Sunday intervenes the case is still worse.

The mail arrangements by train are equally bad, the incoming mails being held over night and till three o'clock the following day before going out on the train and only reach their destination late the following night at best, and for points a little off the railway not till the third day. This cannot be called modern or up-to-date service. Even under these conditions the traffic on the branch is large and has exceeded expectations. The people served by the road are clearly entitled to a better mail service.

A good while ago it was given out that the Railway Department would put on motor cars for service on this road, but nothing has been heard of this recently. If only one of these cars was put on the Port Vernon loop to connect with the train on the main line it would save an hour in the regular through service. Surely something can be done that will give the patrons of this road a chance to come and go and make connection with the outside world with reasonable promptitude.

Never before were so many millions being expended on transportation, and this we are told is an election year. And yet the train and mail service on the government road through this thickly settled and prosperous section of the most thickly settled province of Canada is such as we have described. The interests of business, the convenience of the travelling public, the general welfare and good politics alike demand that this service shall be speedily and permanently improved.

This is a matter which should secure the attention, not only of the Postmaster General, but of the Minister of Railways and Canals. Probably the fault lies with the Minister of Railways. There is no doubt that this is a line of railway which pays the government of Canada perhaps as well as any of the branch lines connected with the government system, still we have the fact that the mails for the southern portion of the province arrive in Charlottetown between 9 and 11 at night and are not distributed until three or four days afterwards. It is up to the Postmaster General to improve the system, and I believe, that if this matter had been brought to his attention before, he would have improved it. He should see that we have an up to date post office system in the province, especially the southern portion, which had a better system before we were given improved communication by railway.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this to my attention. The fault does not lie with my department but with the Railway Department, which has the arranging of the railway system of Prince Edward Island. The Post Office Department pays the Intercolonial Railway for mileage just as it does other railway companies, and we are entitled to just as good a service. I shall make the necessary representations to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals to-morrow and see that the Intercolonial Railway gives us a service on Prince Edward Island to which the Island, and particularly that section of Queens county, is entitled.

Mr. ALEXANDER MARTIN (Queens). I am pleased to hear this statement of the hon. gentleman. I do not think however he can claim that the matter has not been brought to his attention. I placed a question on the Order Paper early in the session.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was away.

Mr. ALEXANDER MARTIN (Queens). I also asked for the correspondence. The question has been brought up year after year, and I trust the minister will take the necessary action now. Heretofore the difficulty was that the Postmaster General laid the blame on the Minister of Railways and Canals, and that minister laid it on somebody else. But if they will both agree, there would be no difficulty in remedying the present condition. That can only be done by giving us a second train ; and if that is done, the hon. minister will be entitled to the gratitude of our people.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the hon. minister any inspectors to look after the literature which comes through the mails ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Every postmaster is by law authorized to inspect such literature. He sends the objectionable literature to the department at Ottawa which passes on it in the last resort.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the department do with it ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Burn it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is there any inspection of literature which comes from Great Britain ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Generally speaking, the literature coming from Great Britain is not objectionable. Still last year my attention was brought to some papers which should not be entitled to the privilege of the mail, and through the good offices of His Excellency we prevented it from coming in. I have here a blue-book published by the Postmaster General in England, giving the list of Canadian magazines posted—that is the magazines coming under the special arrangement we made last year with Great Britain and entitled to what is called the intellectual preference. My hon. friend will see that it is very respectable and high class literature.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have been told that there are many publications coming from Great Britain which should not be allowed in.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Many come in by express.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. These are coming in weekly. You can get them in some of the book stores. I went down and picked out half a dozen in one book store. They are the very lowest class of literature, both as regards the printed matter and the illustrations, and should not be allowed into the country. It is the duty of the hon. minister to make some investigation and take some steps to prevent such literature coming in. He knows very well that a great deal of the literature circulated in Great Britain should not be allowed to pass through our mails. You can put your brightest and brainiest in the pulpit and your best young men and women in your Sunday schools, and you may take care of your schools, academies and universities as much as you like, but so long as you have literature of this class filtering into the country, you are going to have the tone of the people dragged down. And when I find the Postmaster General stopping some of the splendid magazines coming here from the United States, the 'Scientific American,' the 'Outlook,' and many papers devoted to industrial education—or, if not stopping them, making them more difficult to obtain by adding to the cost of them in this country—I cannot but note the contrast in this treatment and the treatment of these and the papers of which I complain. So far as the daily newspapers are concerned, the Postmaster was forced to take a different position from that which he assumed at first; and he has paid out tens of thousands of dollars of the public money of this Dominion to daily papers throughout the country because he made the serious blunder in his treatment of daily newspapers in the mails. He made a similar blunder in regard to the weekly newspapers. The weekly newspapers that go from this country to the United States ought not to be saddled with extra postage. It is well enough for the minister to say that he has placed a man at the border to receive these papers and distribute them throughout the United States, but he will not find the weekly papers satisfied with that. They want a removal of the embargo upon them. Not only are these clean papers, but they do a good work in advertising Canada gratuitously in the United States. The minister knows that he is backing down with regard to these newspapers as he did in the case of the dailies. But instead of coming out squarely and placing them on the same footing as the dailies, he is trying to satisfy them with some little advantage. But the weekly papers are not to be satisfied in that way. They will press their rights until they obtain them.

But my main object in rising was to call the attention of the minister to some of the pamphlets coming into our country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They do not come through our mails.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But somebody has charge of the literature that circulates in our country. Which of our ministers has control of the investigation of news stands? The newsdealer from whom I purchased these papers of which I have spoken told me that he had fifty publications coming from Great Britain. I picked out half a dozen which should never be allowed to be exposed in this country and the minister knows it well. No matter how they come here, they will have the effect of lowering the tone of our people, and they should not be allowed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The question to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) has referred is not a new one. I can assure my hon. friend that as regards this periodical, 'Photo Bits'——

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the minister will allow me, I refrained from naming any of these publications, because I do not think we should give them any advertising in this House. I would respectfully ask the minister not to use the names.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Very well. As regards this publication which I hold in my hand, it is one of the papers, which, long ago, has been stopped by the department from coming through in the mails. I have myself given instructions with regard to said publications, and every officer in the department with a head on his shoulders, knows that we have a right to stop such literature from passing through the mails. But, when they come in otherwise, for instance, when they come by express direct to the newsdealer, we have not control over them. It is not my duty to watch the news-stands and, when to issue warrants against news dealers. That is the business of the provincial authorities. The duty of the Postmaster General in reference to this class of

literature is clearly defined in the Post Office Act. But, for instance, my hon. friend saw these papers on a news stand. If he had felt it his duty to have a warrant issued against the newsdealer, his course was to go the police court and lay an information. The provincial authorities would, I am sure, sustain his course. The Postmaster General has surveillance over matter that goes through His Majesty's mail, but that is all. In many cases, we have gone beyond the strict letter of our duty in this matter. On many occasions complaints were made to me, for instance, by the Lord's Day Alliance, and members of the clergy, who lose no time when they find that unwholesome literature is being circulated in the country, in appealing to the Post Office Department. Under such circumstances we give the most positive instructions to the postmasters, and if the papers do not come through the mail, we take upon ourselves to write to the attorney general of the province. On several occasions I have written to Mr. Foy and to Mr. Gouin, and have called attention to the complaints which were coming to the Post Office Department. My hon. friend may rest assured that we have no intention to allow this class of literature to be circulated in the country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot understand how it is that the Postmaster General can take unto himself the authority of dealing with daily papers or weekly papers coming into the Dominion——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Through the mails.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, these do not come through the mails.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They do not pass through the post office.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When they pass through the post office any thing objectionable would easily be covered by a wrapper. There is no reason to suppose that they are coming in by express. Then why is it that he has no power to deal with weekly papers, the filthy papers from the United States ? He admits to-night that the weekly papers can come in here in bulk by express, and be distributed to the news stands, because he has admitted that he has not any control over these publications that are coming in from Great Britain.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend surely knows that papers can enter in the form of parcels from England. They come over in a separate compartment of the mail steamer, by express, and they are sold to the newsdealers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why not the same over the United States papers ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend knows that, for instance, papers can come from Buffalo to Toronto by express without passing through the post office. With these, we have nothing to do. Perhaps the Minister of Customs would have something to do with them. We have a surveillance only over the papers coming through His Majesty's mail. Now, as regards the filthy literature, I take issue with my hon friend when he says that there is a carnival of obscene literature in the Dominion, any one would infer from his words that this kind of literature is being spread all over the Dominion. From the reports we have it appears that the bulk of periodicals come through the mails, and it is only in exceptional cases that they come by express. But as regards papers coming through the mails, I can assure my hon. friend, from the reports I have from the officers of the department, and from my own experience in dealing with these matters, that since the amended convention came into force last year in the month of May, we have practically purged the mails. If my hon. friend will not take my word for it, I would ask him to inquire for instance from the very zealous association in the province of Ontario known as the Lord's Day Alliance ; let him ask the members of the clergy. We have received many letters from those associations in Ontario and other provinces thanking the department for the course we have followed on that question. This paper surely does not come through the mails, it started throught the mails, but we stopped it. There are four or five obscene papers of the same class and with about the same title coming into Canada. But when those papers are being sold, any citizen can lay a complaint, can have a warrant issued and a fine imposed on the newsdealer who sells them. But that citizen must himself put the judicial machinery into motion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Some minister must be responsible for this literature that is coming in. Perhaps it is the Minister of Customs, who has been looking at one of these papers for a little while.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend may find the evidence in the blue book which I handed to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that as soon as we make representations to the post office authorities in Great Britain as to the objectionable nature of any of the newspapers which have applied to be put on the Canadian post list, they immediately withdraw the privilege which is given those papers, that is to say, the privilege of coming into this country at the reduced rate.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask the minister if he did not forbid 'Collier's Weekly,' the 'Scientific American' and some other United States publications from being expressed into this country and distributed here ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No. The weeklies from the United States were coming in with a mass of other papers, good, bad and indifferent. They were filling our mail cars, they were paralyzing the whole mail service. It was not the desirable papers that were coming in in such large quantities, but mere advertising sheets which under cover of a journal, contained nothing else but advertisements, and sometimes very filthy advertisements; novels and novelettes. As I have explained to the House time and again, we objected to that. We said, the time has come when we must control our own classification, that is to say, the papers that should be admitted into our mails coming from the United States must be of the same character as the paers published in our own country and enjoying the second class rate. The Americans were not averse to that; they were themselves deluged by so-called papers loading down their mails and had been for years. Representations were made, and finally it was agreed that these papers should come from either country at a rate not less than four cents a pound. Now my hon. friend says: You have departed from your cast iron rule, you have backed down, you have not been consistent. Let me tell him that the objection was not against the dailies. The daily papers published in the United States and sold in Canada are not objected to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why is it if the daily papers are not the objectionable papers that are coming into this country the minister has been compelled to pay tens of thousands of dollars of the people's money for the mistake that he made last May?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well what has the minister done?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend must not give himself to the—shall I say virtue—I dare not say vice—of exaggeration. He should not exaggerate. We had first to come to definite terms. We said that papers going out from Canada to the United States, or papers coming from the United States to Canada and enjoying second class mail privileges, would have to pay four cents a pound—dailies and weeklies included. We make no distinction in regard to that certain rule. My hon. friend asks: How is it that you have paid back to the papers thousands of dollars? Here is what happened: Very few American daily papers are read in Canada. On the other hand some of our newspapers are sold in large quantities in the United States, especially in the eastern states, and also in Michigan and Ohio. The Winnipeg 'Free Press,' the Toronto 'Daily Mail,' the Toronto 'Globe,' 'La Presse,' 'La Patrie,' 'Le Canada' considered themselves somewhat mulcted when that new regulation was put into force and as our objection was not against the daily newspapers and as they were bona fide papers falling under our classification, publishing political news and giving the ordinary food which one might expect in a daily newspaper, we relaxed the rule and we stated that our amendment to the convention would not apply to them. When we amended the convention last year the Canadian Press Association met at Toronto, and, whilst we were patriotic enough not to object too strongly to the new convention as amended, yet, it appealed to the Postmaster General and asked that it should not exact the difference between the old rate and the new rate until the first of January. That representation was made to me by all the papers, the 'Daily Mail and Empire,' the Toronto 'Globe,' 'La Presse' of Montreal, the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' having a circulation in the United States. The editors sent a delegation to Ottawa and they said: You should not exact the difference between the old rate and the new rate until the 1st of January next. The change took place in the month of May last. Well, I said to the representatives of the Canadian Press Association: First of all, be good enough to pay according to the new rate and on the 1st of January I will ascertain if really you have been taken by surprise and on the 1st of January, if my colleagues agree to it, I will see that a remittance is made. Was not that fair and was not that good policy? They reported to me that the notice had not been sufficient. According to the postal convention between the United States and Canada a public notice of some months has to be given that an amendment will take place or that the convention will be abrogated. The newspapers said: We did not pay attention to that; we did not see it. We were in ignorance of the amendment and it has taken us by surprise. Under these circumstances I reimbursed them the difference between the old and new rate on the 1st of January next. That is what has been done and there has been no complaint against it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I may be very dense but I cannot quite understand this. On May last the minister places a restriction on daily and weekly papers going into the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And coming from the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And also on papers coming from the United States into Canada. Now he has receded from that position. He takes back all that he has done in regard to daily papers and in taking back what he has placed on the statute-book he allows every daily paper in the United States to come into this country just the same as they did two years ago. The same daily papers are coming as they came two years ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no objection to them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why did not the minister investigate the subject last May and satisfy himself before he put the daily papers to all the inconvenience that they have been put to for a year, the loss of subscriptions and the loss of thousands of dollars that he has paid back. He must admit that he has paid that money out without getting any value for it. I would suggest to the minister that instead of only backing down part of the way in connection with the daily papers he should come out and say, I have made the same kind of blunder in regard to the weekly papers and I will do the same thing ; I will pay them for the mistake made last May.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I cannot be so angelic as to admit that I have made the blunder that my hon. friend suggests I have made. I confess that I am but human, but still under the circumstances I have done the best and events have proven that the policy was on the whole a wise one. As regards daily newspapers, there was no complaint, but we had at that particular moment to apply the rule to all newspapers whether weeklies or dailies. I have outlined briefly to the House the arrangement I have made with the Washington authorities and I think it is a fair arrangement as regards the weeklies. I may now state fully how the whole question stands :

The interchange of second class matter between Canada and the United States is now effected at the rate and regulations herein stated.

Under the postal convention between Canada and the United States, as amended in January last, and effective since February 5 last, legitimate daily newspapers published in either country, and addressed to bona fide subscribers in the other, may be mailed by the publisher in the post office at the place where they are published upon prepayment of postage in cash at the rate of one cent per pound or fraction thereof.

Newspapers and periodicals published less frequently than daily, when posted in either country for despatch to the other, are liable to postage at the rate of one cent for each four ounces, or fraction thereof, calculated on the weight of the package for each post office of destination, and when thus mailed direct prepaid by stamp the country of destination is under obligation to effect distribution of whatever may have been accepted by the country of origin.

United States legitimate newspapers and periodicals, other than dailies, which have been accepted by the Post Office Department of Canada, may, under the mailing-in-Canada privilege upon prepayment of postage at the rate of one cent per pound, be posted by United States publishers at the following Canadian post offices, viz.: St. John, New Brunswick; Montreal, Quebec; Toronto, Ontario; Winnipeg, Manitoba; Calgary, Alberta, and Vancouver, British Columbia. Copies to be so tendered for mailing must be despatched to Canada by express and be restricted to bona fide subscribers. Publications admitted under the mailing-in-Canada privilege must comply with the provisions of the Postal Law of Canada, that is, in their subject matter they must 'consist wholly or in great part of political or other news or of articles relating thereto, or to other current topics.'

Canadian newspapers and periodicals issued less frequently than daily may be posted in the United States upon prepayment of postage at the one cent per pound rate. United States regulations governing the mailing in that country of a newspaper or periodical published in another country expressly stipulates that copies of a publication so mailed, in order to be accepted at the one cent per pound rate of postage, must be posted by the publisher's authorized agent, and in accordance with this regulation it would be necessary that the Canadian publisher have an authorized agent in the place at which he desired that his publication should receive entry into the United States mails as second class matter. Recently, however, this regulation was modified to the extent that eleven United States post offices have been exempted from requiring that the posting should be performed through a publisher's agent. The Canadian publisher may, therefore, assign his mailings by express direct to the postmasters of the following offices:

Boston, Massachusetts.
St. Albans, Vermont.
Ogdensburg, New York.
Buffalo, New York.
Detroit, Michigan.
Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan.
St. Paul, Minnesota.
Grand Forks, North Dakota.
Helena, Montana.
Spokane, Washington.
Seattle, Washington.

from which offices they will be distributed through the United States on prepayment of postage at the rate of one cent per pound, provided, of course, that application for second class privileges has been made by the publisher at the United States post office at which he desires to secure entry, and that such application has been accepted.

My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) will note that the weekly rate is now 1 cent per pound and not 4 cents. Each country, therefore, has the power to see that its own classification is followed. Every weekly paper going to the United States will have to apply to the post office authorities at Washington to be entitled to the second-class special rate of 1 cent per pound and I think it is safe to say that every weekly paper in Canada will obtain that privilege.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, yes, the Canadian papers are all respectable papers, and of course we could retaliate if it became necessary, which I do not think is at all likely. After this permission is obtained the weekly newspaper can be sent to one of these points on the border line and instead of compelling these newspapers to have an agent there on the spot, the United States authorities will

relax that regulation and the postmasters will be the authorized agents for these weeklies. We do not in Canada exact from the United States periodicals the appointment of an agent to obtain the remailing privilege. We are on an equal footing therefore, and the rate of postage for Canadian weeklies, which conform to this regulation, will be in future 1 cent per pound plus the express charge which is practically nothing.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I see the minister is letting himself down as easily as possible.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I should have pointed out that we have secured what I may term our independence in connection with postal matters. I will admit, to please my hon. friend, that I have receded on the dailies and that I have receded to some extent on the weeklies.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But we have gained this very important point that we will only admit to His Majesty's mails in Canada the newspapers that will come within the Canadian classification. Prior to the recent amendment to the convention we were obliged, under the reciprocity as regards postal matters, to accept a huge mass of filthy weeklies, objectionable literature, and patent medicine advertising sheets. Now, we accept only such as come under our own classification and that is a great advantage to Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How are you situated in regard to publications from Great Britain?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Newspapers published in Great Britain can come to Canada at the reduced rate of 2 cents instead of 8 cents per pound. We can stop objectionable literature from Great Britain as well as from any other country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Previous to the convention did we not have the same right with respect to similar periodicals coming from the United States?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The object of the amendment was specially to restrict the objectionable literature coming from the United States which came here in vast quantities, and particularly to restrict these advertising sheets which came under the guise of newspapers and which were to be found in almost every home in the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister would seem to think that these sheets do not come through the mails now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know that some of them have been prevented from the very beginning.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If these objectionable newspapers which are to be seen here do not come through the mails then I presume they must enter through some customs port. I realize that there might be a great deal of difficulty for the Minister of Customs to exercise any very effective control or supervision over the entry of such papers.

Mr. PATERSON. We have the power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that the Minister of Customs has the power. I do not want to minimize the importance of exercising the power effectively. Whether these papers come in by mail or by express they are equally objectionable and ought not to be exhibited for sale on the public news stands of the country. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs whether the matter has come under his consideration in any way, what means he has exercised in the past, and what further means he can exercise in the future, to prevent the entry of periodicals of this character, which I am sure he would consider very objectionable indeed.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not censor these publications myself; my officers do that. One of the publications I saw is something that I think should not be allowed to come in. We are continually confiscating literature of this kind. Every little while in Montreal we are not only having literature seized but having the importers of it brought up and fined. I was not aware that such publications were coming from Great Britain, but I will mention the matter to the officer in charge. Under the law we have perfect power to order literature of this kind to be destroyed. Whether we would have power to confiscate anything of this kind after it had passed the customs and gone into the possession of the dealer I do not know. That is a point on which I shall have to consult the commissioner. Perhaps the leader of the opposition will have an idea whether under a tariff that prohibits immoral literature we could follow it after it had passed the customs. I am inclined to think we could.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would depend altogether on the terms of the statute, and I am not sufficiently familiar with these to give any opinion on the subject. It would seem to be a fairly logical consequence that if the goods are prohibited, and through some inadvertence of an officer and the impossibility of detecting their true character, the goods are permitted to enter the country, the customs or some other department should have the power to follow them up and see that they are taken possession of and destroyed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I know that the Minister of Customs and the Postmaster General will do what they can to stop the im-

portation of this kind of literature, which is exposed openly on the news stands. I picked up this paper yesterday at a news stand, the proprietor of which told me that he received fifty publications every week from the old country. These publications are coming in in very large quantities and are being distributed throughout the country. I think some of them come by mail, because an ordinary small newsdealer could not afford to get them by express from the old country. The newsdealer told me that Saturday was the day on which these publications were first exposed for sale, so that when I bought this paper yesterday, the bulk of them have been sold. I may say that I have spent a great deal of time in the United States, travelling and going to school in different cities, and I can defy the Postmaster General to go into any city of the United States and pick up any such literature as this. I do not believe it is allowed to be published. I cannot express too strongly the hope that the ministers who have charge of this matter will stop the importation of this kind of stuff, and they cannot stop it too soon.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend has spoken of the facilities provided for newsdealers to import this objectionable literature through the mails. It is quite true, it may come in small packages, and be easily passed without being detected ; but the Postmaster General has the right to open the packages and see whether the literature is objectionable or not. If it is, he confiscates it. I remember a case in point in Montreal. A certain newsdealer in St. Catherine street was selling a very objectionable newspaper which he received through the mails from Paris, France. My attention was called, by the Archbishop of Montreal, to these importations. I immediately informed the postmaster at Montreal to stop them. He did so, and to his great surprise two weeks afterwards he saw in the same news stand the very papers which he had stopped coming by mail. Then he found that the newsdealer had changed his mode of procedure and was receiving the papers by express. When objectionable newspapers are offered for sale, any citizen can take action under the Criminal Code and have a wararnt issued, and the law is pretty severe against the circulation of immoral literature. If my hon. friend will allow me to read the regulations of the Post Office Department on this subject, it may serve some good purpose :

According to regulation 191 it is forbidden to post for delivery or transmission through the post any obscene or immoral book, picture, lithograph or other publications, of an indecent, seditious or scurrulous character, or any letter or envelope, or post card or wrapper upon which there are words or things of the character aforesaid or tending to injuriously affect the commercial or social standing of the persons addressed. There is not a day when I do not receive a dozen or so objectionable post cards sent me by clergymen and other gentlemen throughout the country complaining of the circulation through the mails. In each case the decision is prompt, but of course we cannot foresee that people will send indecent post cards through the mail. The regulation 195 provides for the treatment of correspondence by persons engaged in illegal business.

Mr. PATERSON. The prohibitive articles in the tariff cover books, printed papers, photographs or representations of any kind of a treasonable, seditious or indecent character. The difficulty consists sometimes in determining that a certain case comes within that category.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The difficulty lies in the application of the clause. Of course when a publication is clearly immoral there is no difficulty. But there are papers that circulate socialistic ideas and I am hammered from all sides to prevent their circulation. We have of course to be very careful about infringing on the liberty of the subject; that is our great tribulation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice an expenditure in the Yukon of $100,000, and the income only amounts to something over $11,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have to give proper facilities to all sections of the country, and in the Yukon territory our service is much more expensive than in any other section. Even with the sum we pay in mail subsidies and otherwise to the railway and steamship companies, we are obliged during the winter months to forward only a certain weight of mail. I was interviewed the other day by the representative of the White Pass Railway Company, and he told me that in the future they could not renew their mail contract with the department, although we pay them a very high price. Whereas in previous years they would give us three or four trips a week, in the future they will only give two. The reason they give is that business has decreased during the last few years, the cost of living is very high, the roads are much more difficult, and the space available and the numbers of cars and steamers are less.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does that include transportation to Dawson city ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How much is spent by the postal department in the Yukon outside of transportation ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Dawson post office, $4,425. The postmaster's salary is $3,750

and $657 allowance for rent. That is not very much.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not want to go into the details.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, the biggest figure is for travelling expenses of inspectors and clerks, $12,440. Then we have the post office at White Horse, $3,150. That is where all the mail matter aggregates during the winter to leave again when navigation opens in the spring.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the hon. minister will look at page A—2 of his report I would like to ask him for an explanation of the $37,000 paid in connection with stamp vendors, compensation to postmasters and special delivery letters.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have, besides the post offices in the cities, special offices that are licensed to sell stamps. There are no boxes to receive the letters and no postal service except the sale of stamps. For instance, my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) asked the other day to have stamps sold——

Mr. SAM HUGHES. At Lindsay station.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, at Lindsay station, a point convenient for the public. These stamp vendors are entitled to receive some small discount, the exact rate of which I have forgotten. The discount on a few stamps is an infinitesimal amount, but these stamp vendors are spread throughout the country, and the system is a convenience to the public. As to the messengers, that is for our special delivery service. If my hon. friend sent a letter to Montreal by the afternoon train, which he desired to have delivered at once, by affixing a special delivery stamp, which costs ten cents, he would secure the services of a messenger at the Montreal post office to deliver the letter at once, up to eleven o'clock in the evening.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the hon. gentleman please explain the transit charges on correspondence with other countries, for which $33,000 is charged ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have a special arrangement with Great Britain, and also a special convention with the United States. But to other countries that are in the Postal Union we have to pay a poundage on letters or papers carried on their steamship or railway trains.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the minister filled the vacancy in the superintendency of the railway mail service in New Brunswick ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not yet.

Mr. FOWLER. Why ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The question in New Brunswick is the same as in other parts of the country. We want for the railway mail service, especially in these days of fast transportation, the best man available. Sometimes people claim to have a title to a position because they have been in the service for a long time. The gentleman who acted as railway mail superintendent in New Brunswick died some time ago.

Mr. FOWLER. Two years ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There has been a difference of opinion among some of our officials as regards his successor. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) that, for my part, I will see to it that the appointment is made from a purely departmental point of view. We must have the best man available. Three or four names have been mentioned. We have been able to give the service, but the position will be filled before long, and we will appoint the best man that can be had.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to an ignorant onlooker that you are taking a great deal of time to make up your mind. It would almost appear that you are waiting until the elections are over. I would not impute anything of that kind to the Postmaster General, of course, for he has always represented to the House that he does not believe in political appointments, but believes in appointments made in the interests of the service. Still as this vacancy has lasted for two years, I would ask the Postmaster General if he does not think it has lasted long enough ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think the appointment should be made, and it will be made very shortly. Before the end of the session—and I suppose we may say that the end is in sight—my hon. friend may be able to put another question and learn if the appointment is made.

Mr. FOWLER. It is not the intention to wait until the elections are over ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. FOWLER. I am glad to have that assurance. I will certainly put the question again.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Very well.

Mr. FOSTER. At page S—55 of the Auditor General's Report, we find a charge of expenses in connection with the trial of a railway mail clerk at Edmonton—railway fare of six employees to Edmonton and return $695.10. That seems a very high charge for railway fare.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know the case——

Mr. FOSTER. I am not asking about the case, but about this expenditure.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will explain. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that when a postal clerk is charged with robbery of the mails, to establish our case we must prove that the letter has been posted at such a place and received at such a place.

In the present instance we had to bring clerks from the post office at Montreal through whose hands the letter had passed. It was a registered letter containing between $300 and $400. The clerk was somewhere around Moosejaw or Calgary I think. The trial took place in the fall of the year and was postponed once or twice. Without the presence of these clerks, we could not establish the links in our chain of evidence. We could have shown where the letter was posted, but not through whose hands it had passed, so we could not have reached the guilty party. We had to bring clerks from Montreal to Calgary. If the hon. gentleman will look at the charge he will see that the amount is not excessive.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not take their evidence under commission ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We couldn't ; they had to be brought there.

Mr. FOSTER. Referring to page S—9 of the Auditor General's Report, I see that a great many mail bags were repaired, and all at a uniform price of 42 cents. How is that regulated ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We follow the custom that has been followed in the department from time immemorial. Prior to 1896, we had the following engaged in the work of repairs : S. and H. Borbridge, Ottawa ; R. S. Montgomery, Ottawa ; Tackaberry and Laurie, London ; T. Thompson, Toronto ; Mrs. P. O'Donohoe, Montreal ; H. L. Carson, Ottawa ; E. Brown, St. John, New Brunswick. At present, we have thirteen repairers on the list in different parts of Canada. Each district must look after its own bags and sacks. They are repaired in the several districts and sent to Ottawa. They are examined in the department in the lower portion of the Ottawa post office building, where the boots are examined by Mr. Cooch, and from here they are redistributed.

Mr. FOSTER. But the minister, while he has given me a lot of information I did not ask for, has not answered my question. Why is the charge 42 cents for each bag, great, small, little and big ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a contract. Tenders have been asked for for all these different services, and a uniform price has been fixed. The man who repairs the bags takes them all, small and big, at a uniform price of 42 cents. He takes his chances; sometimes he may gain a little and sometimes he may lose. But the price of 42 cents is about the average price.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some repaired for 25 cents.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They belong to a different category, they are very small bags.

Mr. HERRON. Some time ago I drew the attention of the Postmaster General to the condition of the post office at Macleod. I would like to know if he has any report from that office, or if anything is being done to provide better accommodation. I make no complaint with regard to the management of the office, only with regard to the lack of accommodation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend drew my attention some time ago to the state of the post office at Macleod, and I immediately wrote an official letter to our inspector in that district, and I also wrote to the Minister of Public Works calling his attention to the matter. In many of the cities and towns of the province of Alberta, post offices which were quite sufficient three or four years ago, and even two years ago, are to-day altogether inadequate to the increased population. When representations are made to me of the need of better accommodation, I pass the matter over to the Minister of Public Works. The Post Office Department decides if the building is necessary and the Public Works Department erects the building.

Mr. HERRON. The accommodation is entirely inadequate, and I hope there will be no delay.

Mr. FOWLER. Have any post offices been closed during the last year in the province of New Brunswick, and particularly in the county of Kings and Albert ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know that any have been closed in that district. Post offices are closed only in case there are no more patrons, or because a postmaster cannot be found, or because there is no sufficient reason for maintaining the office. Does my hon. friend say that any office has been closed?

Mr. FOWLER. There is the Kerry office in the county of Albert.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If there are twenty or twenty-five people I would open an office at once.

Mr. FOWLER. Then I call attention now to the post office at Kerry, and beg the minister not to close it. If it is closed, these people would have to go a very long distance for their mail, some of them perhaps ten miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister buy the clothing for the uniforms and have it made up afterwards by other parties?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We buy the clothing ourselves, and the contractors here at Ottawa, Noel and Chevrier, make the uniforms under our supervision. We have an officer in the department who supervises the making of uniforms.

Mr. FOSTER. I see you purchased from Caldwell, Boyd and Company, Lanark, a quantity of material; and the Crown Tailoring Company of Toronto make up a large number of trousers, uniforms and so forth.

Do you buy the material from Caldwell, Boyd and Company, and send it to Toronto to be made up?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the Bill of the Crown Tailoring Company is simply for making the goods, not furnishing material. For instance, that $3 for making up trousers, is that for the stuff and the making?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think that is the price of the making, not of the stuff. The blue melton trousers, I think that is for the cloth and the making.

Mr. FOSTER. I presume it would be the same with the tunics. They charge $5.45, that is a pretty round price for making the tunic if they do not find the stuff. Do you put this up to public tender?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. On page J—2 of his own report, the hon. Postmaster General has paid $52,000 to the American Note Company for stamps. Does he ask for tenders for these stamps ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, there is a contract with the government passed by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How long does it run ?

Mr. FIELDING. Tenders were asked for originally and this contract was extended.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. For how long ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it was for a period of five years more.

Mr. FOWLER. Were new tenders asked for ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, not recently. This is a class of work for which you have difficulty in getting tenders. There are but few persons able to compete, and by getting tenders you accomplish nothing. The course adopted was that originally tenders were invited and the contract went to the lowest tenderer. This contract was extended on two occasions. In both instances the proposals were referred to the King's Printer and in one instance to a gentleman associated with or interested in the printing of bank notes, familiar with the value of these goods and upon the certificate of the King's Printer that the prices were fair and reasonable, the contract was extended.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the minister if he has ever taken into consideration the question of printing postage stamps and bank notes at the mint. I think that is worthy of his consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. The facilities there are not at all adapted to it. My hon. friend means that we should have a government printing establishment instead of the present arrangement. The present arrangement of not having this work done in a government establishment but in an office in the capital specially constructed for the purpose and more or less under the supervision of the government was adopted some years ago and it has worked satisfactorily.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The original contract was passed in March, 1897. They print Dominion notes, postage stamps, postal notes, post cards and inland revenue stamps of every description.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an item of $21,000 and over at page S—61 for 'labour at the Montreal post office.' What is the class of labour that you employ there ? It seems a large amount of money. I suppose there is a good deal of work to do.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The two largest offices in the country are Toronto and Montreal. We have in Montreal, more than anywhere else, the burden of the foreign mails. The mails are distributed from there to all points in the country. Therefore, we have to employ more transfers and more labourers than at any other office, Many of these labourers are not civil servants in the ordinary sense of the word. They are merely labourers and their wages range from $1.25 to $2.25 per day. Besides that we have in Montreal and Toronto a very brisk Christmas season when we are obliged to employ 100 men or more in order to provide the public with the necessary facilities.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that in Toronto the pay of labourers ranges from $1.25 to $1.75 and in Montreal from $1 to $2.25.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The farther west we go the dearer labour is.

Mr. FOSTER. But in Montreal it is dearer than in Toronto.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Labour in Calgary and other western towns is higher than in Montreal, Halifax and St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. In Vancouver it is from $1.25 to $2.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no section of the country where we have to change our labourer and mail clerks more frequently than in the west. That is our great trouble. They complain that the salary is not high enough. We give them a provisional allowance besides.

Mr. FOSTER. But for these labourers you do not have any provisional allowance. You do not mean to say that you are paying less in Vancouver than in Montreal ?

Mr. FOWLER. That is a guess that the minister has made.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Generally speaking, we pay more.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not seem to be a satisfactory explanation.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do you not say that it is a better class of labour in Montreal ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I wish I could say that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have received a great many complaints from Montreal. I do not suppose there is another city in which the mail service seems to be as badly managed as in Montreal. The minister is well aware that not only are the daily papers complaining constantly, but business men are complaining and thirty members of the board of trade have signed a statement setting forth their complaint. I cannot understand how it is that from a city like Montreal there should be so many complaints constantly of irregularities, of miss-sent letters and of all kinds and classes of complaints.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will admit that up to a year or so ago there were many complaints from Montreal. I have explained before to the House the reason why. There were some internal difficulties in the Montreal post office, difficulties which have been removed since the appointment of a very efficient officer, Mr. Gaboury, who is the assistant postmaster. There are not so many complaints as my hon. friend thinks. If there is a missent letter I know it because there is a wire or a letter sent stating the fact. It is surprising how few complaints are made. I will give the committee a statement about the complaints that are made. The total number of complaints relating to the carriage of articles through the mails last year was 708. There were 573 complaints of delay and with respect to 251 of these the evidence showed that the delay was due to causes beyond the control of the department. Last year the winter was very severe especially in the west. We had a coal famine and while trains were not running complaints should have been made to the weather bureau and not to the post office. When trains were stopped letters were delayed and the complaints came to the Post Office Department. They should have gone to the weather bureau. There were 48 complaints of misdelivery and in 8 of these the responsibility rested elsewhere than with the department or the misdelivery was not established. There were 84 complaints of nondelivery and in 47 of these the complaints were not substantiated by evidence, or the sender and addressee and not the department was at fault. It should be born in mind that 478,290,967 articles of mail matter were carried by the Post Office Department during the same period. The complaints numbered only an infinitesmal fraction of a percentage of the total number of mail pieces carried so that the statistics would not confirm the statement that the post office is not well managed. Men are not perfect, letter carriers are not perfect, the department may sometimes be at fault, but it is surprising that compared with the vast business the complaints were so few.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman does not hear one half of the complaints.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If they are from my hon. friends district he does not fail to mention them.

Mr. LAKE. I have made complaints many times but there are a great many others I have not made. For instance there was a letter posted to a member of my household from Winnipeg and it went to England and back again.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was an investigation made ?

Mr. LAKE. No. The letter was properly addressed and the mistake evidently occurred in the Winnipeg post office. The practice in England is to bring all these complaints before the Postmaster General, but in Canada there is a feeling that people do not like to complain as they imagine they might get some official into trouble. However that may be, the Postmaster General does not hear a very large proportion of the complaints.

Mr. PATERSON. Will there be a probability of my getting the Customs estimates through when this item is passed ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. PATERSON. I am tired sitting here and I will go home if you do not think my estimates will be passed to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought you were interested in the Postmaster General's estimates.

Mr. PATERSON. If you do not take the Customs estimates up to-night we are out of money and it is a very serious thing.

Mr. FOSTER. I have often felt that way myself.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice that the report of the Post Office Department states that in the dead letter branch the value of contents of letters received during the nine months ending March 31, 1907, is estimated at $524,000 while the amount disposed of was estimated in value at $34,000. What is the explanation of that ? Does it mean that the Postmaster General has letters to the value of nearly $524,000 still in his possession.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, less the $34,541 disposed of.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What do you do with them ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are in our possession and we have not been able to dispose of them.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they registered letters ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, it includes parcels and all sorts of things.

Mr. FOSTER. You auction these off, do you not ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How often are these sales held ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not say.

Mr. PERLEY. Has the minister ever taken into consideration the question of issuing a special stamp, part of the postage of which could be used to assist in the fight against tuberculosis ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My attention was called to an article which has been published in the 'Outlook' by a celebrated philanthropist of the United States in regard to a stamp which has been issued every year at Christmas time in Denmark, if I mistake not, and sold for two or three weeks during the year. It has a special value of say five cents, while the value of the ordinary stamp is two or three cents, and the difference goes to the hospital for the suppression of tuberculosis.

Mr. FOWLER. Are people obliged to buy that stamp during that period ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, it is purely voluntary ; but in Denmark it has been a tremendous success. Everybody is anxious to have a stamp.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it purchased as a souvenir ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, yes. People wish to have it on their letters and parcels that are sent abroad.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But if a two-cent stamp is used on a letter, it will go just the same ?

Mr. LEXIEUX. Yes. The use of this special stamp is not compulsory. Of course, I have not studied the question for Canada, but it has been hinted to me that such a stamp might be issued.

Mr. PERLEY. I understood that last year the minister was giving this matter consideration, and had some idea of issuing the stamp for last Christmas. I would like to know if he is seriously considering it now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, yes, the matter is under consideration, and very serious consideration. The reason that this year I ceased considering it was that I decided to issue a series of stamps to commemorate the Quebec tercentenary, and it would not do to multiply these special stamps. In fact, the postal union would, I am sure, protest if a country abused the privilege. But I may assure my hon. friend that after the tercentenary stamp is issued, I shall be pleased to take the earliest oportunity to confer with him and all others interested in regard to that matter, always subject to the approval of my colleagues.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should the postal union object ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The simpler and more uniform the stamp is, the better for the postal relations. Up to the last postal union congress, memorial stamps, such as those that will be issued for the tercentenary next month, could be used from Canada to any other country. By the regulations adopted at the last congress, it has been stipulated that these special stamps shall be used only on the continent ; so that the stamp to be issued for the Quebec tercentenary will be used only on the continent of America, unless I obtain permission from the British authorities to use it between Canada and Great Britain, a permission which I expect to obtain. According to the postal union rules the special stamp cannot be used between one continent and another.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to ask if the revenues from this special stamp go into the ordinary revenue of the Post Office Department, as we are voting so much money for this celebration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course, parliament has voted $300,000 towards the Quebec tercentenary. The stamps, I hope, will be sold in large quantities ; but we must also provide for the extension of the postal service year by year in Canada. Of course, the extent to which these stamps will be sold is entirely speculative. But I can say that the stamp to be issued next month under the authority of the present Postmaster General will be from an artistic point of view one of the most beautiful ever issued.

Mr. FOWLER. Can the minister give us an idea of what the design will be ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I cannot, because it is contrary to etiquette in such cases to publish the description beforehand. But I intend, as soon as the time is ripe, to lay on the table of the House a whole series of the stamps, so that the members can see for themselves the kind of stamps we issue in celebration of that great occasion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How is it the Canadian Pacific Railway receive about $550,000 for the nine months, the Grand Trunk Railway $289,000 and the Intercolonial Railways $120,000? I notice that the Intercolonial

Railway is paid bulk sums in many instances for carrying the mails and the Grand Trunk Railway also for a number of places, while the Canadian Pacific Railway furnishes a definite statement and charges so much per mile, varying from two cents to eight cents. On the Intercolonial Railway there is paid between certain places from four cents to eight cents.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the United States they pay according to space and weight. Here we pay according to mileage. The standard price is four cents per mile for baggage car service and eight cents a mile for postal car service, the postal cars being equipped with racks for boxes and letters and accommodation for mail clerks. The Grand Trunk Railway was the first railway system built in Canada and it received from the government a special rate on certain lines per mile or per weight. That system went on until Sir Oliver Mowat became Postmaster General in the fifties before confederation. Sir Oliver Mowat appointed a commissioner, and that commissioner fixed the mileage system which is still in existence. The Grand Trunk Railway had some vested rights because it was the first company carrying mail, and it has kept those rights until now, but at the period I have mentioned, a four cent per mile for baggage car service and eight cents per mile for postal car service was made uniform on the other railways. Later on, it was made uniform on the new portions of the Grand Trunk Railway. The Canadian Northern, which was built still later on, when it was voted subsidies, was given these subsidies on condition that it should carry the mails free. In the Subsidy Act, there is a clause providing that railway companies receiving subsidies from the government shall carry the mails free. I cannot say in what year that clause was inserted. At all events we have had lately a protest from the different railway companies that the amount paid is not high enough, and I will ask council to appoint a commission to look into the whole question. The principle has been practically adopted that a revision must take place every ten years.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot understand why from one little town to another two cents per mile should be charged and in other cases four cents per mile. Take page S—19 of the Auditor General's Report and you will find that from New Germany to Caledonia two cents per mile is paid the Halifax and Southwestern. On the next page you will find that eight cents is paid from Lunenburg to Middleton. Then the Dominion Atlantic is paid from Truro to Windsor one cent per mile and from Halifax to Annapolis eight cents per mile. There must be some explanation of these differences.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Generally speaking the rates are eight cents and four cents. Sometimes, however, requests are made for more frequent service, and the arrangements is an arbitrary one as the department finds that the revenue does not always warrant the payment of an additional subsidy.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Look at the Intercolonial Railway, page S—20, it is paid $121,000. In some cases bulk sums are paid and in others so much per mile. I can understand that during the summer months more money be paid to the Intercolonial Railway, but it seems strange that that road should get $121,000 when the Grand Trunk Railway only receives $289,000 on all its systems.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Grand Trunk came at a time when a special arrangement was made. They were the only railway, and contracts were based on a lower figure because money was worth more in those days than it is to-day. That is why they ask for a revision of the subsidy.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you ever get registered letters in the dead letter office ? If so, what do you do with them, when you cannot locate the addressee?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We retrace, if possible, the person who sent the letter. If we are unable to find either party, the money goes to the Receiver General.

Mr. FOWLER. In this amount of $524,000, in the mail matter in the dead letter office, are there any registered letters?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I believe so. But most are parcels and articles—an enormous amount, of course.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the minister given any attention to this matter of rural mail delivery?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, yes. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has given it more attention, perhaps, at least in this House, but I have also given some attention to it. I do not suppose that, at this hour, the hon. member (Mr. Fowler) would ask me to repeat the arguments I advanced, not against rural mail delivery, but against the expediency of our adopting it now. I would rather refer my hon. friend to the speech I delivered on the same subject in this House not very long ago. Briefly, the United States have adopted this system; but they have a population of 85,000,000 and an enormous postal revenue, with a territory no larger and a climate more favourable for this purpose than ours.

Mr. FOWLER. How does the minister establish that? We can drive sleighs in the winter time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. but we have the Yukon; we have the Labrador coast.

Mr. FOSTER. They have Alaska.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, but we have many distant districts.

Mr. FOWLER. We have the islands that Captain Bernier has taken possession of.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, where there are splendid deposits of coal which it is important for us to secure. We have a postal revenue that is buoyant and a fair surplus, but we have not the postal resources of the United States. But, I would rather not excite my hon. friend from East Lambton on this subject at this moment. The question is an open question, and later on we will discuss it.

Mr. FOWLER. I was only anxious to know whether the minister was seriously considering it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am seriously considering it and it is a very interesting question.

Mr. PERLEY. In the contracts with the railway companies for carrying the mails, what power is reserved to the department in case the service is not carried out? Last winter there was a railway in the county I have the honour to represent that, for two weeks, had not a train run on it. It became so serious that people there had to go many miles in order to get provisions. I brought the matter before the Railway Commission and it was attended to almost immediately. In the first instance, I thought of going to the Post Office Department about it, to learn whether the Postmaster General had any power in such a case.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. No service, no pay. But, of course, the people prefer to have the service than to have the payment kept back; and in such cases I always advise them to apply to the Railway Commission to have the service carried out.

Mr. PERLEY. Do I understand that the department has no power to inflict a penalty upon a railway company in such a case other than to withhold pay for the exact time during which they have not rendered the service?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is the penalty.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the hon. minister a surplus, and, if so, of what amount?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The surplus will be in the neighbourhood of $1,500.000 and $1,600,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What does the minister propose to do with it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Spend it in the best interests of the postal service—but cautiously.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister seems to be spending it very cautiously. I hope he does not intend to hand it over to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). That hon. gentleman will get rid of it quickly enough. It would be better to spend a portion of it in improving the postal service which certainly needs improvement.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am doing my best. I do not think there is an hon. member of this House who can say that he has come to the Postmaster General with a fair request and been refused. I have multiplied the services wherever it could fairly be said that they were not sufficient to keep up with the increase of population and in accordance with the good times that have prevailed. Where there were tri-weekly services I have established daily services; where there were daily services I have established semi-daily services. I have reduced the distance between post offices. Formerly we did not establish post offices in ordinarily thickly-settled parts of the country at distances of much less than from six to eight miles. Now we have post offices four miles, or three, or even two miles apart. Where there is a mill, a school, a church or an establishment of any consequence, we never say no to the request for a post office.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the minister withdrawn the postal service on the river boats that run between St. John and Fredericton?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood he had.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Last year, there was, I would not like to say a hold-up, but some thing very like a hold-up at the opening of the season. They said they would not carry the mails unless we would double the subsidy to something like that. Then, we had to protect ourselves. This season it is all arranged, and we will carry the mails as before.

Mr. HERRON. I was surprised to hear the Postmaster General state that he had tried to establish post offices at distances of four and five miles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Two miles.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In thickly-settled sections.

Mr. HERRON. In our country, even in what we call thickly-settled portions—where we have a settler on every section, or, possibly, every quarter-section—there are people who have to drive fifteen miles for their mail. It is quite common to go seven or eight miles. I speak of only one particular section, but I think this is fairly general.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman would point out to me a section of 25 to 30 people I would certainly establish a post office. That is my policy. Of course, we cannot have a post office at every door; but if there is any considerable number of people gathered, we establish a post office. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Herron) will

look at the postal map of his section, he will see that the post offices are there. It is not the same in the west as in the east, which is much more densely populated.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister has stated that by reducing the rate in the cities from two cents to one cent, he will increase the revenue to the department. Now there is still a million and a half of money to be spent in the rural districts in a year, that is the department is bringing in a million and a half more money than they are going to make use of.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not say a million and a half more. I say that the reduction of postage from 2 cents to 1 cent for drop letters will increase the revenue. But the hon. gentleman should not lose sight of the fact that the cities are paying for the deficiencies of the rural districts. Toronto, Hamilton, London, Brantford, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, Winnipeg especially, are paying for the service in the rural districts. When my Bill comes up I will establish these facts by figures.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will have to see the figures before I accept that statement. I feel that the minister has not given the subject quite as much attention as he ought to. In the United States they are expending this year $36,000,000 on a rural free delivery service for about 18,000,000 people, that is practically $2 to each person. Now if the minister will investigate the conditions in the province of Ontario, he will find that we have about 40,000 square miles of territory that can be covered with a rural free mail delivery, covered successfully ; and in the province of Quebec about 20,000 square miles. When the minister states that because the United States has 80,000,000 of a population Canada must wait until we have 20,000,000, I am satisfied that he does not understand the question.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman forgets that the United States did not establish that system when they had 60,000,000 people, or even when they had 70,000,000 ; they had nearly 80,000,000 when they started rural mail delivery. The system has been in existence in England for nearly a century, it has been in existence in France, Switzerland and some portions of Germany for years and years. But there is no comparison with the conditions in those thickly settled countries and the conditions prevailing in much the greater portion of Canada. Why, you could put England in Lake Superior and you would not see the shores of England. Of course, I admit that in some portions of Ontario the system might be established. I do not know of any more prosperous section of the British empire than the province of Ontario, there is no more intelligent portion of the British empire than the province of Ontario. But if you give free rural mail delivery to one section of the country why should you not extend it to another? My hon. friend speaks of Lambton, of the Niagara peninsula, of the county of Essex, and that beautiful section of Ontario, and he says that surely they are entitled to free rural mail delivery. But what about Gaspé, what about Kings and Albert, what about Argenteuil, what about Carleton ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister mean to suggest that there is any more prosperous section of Ontario than the county of Carleton ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Surely not from an intellectual point of view.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We could establish free rural delivery in a large portion of Ontario, Quebec, the eastern provinces and some parts of the western provinces. But the minister intimates that all those districts must wait until the rest of the country is filled up. until Gaspé, or Argenteuil, or some of those outlying districts are filled up. If that is the position the minister takes with regard to rural delivery, I see very little hope for it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have a standing invitation from the hon. gentleman to discuss that question before the farmers of Lambton. I would like to explain to the farmers of Lambton that their member in the House has made very nice and very able speeches in favour of rural mail delivery, that he was quite ready to spend in Canada what the United States are spending, and when his electors from Lambton learn that it will cost millions and millions beyond the revenue we have, they will probably give a cold douche to my hon. friend and his proposal will have to wait for a few years.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister is not fairly stating the question when he says that we will have to spend millions in Canada to establish this service in the thickly settled portions of the different provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not want to establish it in any portion but I want to give it to the whole country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister knows that in the United States no route can be established unless there are 100 families on that route. A standard route is 24 miles long and in the outlying districts of the United States they are not being served by a rural free mail delivery at all. The minister talks about it costing millions and millions to serve the people in Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX. $29,000,000 in the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am aware of it. I say that it cost $36,000,000. But, they are serving nearly 20 million people.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are discriminating.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask the minister if in the thinly settled portions of the country they say that the farmers in the thickly settled portions are discriminating against them. As far as rural mail delivery is concerned we cannot have it if the present position of the minister is maintained. He may talk about the population of the United States and about their not having adopted it until they had 80 millions people. It is folly to approach the subject in that way. He might as well say that the telephone and telegraphs and all new inventions for the dissemination of knowledge throughout the country should not be made available to the people.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You require a city of a certain size, do you not, before you give free mail delivery ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, the new regulation requires a population of 12,000 and a revenue of $20,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister consider that cities just a little under that are discriminated against ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, we apply good common sense to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course you do. What is the difference between that principle and the principle of establishing routes wherever there are a certain number of persons? That is exactly the principle the minister carries out with regard to cities and towns.

Mr. FOWLER. I would suggest that an experiment be made of the rural mail delivery system in Kings and Albert, and if it is satisfactory there and not too expensive the minister might apply it to outlying districts such as Lambton and others like that.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I would like to ask the minister if, in his annual balance sheet, he charges up anything against the postal revenue for the money invested in buildings put up for the purpose of carrying on the post office work. Does he not think there should be a certain proportion charged against this money which is invested purely for the carrying on of the work of the department ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not always, public buildings very frequently include the customs and the public works as well as the post office.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I know, but a good many of these buildings are put up for carrying on the postal work of the country. A portion of the cost of those buildings should be charged against the department so that the people would have an opportunity of seeing just how our postal matters stand. I would like to ask the minister if the Post Office Department is required to approve of the erection of new buildings before the work is begun ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, when the erection of a public building is proposed the Department of Public Works receives, through my department, a statement of the revenue, the population, the postal facilities required and the probable revenue for the future. We generally say if a public building should be erected or not. We are the determining voice, generally speaking.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Why do you put up post office buildings in places with a small population and leave large towns without public buildings ?

Mr. FOWLER. There does not seem to be a quorum present. The committee had better rise under those circumstances.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Do you not think we should carry this item. I have given all the explanations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not have any objection to this passing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will give the explanation with reference to the mail service. There is an increase of $93,500 made up as follows :

Ordinary land service..	$53,500
Mail service by railways..	10,000
Mail service by steamboats..	20,000
Supply and repair of mail bags.. ..	10,000

The vote for land service is for new post offices, increase in the frequency of existing services, increased price of old contracts renewed, and submitted to public tender. The increase for the mail service by railways is chiefly to provide for the extension of the service in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan. The miscellaneous is as follows : Travelling charges, $3,000, stationery, printing, advertising, $5,000, postage stamps, post cards envelopes $10,000, other miscellaneous items, $42,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Your postage stamps are by contract ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. This miscellaneous vote includes the payment of labourers ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, we have to employ extra men at busy seasons.

Mr. FOSTER. Who employs the labourers in Montreal, for instance ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The postmaster.

Mr. FOSTER. Has he sole authority ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are appointed under my authority. He writes to the department that he requires 20 men say for such a time and I have a list of names that are sent to me.

Mr. FOSTER. By whom?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may say they are sent by members of parliament on both sides of the House and by others. There are applications coming in all the time by the hundreds. If the postmaster at Montreal or Toronto asks for twenty men I send him a list of 50 or 60 names and the applicants are brought before them and tested. I have given the assistant-postmaster at Montreal complete discretion as to the selection of the men. My hon. friend will understand it would be very risky to take men for post office work simply because they are recommended by politicians, and we must find out if they are reliable and trustworthy.

Mr. FOSTER. What test is made?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He sends for their parents or their friends and asks for certificates and when they are well recommended he appoints them.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he make any test as to their mental qualifications?

Mr. LEMIEUX. When they are merely to do labouring work such as carrying mail bags they do not require much education but sometimes they enter as labourers and they are employed in the sorting of letters and so on. Of course you will not find university graduates or men who have passed the civil service examination who will take $1.25 or up to $2 a day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister of course has followed precedent, but I would suggest that in future these estimates should be given in more detail so that we will not have an appropriation of $504,000 under the head of miscellaneous, and which money could be devoted to any one of numerous subjects. Some of the departments bring down their estimates in the greatest detail and others bring them down in three or four huge items at the tail end of which is a miscellaneous vote which can be utilized for any possible purpose. That is not according to the spirit of parliamentary control over government expenditure.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I admit there is room for improvement there and will try in the future to have more detail.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business next sitting.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 a.m. Saturday.

290½

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 26, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 175) for the relief of Catherine Ann Cannon.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 177) for the relief of Mary Alexander.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 176) for the relief of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 174) respecting certain patents of the General Chemical Company.—Mr. Stewart.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—Mr. BERGERON.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I beg to rise to a question of privilege. I was away on Friday last, but on reading 'Hansard' I find a statement referring to myself in a speech made by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) which is not correct. That hon. member is reported as saying:

I am just coming to that. It was strange that a gentleman, a member of the great Conservative party, following the same noble leader, would not have come to me and said something to me about it. Now I come to what I have got to do about it. Soon after the notice was put on the paper last year, the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) notified me that Dr. Worthington had something terrible against me. He is going to expose you, said Mr. Bergeron, and your grafting in connection with the Ross rifle. And he asked: Is it not possible for you to pay back the money?

This is the first time I have heard anything of the matter. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) has never spoken of it to me and I have never spoken to the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) in the way he has here indicated. The whole thing is entirely a dream, as far as I know.

THE GOVERNMENT STEAMER 'CHAMPLAIN.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the government whether they have any information as to the use of the government steamer 'Champlain' on Sunday last. I have a telegram in the following words from a gentleman who professes to be familiar with the facts as stated:

Government steamer 'Champlain' used by Taschereau, Minister of Public Works, Quebec, candidate in Charlevoix, for political purposes. Please have question put by whose order and who is paying for it. Conservatives

were turned off steamer yesterday though they offered to pay passage.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say I have no knowledge of this matter. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. L. P. Brodeur) is not present, he is not in the city to-day although I expect him. I shall make inquiries and report to my hon. friend at a later date. If any government steamer is being used for election purposes prompt action will be taken to put an end to that practice.

SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY LAND COMPANY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior for information in respect to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. I have here a letter which explains the matter perhaps better than I could explain it. The letter reads :

Would you kindly inform me if the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company have any agreement with the Canadian government to sell homestead lands. I bought the northeast quarter 12-24-1, west third meridian recently. Their contract calls for actual residene on this land for three years and I have five years to pay for it in. It seems hardly right that a company can take money for this land and compel actual residence which makes it a homestead under homestead rules, and a private concern getting the money which should be better applied to the country's welfare. If so, can I obtain full title for this land by paying all the price this fall or any time before the three years? Hoping you will favour me with an early reply and thanking you for your kind consideration, I remain, Sir,

Yours respectfully,
NORMAN WILLERTON,
Craik, Saskatchewan.

As I do not understand very thoroughly the exact scope of this inquiry I thought. that as the minister will know the circumstances, it was best to apply to him in this way.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. member will allow this to stand until to-morrow I will have an opportunity of seeing the letter and will be better able to reply.

IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT—HALIFAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any objection to lay on the table of the House the report of Mr. Robertson who made an investigation in Halifax recently which I understand resulted in dispensing with the services of Mr. Joseph Bernstein ? It is understood that the report would be laid on the table of the House.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). If the hon. member wishes it I would be very glad to place it on the table of the House, is it the wish of the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some weeks ago while the investigation was pending I understand the minister to promise that as soon as it was completed the report would be laid on the table of the House. I know of no reason why it should not be laid on the table of the House ; if the minister knows of any, of course that will have to guide him.

Mr. OLIVER. None whatever ; I simply wanted to have an expression of the wish of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the attention of the Minister of the Interior been called to the statement that one of his officials in Halifax is impeding to some extent the free choice as to location of certain immigrants. I have a statutory declaration which charges that one of the officers of the Interior Department is concerned to the extent of $2 per head in inducing immigrants to go to a particular place and that some 15 of them whose names are given in this declaration have been sent to a part of the Dominion where they did not intend or desire to go.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like of course to have the terms of the declaration. I might say in a general way that any such action on the part of any official is absolutely contrary to his instructions, and if he is acting in that way he is acting improperly. When I have been made aware of it I will take such action as seems proper. No such information has come to me until now.

SUPPLY—DISTRIBUTION OF 'HANSARD.'

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

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I have a complaint to make about the distribution office. Instructions were given two or three years ago by the Debates Committee that the supply of 'Hansard' to members should be increased as it often occurs that members require more than their allotted share of two copies. There is sometimes a great demand for 'Hansard.' especially for the unrevised edition which is supposed to be the more correct. However, the employees in the distribution office seem to assume that they are masters in their own house and seem to care little whether they comply with the wishes of the members of the House. I regret to have to say that members of parliament are not treated in that office as they should be. Instead of being treated as masters they are treated as servants, and an end should be put to that. I may be answered that this is a matter for the Debates Committee but I would point out that the Debates Committee is very badly managed. It has sat two or three times this session and about ten times altogether in the four sessions of this parliament. It meets to appoint a chair-

man and after that it sits whenever it is forced to, and the reports of that committee are made haphazard as for example the report which was presented the other day. I suppose some of the officials who are under that committee come to think they can do anything they like.

A few minutes ago I sent for a copy of Thursday's 'Hansard' and I was sent one copy and when I wanted to get more I was told there were no more and to understand that there were no more. You, Mr. Speaker, should be the master of all these employees, and if you do not take means to deal with them I shall be compelled to resort to another course. I shall not allow any employee in this House or anywhere else to be impertinent to me as long as I have the honour of a seat here. I think it is in the interest of every member of parliament, whether he sits to the right or to the left of the Speaker, to see that proper treatment is accorded the members by the officials, and if something is not done to correct the condition of things which I have pointed out I shall have to defend myself by other means.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). The observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) should not go unchallenged. I do not think it is fair to the chairman of the Debates Committee who is not here this afternoon, or fair to the members of that committee to say that the committee is badly managed. If that committee is badly run the members of it are to blame, for, as the hon. gentleman knows, the members of the committee receive notices to attend the various meetings and if they do not attend it is their own fault. I happen to be a member of that committee as is my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) and I am equally to blame with him for failure to attend regularly. I acknowledge that I have been dilatory in my attendance upon the committee, and upon inquiry I have discovered that my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is in the same position in that regard as I am. The same remark would apply to many other members of the committee. We had a meeting a few days ago when my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) was not present, and this question of the distribution of 'Hansard' was discussed. At that meeting there were present the hon. gentleman from Leeds, (Mr. Taylor), the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Sam Hughes), the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche), and myself, and I suggested that at our next meeting we should revise the present list of those to whom 'Hansard' is sent and make a new list, because in my judgment the existing list is not a proper list. The matter will come up at the next meeting of the Debates Committee. Now, as to the officials of the distribution office, so far as I know, they have always been disposed to grant any reasonable request made by a member of the House, but of course when they have no copy of 'Hansard' to give they cannot give it to my hon. friend from Beauharnois or to anybody else. I can hardly believe that the officials of the distribution office are to blame as my hon. friend would seem to indicate. If there is blame to be attached to any one I feel that it must be placed elsewhere. I agree with my hon. friend that the committee should take steps to inquire into the distribution of 'Hansard.' If it is at all convenient I shall attend when the next meeting is called by the chairman, and I trust my hon. friend from Beauharnois with others will be there so that we may try to settle this question of the distribution of 'Hansard' once and for all.

Mr. BERGERON. Let me tell my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) that I have been present at every meeting of the Debates Committee except the last one, and I will avail of this opportunity to explain why I was then absent. The committee sat at 10 o'clock in the morning ; the House did not adjourn until 3 o'clock the same morning and as the post office was closed when I left the House I was not able to get my correspondence. If the notice of the committee were there I consequently could not receive it. When we leave here at 3 o'clock in the morning and get to bed at 4 o'clock we are not very much disposed to get up to attend the meeting at 10 o'clock. Any way I did not know anything about the meeting and it is the only meeting I missed. About two or three years ago instructions were given by the Debates Committee that when there was an important debate the officer at the head of the distribution office should communicate with the Printing Bureau and order 500 or 600 or 1,000 extra copies of 'Hansard.' When the type is set up and the forms prepared it does not cost a great deal more to print the extra number. There is sometimes a great demand for 'Hansard' and members should be enabled to get a sufficient supply. The press of the country, in spite of all they can do, do not give a very elaborate report of what goes on in the House, and we can only get it from 'Hansard.' The officer of the distribution office should get extra copies printed without being told every time. When the Elections Act was under discussion, nearly every member asked for ten or twelve copies of 'Hansard,' but could only get two copies. The discussion on the Ross rifle was a very important discussion, and a good many members wanted extra copies of 'Hansard' containing that discussion, but could not get them. A good many members have complained to me of this matter, and unless there is a change, something is going to happen, because we cannot be driven in this way by employees of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The clerk of the distributing office is not responsible for ordering more copies of 'Hansard.'

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I doubt that very much.

Mr. BERGERON. Instructions were given to that effect two or three years ago.

Hon. J. BUREAU (Solicitor General). At the time the committee ordered more copies of 'Hansard 'to be distributed, it was at the request of certain members of the committee, who stated that certain members of the House wanted more copies. The chief clerk of the distribution office may think that a debate is unimportant when my hon. friend from Beauharnois may think it very important; so that I think it would be unfair to hold the clerk of the distribution office responsile for deciding whether in the judgment of any member, a debate was important or not. If a member wants more copies of 'Hansard,' I think it only fair that he should inform some member of the committee or the clerk of the committee, instead of throwing the burden on the chief clerk of the distribution office, and expect him practically to guess. for that is what it is, which debate is more important than another. The hon. member for Beauharnois, as I understand, sent to the distribution office by a messenger or a page for copies of 'Hansard,' and the messenger came ack and said there were no more copies. Between that and turning down a member there is a wide difference. I understand my hon. friend to say that he was treated in an impertinant way by the chief clerk of the distribution office.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not say that.

Mr. BUREAU. If my hon. friend did not say that, he led everybody to understand that. That is something I want to correct. I have had a good deal to do with the chief clerk of the distribution office, and I can say that he has always acted politely and done what he could to accommodate members.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). As I understand, each member is entitled to two copies of the unrevised 'Hansard,' but only gets one copy. If the copies he is entitled to were put into his box, he would get them, and no one could feel that he was treated unjustly. I may say that I have not been treated impertinently by the officers of the distribution office, but several times this session I have been unable to get one copy of 'Hansard' except the one put on my file. I think that should be provided against. It seems to me that in the case of the budget debate and other important debates, a much larger number of copies of 'Hansard' should be struck off, so that they would be available to members who want them. It would not cost very much, and would be a great convenience to members who, when written to for copies of 'Hansard,' have frequently to write a long letter giving excuses why they cannot send them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have been told that some hon. members opposite sometimes get as many as a hundred copies.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has been told something that only exists in some person's imagination.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems rather invidious to place on the chief clerk of the distribution office the responsibility of deciding whether a debate is sufficiently important to justify him in ordering an extra number of copies to be printed. I would think that a matter of that kind should be left with the chairman of the committee. The chief clerk might of course be instructed, in respect of the budget debate and other important debates that must occur every session, to have an extra number of copies printed. Apart from that, you can hardly expect him to realize the standpoint of members of this House, and decide whether or not an extra number of any particular debate would be required. Perhaps the suggestion might be made by the Prime Minister to the chairman of the Committee on Debates to give this matter attention. It is very annoying sometimes to send for a few extra copies and not be able to procure them; but looking at the matter from the standpoint of the chief clerk of distribution, the very demand for extra copies of a particular debate might suggest to him that other members would be likely to come for further copies, and that therefore he must not exhaust the supply. So far as my own experience is concerned, I am bound to say that he is not only very diligent but invariably courteous in the discharge of his duties.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The distribution office is not under the control of this House alone. It is under the control of the Printing Committee, which is a joint committe of the Senate and the House of Commons. Mr. Davidson is an active and painstaking officer, and will do whatever he is told to do, by that committee.

THE CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I rise, Mr. Speaker, to move:

That all the words after that be omitted and the following substituted therefor: The civil service system of Canada should be based on merit and character alone, and all the appointments thereto should be made from candidates whose competency has been established through open competitive examinations conducted unedr a non-partisan civil service commission.

This motion has been a long while in finding its way to discussion in the House.

It is not necessary for me to give the reasons; I think they are patent to all who have at all followed it. Suffice it to say that I bring it to the attention of the House at the present time with a good deal of hope that the resolution may commend itself to both sides of the House and be practically agreed to as the principle upon which the civil service of Canada should be based. I am led to that from a good many indications. I think it is clear to all of us who have studied public opinion that, during the last three or four years, opinion in the country, outside of parliament and in political circles, has been paying considerable attention to the question of the civil service, the principle upon which it should be based, and the rules under which it should be conducted; and there appears to be a growing and widely distributed sentiment in favour of a better system than the present one. Many of our most prominent daily and weekly organs have advocated the merit system with greater or less force; and it is very gratifying to know that a good many of our public men on both sides of politics have given more or less time to the discussion of the question, and that a great many very strong opinions have been expressed by men prominent in both political parties in favour of a change in the basis of the system. It is therefore in the hope that the resolution will receive practical accord on both sides of the House that I venture to make a few remarks in reference to it.

I do not propose to make any apology for bringing the question before the House. It is not by any means an academic question. It is an intensely practical question, and there never has been a time in the history of Canada when it has been more practical and more vital than now. When a country is young and its operations comparatively limited, a civil service system which is not the best and the most carefully thought out, might be fairly effective by reason of a personal supervision given it by heads of departments and the general and every day supervision made by the press and the critical portion of the community. Both these tend to keep it within line and prevent abuse and lead to a fairly good carrying out of the general business of the country. But in proportion as the country widens and its proportions become more important and the amount of business grows, then it becomes necessary for the system to be the very best in principle and very strongest in regulations in order to do the work absolutely necessary. That time has arrived—perhaps it arrived years ago in the Dominion—but there can be no doubt that it has arrived now. So that in view of the public interest concerning the subject and its importance and practical nature, I do not suppose anybody expects to hear an apology from me for discussing it.

It would be interesting to thoroughly deal with the question historically, but that would take one over a great deal of ground; and the history of civil service reform in all countries is an open page to-day which can be easily read and known by any one who takes any interest in the matter. Therefore I do not propose to deal with the subject very largely in its historical aspect. I propose however to discuss two or three systems of civil service and the operations thereunder, to the end that what has been proved in experience and results may be made patent to our minds and we may have the conclusions which result therefrom. Of course one would not attempt any remarks on civil service systems if he did not at once refer to the system of the motherland, which has had a long history, which is full of rich results, and the lesson of which is open and available to all students of civil service reform. Suffice it to say that in the beginning, the service was entirely in the hands of the sovereign. Everything was at his disposal, and he used it for the purposes that best suited him; sometimes for the common good, but oftener, I am afraid, for purposes of the royal family and the royal person and its adherents and favourites. After this power was taken away from the King and translated into parliament the patronage system, without any great alleviation, went into the hands of the ministry of the day and the parliament which supported that ministry. So that from the earliest time of the work of the country as carried on by what we denominate civil servants until 1855, there was a period in which patronage was absolutely supreme, in which the principles of civil service were very little adhered to if they were even acknowledged; and history shows us the results in a demoralized, inefficient and costly civil service. About 1853 or thereabouts, the first great forward step was taken and the directors of the East India Company abolished all patronage with reference to the kingdom, for it really was such which they had under their direction, and instituted an absolute and strict civil service system in which everything was thrown open to merit, and in which that merit was ascertained by means of examination. This radical improvement had its effect in the mother country.

In 1855 a system of civil service was introduced against the will of parliament, absolutely against a majority vote in parliament, and was initiated by the executive itself. By judicious explanation of its motives and methods, and a judicious distribution of that information through the country, the executive worked upon public sentiment so that, within a very short time, the parliament which had been adverse to a civil service system based on examination came to be entirely in its favour and from that

time up to the present, that is from 1856 or 1857, the parliament of Great Britain has never wavered in its allegiance to the system of merit and examination as applied to the civil service. It was not until a good deal later, however, about 1870, that the full measure of civil service reform, so far as principle and regulation is concerned, was applied to the service. In 1870, after repeated investigations and commissions, and as a result of the information thereby gathered, the open competitive system was put into force, and the old system of appointment through patronage or nomination, the old ineffectual departmental examination and system of limited competition, were all done away with, and the principle of open competition for every British subject under proper conditions was established by the parliament of Great Britain and embodied in the British civil service. The results have been, I think beyond all doubt, eminently satisfactory. That they have been satisfactory is shown by the adherence of the British parliament and people to the system and the continuous strengthening of that system, so that, at the present time, it is, perhaps, stronger than it ever was before, and, during its history, it has served as the starting point and example for civil service systems in almost all the great progressive countries of the world.

In brief, we find the system to be the establishment of a civil service commission, the granting of freedom to every British subject who complies with necessary conditions, to compete for entrance into the service and for the prizes of the service; the absolute elimination from the great bulk of the service of anything like patronage of any kind, and the utter banishment from the service of anything like political influence, either by way of assessment, intimidation, promise, or anything of that kind unfortunately too well known in other countries, our own not excepted. There are certain limited classes of positions which are excluded from this general system, namely, the classes of technical and political positions. But, even in these, the larger portion are still subject to what we call non-competitive examinations. That is, although these positions are not open for competition on the part of allcomers, yet when the head of the department, or whoever has that duty, nominates to an office, the nominees must be examined and receive their certificates of fitness from the civil service examiner, and do not receive the position unless they pass these competitive examinations; and, of course, the successful applicant, as shown by the result of these examinations, gets the position. So, in that case, merit is again defined by examination; and, although at the entrance to it, the number who may apply to be admitted to the competitive examination is somewhat limited, still there are competitors and they have to pass examinations and the best man wins.

There are two statements that I wish to read on this subject. One was made by Mr. Mundella, who was a member of the British cabinet at one time. He said:

> I stand before you the representative of the largest constituency in England, and yet have not the power to control the appointment of the lowest excise officer.

The other was made by Mr. Gladstone, who was still greater in power and influence. He said :

> As to the clerkships in my office—the office of the Treasury—every one of you has just as much power over their disposal as I have. . . . In order that the public service might be indeed the public service; in order that we might not have among the civil officers of the state that which we had complained of in the army, namely, that the service was not the property of the nation, but of the officers, we have now been enabled to remove the barriers of nomination, patronage, jobbery, favouritism, in whatever form; and every man belonging to the people of England, if he so please to fit his children for competing for places in the public service, may do it entirely irrespective of the question what is his condition in life.

To these two statements I desire to add a fact which I came across and which I will give without mentioning names. A very distinguished member of the British cabinet commenced his career as a clerk in the lowest grade of the civil service. He entered through the system of examination, and made his way up to the highest, or nearly the highest executive position of the British government.

I suppose there are now about 70,000 employees in Great Britain coming under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. Two or three instances might be given to show the difference between the condition of things here and there. Take, for instance, the Inland Revenue. The Inland Revenue service of Great Britain is in charge of a board of commissioners who are appointed by the Crown and hold office during good behaviour. They have over 8,000 officials besides a large number of employees. The entrance is by examination through the lowest grade. There is no removal except for cause, and religion or politics is never a cause of removal. When a removal takes place, the cause has to be written and signified to the Civil Service Commissioners' board, and no interference from politicians, or wardworkers or ministers may interfere with the discipline of this large staff of officials and employees. Not only is there no removal except for cause, but, before removal, there must be a proper hearing. The Customs Department of Great Britain has been managed now for over one hundred years in the manner I am about to

describe. A board of four commissioners is appointed, as in the case of the Inland Revenue. They have over 5,000 clerks, besides large numbers of employees who are exactly on the same basis as under the Inland Revenue Board—no politics, no interference. The higher places are filled by promotion, and the board annually inspects each port, which I think is a most excellent feature of the system.

Then there is the treasury, which is run by a board of seven managers. There is the Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and others, and as these are pasing, ephemeral, there is a permanent secretary in whose hands is placed the chief business of directing the treasury so far as its officials are concerned. The Treasury Board, of course, dominates the policy. However parties may differ, the board defines the policy for the Department of Inland Revenue or Customs. But there is no political interference in any way, shape or form, nor removal except for cause, and the reason, in case of removal, is to be given in writing.

The postal division is managed by a permanent non-political secretary. The post offices are divided. There is the very small and unimportant post office, which is allowed to take care of itself and is judged by its results. If the results are good it is undisturbed; if any difficulties arise, troubles or laches take place, then of course it is looked into and a remedy applied. Then there is the class of post offices which have not over £120 of income. There the clerks are nominated by the postmaster and the postmasters are selected by the Treasury Board, and are removable only for cause. The next class are the post offices having over £120 revenue. There the postmasters are selected from the entire service as a recognition of merit. That opens the horizon and gives scope and consequently spirit to the service. They are appointed by the Postmaster General and are removable only for cause, and any application in favour of them by members of parliament or persons in political life is a detriment, and is more likely to militate against the appointment of the candidate than to help him. Then the last are the great city post offices. These great city post offices are under the civil service entirely. All clerks enter by open competition and examination, and the same rule applies with reference to promotions and removals.

Then there is the consular or diplomatic service, which is now almost entirely taken out of patronage, and a system of rigid and thorough examination prevails, combined as well with the record of the person himself, whose experience makes up a large part of that record. In the House of Lords the clerk of Parliament selects those who are to be examined for clerkships, and in the House of Commons the librarian selects them, and they have to make good by competitive examination. Any one, I think, who has the interest of the service at heart would be glad to see a system of that kind applied to both our Houses here, at least I certainly would. So much then with reference to the British service. I will have a little more to say with reference to the results of that service later on in my remarks.

The next country to which I invite the attention of the House is the United States of America. Many of those who have not followed closely the track of progress of the United States in this respect are inclined to think that it is a very poor example of a civil service country to bring before the parliament of Canada, and I have noticed on two or three occasions that when some remark has been made with reference to the civil service in the United States it has provoked a smile. Well, that is not impossible of explanation. No man can keep all subjects within his ken, and until a few years ago when I gave some attention to the civil service in the United States, I myself would have been inclined to put it amongst the more backward of countries, and to conclude, as so many in our country do, that it is delivered over body and soul to the spoils systems, as it was not very long ago delivered over almost absolutely to the spoils system. But to make a long story short, the evils of their system so impressed themselves upon the better thinking public men of the United States, as they had done before in Great Britain, that methods were adopted, a plan of educational work was undertaken throughout the country and carried up into Congress. and it resulted in 1882 in the enactment of the present civil service law of the United States. Now, wonders have been done under that legislation, giving as it does a very large power to the president, by proclamation, to bring under the operation of the Civil Service Act such departments and such parts of departments as it may suit him. This of course he does with a full knowledge of what is needed and of what will be fairly well supported. President Cleveland began that work particularly, and he and President Roosevelt have been especially the two presidents who have done so much to widen the scope of the civil service, and by their repeated proclamations to bring constantly wider and wider areas under its scope. In operation the United States appoints a Civil Service Commission of three. This Civil Service Commission, with the president, is authorized to prepare the rules and regulations for the civil service, and what they prepare, when it is promulgated by the President, has the force of law and becomes equal to an enactment. They have the power of examination, and for that part of the civil service which is under the merit system, a careful system of examinations is carried on by

these commissioners, not a pedantic system which takes care simply for the literary parts of the examination, but one which is intensely practical in its end. It is carried out by men who mingle with all parts of the service in every part of the United States, who become thoroughly saturated with its needs and with its capabilities as well. They conduct their examinations on the line of getting at the best that is in the applicant, practically deciding, as far as they can, what is the best the candidate can do for the service into which he wishes to enter in any one of a dozen of different great trends that the service takes. They then carry on their examinations. All who fail to get 70 per cent on an average in these examinations fail to get their names on the register; all who make 70 per cent or over are placed upon the official register in the order of time and in the order of merit, and this is the register of certificated candidates for employment. When the head of a department requires some one to fill a vacancy he applies to the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service Commission look over their different branches, having regard to the kind of work that this head of a department requires, and hand him the three highest names on the register in that line of work. The appointing power has then a choice between those three. He selects one and the appointee must be placed on probation for at least six months. If he fulfils the requirements he is then permanently appointed. If he does not, then the head of the department must state to the Civil Service Commission the reasons for his failure. The Civil Service Commission then give him the next three highest names out of which a choice must be made.

Mr. PATERSON. How do the commissioners get the list?

Mr. FOSTER. By examination.

Mr. PATERSON. Made by themselves?

Mr. FOSTER. Made by themselves.

Mr. PATERSON. Do they examine from all over the union?

Mr. FOSTER. From all over the union.

Mr. PATERSON. Have they no boards of examiners under them?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, certainly, do you suppose that three men could extend themselves all over the union and cover the work?

Mr. PATERSON. They do not themselves get the list.

Mr. FOSTER. They get the list because they are the body who manage and control the whole system, who appoint all sub-examiners.

Mr. PATERSON. Is there a board of examiners for each state?

Mr. FOSTER. That is according to the necessities of the case; in some states there is more than one body of examiners and when I say that the commission do it, I say it in a sense that the Minister of Customs collects the revenue. He has to do it through those whom he appoints and for whose actions he is responsible. The examination papers are under the control of the commission in every respect.

Mr. PATERSON. They are prescribed by them.

Mr. FOSTER. They are prescribed by them. Of course, as I said before, they are careful to procure information from every source, to know what a department wants, to know what its various services are, the kind of work it does and what kind of talent is best fitted for it. They consult the heads and chief officials of departments; they do not simply sit down, draw their salaries and issue mandates, but are a real, live, governing, actively-working board who try to saturate themselves with the service and making every effort to get the best services for the country from the material within the country. I have now explained the register.

The applicant who gets his name upon the register and is so enrolled is eligible for a year, but not for a longer period unless the Civil Service Commission extends the term of eligibility for another year or some other period which they have the power to do. This is to prevent the list becoming crowded with names whose owners have gone into other employment or grown stale by lapse of time. This keeps the list from becoming old and burdened. There is a possibility of making emergency appointments. Suppose that no one is at hand ready for appointment, then the head of the department can make an emergency appointment, but he must immediately notify the board of that appointment and the appointment cannot be for more than three months, unless the board, under certain circumstances, see fit to allow it to go on for another three months. But it is their duty, the moment they are notified of the emergency, to see that the position is filled by the permanent person just as soon as they can get a suitable applicant.

Two great reforms have been brought about in the United States by the operation of this system, two great sources of corruption in the civil service and in politics, taking the two conjoined, have been eliminated, first, the levying of political assessments which at one time in the political history of the United States might have been described as an open practice universally carried on, and, secondly, the use of the service for political purposes in any way. The Civil Service Commissioners' reports of later years, that of this year particularly, declare that these two evils have

been practically rooted out of the civil service. No person is allowed within a department under the civil service to solicit assessments of any kind and no officer in a department who acquiesces in such a practice will be allowed to go unpunished. The law in this matter has been for a good many years coming to the point of perfection. It is very difficult to eliminate the use of political influence in the service, by the head of a department using his influence over employees, and in the thousand and one ways in which political use may be made of the civil servant as a partisan. One of the chief difficulties in eliminating this evil was that if a charge of political partisanship was made, it was left to the head of the department, whoever he was, to deal with the charge and it was found that this system was ineffective. Some heads of departments were loyal and true to the principle of the system and they would carry out the law with rigidity and success. Others were still more politicians than they should be and in their hands the law would become almost a dead letter, so there was still a lamentable lack of effectiveness. This evil has been cured by President Roosevelt handing over the investigation of matters of partisanship to the Civil Service Commission itself. That has been the effective step that has put the quietus upon that form of partisanship and of political use of the civil service. The last report of the American Civil Service Commission, 1907, which I have here chronicles that as the final and decisive act which now puts this matter in the hands of the commission and rings the knell of partisanship or political use of the service of the United States. Here when a charge of political partisanship was made, when it was alleged that a civil servant of the Department of the Interior was fooling with politics the political head let it go in one ear and out of the other, at least it was not taken heed to. Now in the United States instead of its being left any longer with the head of the department, the charge is to be investigated by the Civil Service Commission itself and they, having the good of the service at heart, may be relied on to make it effective and uniform.

Mr. PATERSON. What is the meaning of partisanship there? Does it extend to the vote?

Mr. FOSTER. It even goes this far, by one of the decisions, that if a civil servant carries around the nomination paper of a candidate that is doing political service.

Mr. PATERSON. It does not extend to the vote?

Mr. FOSTER. It allows every man to vote, to express his own opinion, to express it privately. The civil servants have a perfect right to the vote and to the franchise, as I think every civil servant should have, as he is a citizen of the country and he has a right to his vote; he may have his private opinion and is allowed to express it to his friend or his family or in any other private way, but the moment he goes outside that it is political partisanship and may become a charge and subject for discipline. The last civil service report of the United States, page 13, is my authority for the statement I have just made with reference to the trying power. The considerations I have mentioned led to the amendment of rule 1 on June 15, 1907, when the president put the matter under the control of the commissioner. The amendment provided:

That persons who by the provisions of this resolution are in the competitive classified service, while retaining the right to vote as they please and to express privately their opinions on all critical subjects shall take no active part in any political management or any political campaigns.

With reference to the enlargement of the system a most important change affecting excepted positions was made by executive order November 7, 1906, under which 1,100 deputy collectors of internal revenue were transferred to the competitive class. The report says:

This is an important advance as it has been impossible to secure satisfactory results in any part of the service to which any considerable proportion of positions of the important classes are exempted from examination.

This illustrates the power I spoke of, possessed by the President of bringing in portions of the service under the sweep of the Act.

Quoting still from the report:

The United States undertook work in the Philippine Islands a few years ago. Some seven years ago (this report goes on to say), on September 19, 1900, the Philippine commission passed an Act for the establishment and maintenance of an honest and efficient civil service in the Philippine Islands by which provision was made for filling vacancies in most positions in the civil service by examination.

The Filipinos, owing to lack of knowledge of the English language, were not eligible, and this report goes on to say:

It was impossible to get eligible men. It was necessary at first to fill almost all the positions by English-speaking people. But what would happen as the Filipinos at that time had no knowledge of English? They qualified in the Spanish examinations only and got appointed only to those positions in which a knowledge of English was not essential. As the years have passed the Filipinos have steadily acquired English and they now take part in English examinations and during the year ending June 30, 1906, 53 per cent of the Filipinos examined took the examinations in English and it was found possible to appoint Filipinos to 80 per cent of the vacancies filled by local appointees. By amendment to the Philippine Civil Service Act the classi-

fied service was greatly extended until it includes almost all positions above the grade of unskilled labourers, except the Philippine constabulary. The Philippine Civil Service Act provides that employees of the Philippine assembly selected by it shall be in the unclassified service. One of the first acts of the first assembly was to waive this exception and provide for the appointment of its employees under the Civil Service Rules and Regulations.

This is an indication that the merit system has the support of the people, and the remark that is made upon it is the great impetus it has given to education in English among the Filipinos; their desire to participate in the service has given them a trend in an educational way in the acquirement of the English language and the knowledge that appertains thereto. Then in Porto Rico they have applied the civil service regulations in the same way and they have now an effective civil service in that island, a thing which of course was unknown before the people of the United States took possession of it:

The federal services were placed under the Federal Civil Service Act by an Act of Congress of April 12, 1900, and examinations and appointments have since been made in accordance with civil service law, and on March 14, 1907, a civil service law was passed by the legislature of Porto Rico and approved by the government to take effect January 1, 1908.

The above quotations from the United States Civil Service Board for 1907, serve as indications to show how widespread is the work which has been done in civil service reform in the United States of Amerlica and its dependencies. There is also another point to be kept in mind with reference to the United States service. The United States service is divided into two classes, one called the classified service and the other the unclassified service. Not all of the service in the United States is under the examination system and the merit by examination system, of which I have been speaking. I wish to briefly give an outline of the service in that regard. First, there is subject to the civil service law the classified civil service. That takes in all persons employed in the executive civil service of the United States, however they are remunerated, whether they are permanent or temporary, by regular salary or otherwise, first those who are merely employed as labourers or workman, and second those whose appointments are subject to consent or ratification by the Senate. These two classes are exempted from the classified service, but all others are included in it and are subject to examination, except those who come under schedule A who are appointed without examination or upon what is called non-competitive examinations. That is to say, the head nominates them and then they are to be examined by the Civil Service Commission to see whether they are qualified or not. Or, if the head wishes it he can have them undergo a competitive examination and conform to the general rule of the service. Under schedule A you get a pretty large list. For instance, it includes: two private secretaries and confidential clerks which are allowed to each head of a department such as the Navy or the Interior; one confidential clerk and private secretary to each inferior department; one to the head of certain bureaus, and such appointments as attorneys, Chinese and Japanese interpreters, persons receiving not more than $3,500 and doing work in connection with their own private work; quasi naval and military officers under enlistment, employees of the government in foreign countries in many cases. It is a special and technical class which is embraced in schedule A and these officers are therefore not subject to examination though they are within the classified service. In the unclassified service is included all appointments by the President which have to be approved by the Senate, and all unskilled manual labourers in Washington and in the field service. But with reference to the unskilled labourers there is this somewhat remarkable feature, and it seems to me to be very praiseworthy: the unskilled labourer in Washington and in the field service does not get in helter-skelter; whoever comes first and may have the pull is not selected. The whole of that unskilled manual labour department is under the head and direction of the Civil Service Commission and certain machinery is provided by which it is all tabulated and registered, and the Civil Service Commission direct and dominate.

In practice it so works out that the whole matter is practically under the Civil Service Commission through its appointment upon the employment board, and the head of the department takes little interest in it. All applicants for employment are examined and inquired into as to their physical and mental qualification—they have to undergo a medical examination; as to their character and habits—their record is thoroughly searched; as to the experience they have had and which is shown by vouchers which they get; and of course the age-limit restriction has to be taken into account. On the information thus got these men are rated, and all who rate over 70 per cent are put upon the labour register; and when labourers are wanted in this field or the other field, application is made to the civil service board, who at once send the men who they think, from that examination, will be best fitted for the work. In that way incompetent people are weeded out from the great unskilled labour department which I have spoken of, and it is put upon a basis where character, good habits, ability and record comes to be a determining factor. To show the progress that has taken place, I take two years. In 1903 there were 271,000 in the executive civil service, and of

those 135,485 were appointed after competitive examinations. In 1907 there were 337,000 in the whole service, and of those 197,000 held their position by competitive examinations. Making up the other 140,000 employees are 6,314 postmasters of first, second and third classes, and 53,345 postmasters of the fourth class ; that is, nearly 60,000 postmasters who do not come under the examination system.

Mr. LEMIEUX. How many postmasters altogether ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the number of postmasters. The postmasters are not under the examination system except those of the great cities, and of course they all are. Then there are 10,000 post office clerks, 22,700 canal employees, 30,000 unskilled labourers, in part under the system, and 8,147 Presidential appointments. We may state generally that the great bulk of the civil service of the United States are under the merit and competitive system. Now, it is not necessary for me to read reports of commissions and messages of presidents to Congress for the last fifteen years in order to show the satisfaction which is felt and the excellent results which have followed the application of this system. It is marching forward to conquer the whole field. Taking in year after year geographical sections and portions of the service, and is rapidly approaching the point when the whole civil service will be practically under that system. How far forward the United States has gone, in the breadth of its system, in the worth of its system, in the morale of its members, and in the spirit of loyalty and good work can be found by any one who will take the trouble to read these reports.

The Commonwealth of Australia passed a Civil Service Act on May 5, 1902. It provides for a public service commissioner and not more than six inspectors to make up the board. These are appointed for a seven years term and are eligible for re-appointment. They can be removed by parliament on statement made to parliament. The inspectors have to inspect each department and report. There are four divisions of the public service—the administrative, the professional, the clerical and the general. Examinations are necessary to all appointments. The examinations are competitive. There is a medical test. There is a probationary system of six months. Temporary appointments may be made, but for no longer than six months, when they are made permanent. Promotions take place on examination. There is a system of life insurance which provides in part for the employees by co-operation with the government in certain ways.

The different states of the United States are passing rapidly into the civil service merit stage. One of the most notable instances is the state of Wisconsin. In that state there was a merit system before 1895, applied to the larger municipalities in the matter of fire and police, under which 18 of the largest cities of the state carried on these two great departments of their work. It was in 1905 that the last Inclusive Civil Service Act was passed in Wisconsin. There were three Civil Service Acts. One applied to the merit system to the National Guard of the state. Another applied it—and that is a lesson which we may take note of—to officials of the legislature itself. I think this is the first instance of the kind in the United States. The third was a general Civil Service Act. The chief points of that Act follow very closely those of the United States system. There is one point in which it is illuminative. The Act went into force in 1905. It required every one of the civil servants then in office to pass an examination before the end of 1906. That examination was made one not of a literary character, although the desire was to test their intelligence and knowledge, but was based largely on record and experience as detailed by the heads and chiefs under whom the officials had worked; but it brought every civil servant up to the point where after 1906 he held his position by virtue of having passed the examination, and having become a part of the system, under its discipline and with all the benefits accruing from it. They were divided into classified and unclassified, and under the sytem of examinations every citizen of Wisconsin had a right to go up and try his mettle. And by excellence of his examination, his character, his record, his adaptability he gets there. Removals are for cause and made by the appointing power itself, but guarded in this way that they must state the reason and hand that reason to the Civil Service Commission and it becomes practically public property, but the commission has no right to review the removal. It is thought that the publicity of the cause and the publicity of the action would prevent wrongful removal. From Wisconsin, as in the federal, absolutely all political assessment and political influence is debarred. Sections 28 and 29 are so important in that respect that I propose to read them and put them on 'Hansard' :

Section 28.—Political assessments—No officer, agent, clerk or employee, under the government of the state shall, directly or indirectly, solicit or receive, or be in any manner concerned, in soliciting or receiving any assessment, subscription or contribution, or political service, whether voluntary or unvoluntary, for any political purpose whatever, from any officer, agent, clerk or employee of the state. Every said officer, agent, clerk or employee who may have charge or control in any building, office, or room ocupied for any purpose of said government is hereby authorized to prohibit the entry of any person, and he shall not permit any person to enter the same for the purpose of therein making, collecting, receiving or givng notice, of any political

assessment, subscription or contribution, and no person shall enter, or remain in any said office, building or room, or send or direct any letter or other notice thereto, for the purpose of giving notice of, demanding, or collecting a political assessment, subscription or contribution, nor shall any person therein give notice of, demand, collect or receive, any such assessment, subscription or contribution. Any person who shall be guilty of violating any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanour.

Section 29—Official influence—Whoever, while holding any public office, or in nomination for, or while seeking a nomination or appointment for, any public office, shall use or promise to use, whether directly or indirectly, any official authority or influence (whether then possessed or merely anticipated) in the way of conferring upon any person, or in order to secure or aid any person in securing any office or public employment or public contract or any nomination, confirmation, promotion, or increase in salary, upon a consideration or condition that the vote or political influence or action of the last named person or any other, shall be given or used in behalf of any candidate, officer or party, or upon any other corrupt condition or consideration, shall be deemed guilty of bribery or an attempt at bribery as the case may be. And whoever, being a public officer or having or claiming to have, authority or influence for or affecting the nomination, public employment, confirmation, promotion, removal, increase or decrease of salary or position of any public officer shall use or promise or threaten to use any such authority or influence, directly or indirectly, in order to coerce or persuade the vote or political action of any citizen or the removal, discharge or promotion of any officer or public employee, or upon any other corrupt consideration shall also be guilty of bribery or of an attempt at bribery, as the case may be. Every person found guilty of such bribery or of an attempt to commit the same as aforesaid, shall, upon conviction thereof, be liable to be punished by a fine of not less than one hundred dollars nor more than three thousand dollars, or to be imprisoned not less than ten days nor more than two years, or to both said fine and imprisonment in the discretion of the court. The phrase 'public officer' shall be held to include all public officials in this state, whether paid directly or indirectly from the public treasury of the state, or by fees or otherwise, and the phrase 'public employee' shall be held to include every person not being an officer who is paid from said treasury of the state.

These are two pretty drastic and far reaching provisions, meant to bring about a certain result and it would seem as though they would be effective for that purpose.

When we come to Canada—for I think we have been long enough in this excursion outside—what can we say for the civil service during the last decade or score of years ? I am discussing this subject absolutely free from partisanship of any kind, with the sole desire of putting my view of the case before the House and the country. I try to weigh my words and use my experience and what knowledge I have, and I think I am not to be found fault with if I say that, in so far as Canada is concerned within the last twenty or twenty-five years, we have not made any considerable progress. If we would be fair to ourselves, we would admit that in these later years we have retrograded instead of progressed. We would admit that to-day the foundation of the civil service itself and the structure built upon that foundation, does not occupy as good a position as it has in past years, for in an advancing and growing country not to be making progress is, I think tantamont to retrograding. I do not think there is such a thing as standing still with reference to this matter; there must be progress or there will be retrogression. If I were to say then that the civil service itself is not as strong as it was fifteen years ago, that the morals of the civil service is not as high as it was then, that its efficiency is not so great as it was at that period, I believe I would be saying what my own experience, observation and information absolutely warrant me in saying.

Mr. PATERSON. Have you thought that out fully ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I have bestowed a good deal of thought on the subject and am quite willing to stand by my words. But I will take another authority, the Civil Service Commissioners, who will probably go even further than I in this respect. And remember that the chairman of that commission is a man probably as well versed, not only in the theory but the practice of the civil service in Great Britain and this country, as any one you could find.

Now, what are some of the reasons why the civil service, instead of making progress, has, if anything, retrograded ? I am expressing my own opinion, I am not binding anybody, when I say that one step towards that retrogression was the abolition of the superannuation system by the present government shortly after they came into office. Taken up in some way, whether in an odd moment and for political purposes, or whether by people who had studied it and come to a conclusion which they thought was right and acquiesced in by men who in their hearts knew it was not right but gave way, when the party came into power it found itself pledged to abolish the superannuation system, and it abolished that system. There was another step, and that was the abolition of the yearly increase of all deserving civil servants who had the recommendation of the deputy head of the department. The very moment this latter was abolished, the civil servant had nothing substantial, firm, to hold to. Do his work as faithfully as he might, still he knew that he received no increase as of right. And what else did he

know ? He knew that if he were to get anything he must rely upon pull, he must get his member or somebody who had influence to secure advantage for him in some way. That is a blunt way of stating it, but that is really what took place. It is true that this rule was entirely reversed within a year or so; but the lesson had been taught. The civil servant had been told : It is not your right, it is not even a prescriptive right for you to receive this increase ; if you get it, you will get it at the will and pleasure of your minister. Now, that had the inevitable effect of throwing the civil service off its true line, the line of thinking what was due to the country, and of setting it to work at making influence, getting members, candidates and others to use their influence in favour of those who could win their support. And so, very great harm was done to the civil service in that way.

With reference to the superannuation system, I appeal to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—I do not know whether he has time to give to that or not that the superannuation system is not something extra, not a piling of something else upon that which is already sufficient ; the superannuation system, if it is well considered, is part and parcel of the remuneration of the civil servant. It should be made an addition to the yearly wage for two reasons : one to induce the continuity in the civil service which is the greatest element of its efficiency, and the other, to make the man feel that after hedging himself out from all the live currents of business life come when he has fifty or sixty years of age and is no longer able to breast these currents in a new business, he shall have something at least to look forward to during the time of his old age. Now, that united with the yearly or monthly wage makes what gives you the best possible for the service of your country. To cut away that support, in my opinion, is to cut away one of the foundation pillars of a good service. But, having that or something which would produce the same result, you make a good beginning in the establishment of the best civil service system. Now, I put another point: It is absolute wastefulness to do away with the superannuation system—and I ask the particular attention of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to this. The superannuation system is not to be judged alone by the dollars spent on it. Here is another way to judge it : Suppose you allow your civil servant only the yearly wage—that is, you abolish the superannuation system : Within a very few years you pay more than you would pay if you had not abolished it. And why ? Because in every department of this government and in every corridor of these buildings, you have men whom you cannot turn out on the street, yet who cannot do the work of the department. There they are, and you must put on extra men who would do the work that these older men do not do. We all have a little human nature, and when an old employee who has been in our charge for years has come to the time when he cannot earn the money that is paid to him, we do not, in fact, turn him out in the street. And so, we have a wasteful system, a costly expenditure. And, whatever we do with reference to the civil service, I hope we shall not fail to have as part of our plan a superannuation system or some contrivance for the same purpose. It may be widened a little—as the civil service authorities in Great Britain are this very day discussing—to provide that when a man dies after having paid all his life into the civil service, his family shall not be left with nothing ; or, even when a man goes out of the service, battered and worn, and dies after receiving his superannuation allowance for a year or two, his family may still have some consideration. There ought to be inventiveness enough, ability enough, in this parliament to devise a scheme which will be economical, but in the end fair to these great interests and calculated to put our civil service upon a better basis than it is on to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him as a matter of information : Is there a superannuation system in the civil service of the United States ?

Mr. FOSTER. There is not. But there is a pretty strong agitation for it. Besides, they pay at a much more generous rate of wages than we do in this country.

Now, there is another point : We have got into a habit, it has become like a burden strapped to our backs, of contracting civil servants out of even the Civil Service Act that we have. This was pointed out by the commission. In one year, for one cause or another, there were fifty cases of 'notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act.' In this way the civil servants to whom this was applied were taken out from under the law. So we had discrepancies, we had wide differences, and bitterness was left in the hearts of those who thought they were equally deserving but got nothing. That does not help the civil service. One of the worst things to import into a civil service, perhaps the one thing that saps their loyalty worse than anything else, is the mere idea that they are not being treated fairly, that some get more than they should and that some, equally faithful, get less. As long as it is a matter of exception, under the charge of the minister, these things will occur more

or less. Then there has been the re-enforcement of the patronage influence, there is no denying that. The patronage system was never so greedy, grasping, insistent, heartless, conscienceless as it has been during these last years, never in the history of Canada. This is a part, I suppose, of the material growth of the country. It may not be the fault of the present government more than of the past government, but the spirit is different now from what it was, and everything that makes is looked to, and as I said, the result is that this spirit is stronger and more grasping than ever before.

Mr. PATERSON. Have you thought that out fully?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I have. It is not only in the initiatory stages. Patronage today follows the man all the way through. Will the Prime Minister let me give him a supposititious case, which is not a supposititious case—I mention no names. A man enters the service, he passes his examination, goes into the department, does his work for years and years, does his work well and faithfully, and rises by his yearly increases. The time comes when he stands at the head of his class, the time comes when provision is made for promotions. Then he says to himself: I must go to the man I have worked under and I must ask him to give me fair consideration. Here I stand above so and so, there is my work, it shows for itself, and I must go to my chief. He goes to his chief, puts in his plea, and what answer do you suppose he gets? Have you any political influence? Think of it, just think of it—Have you any political influence? There is a man who has done his work for fourteen or sixteen years, done it well, and there is not a black mark against him. And when there are chances for promotion, all that he wants to do is to let his work speak for itself. The work is all chucked aside, and his chief says to him: Have you any political influence? Well, no, Sir, I didn't suppose that was necessary. I supposed you knew my work, and the recommendation is in your hands, I have to depend on you. Can't you get somebody to recommend you? In the end what happened? In the end it filtered down to this, that he had to ask the defeated candidate in the county, and the defeated candidate put it to him just as plain as this: Who is your father? Who is your brother? Where do your people live? How have they voted? They all went against me, I believe. And he was simply told: Let your father and his brothers go to the parish committee and if they can get their recommendation perhaps something can be done. Now, there is no need of any comment on that. I said that I was not treating this subject in a partisan way. But there is the minister's chair, and in that chair, if he were present, would be the minister who absolutely put the patronage in the city of St. John into a committee of wardworkers, called them together, and said: I cannot do this thing, you must do it, I put it into your hands. What malversation of the trust of office! At least, for Heaven's sake, if it has to be done, can't we decently keep it under cover in some way? A man says: You better be open and above board. Yes, except for this, the infernal example of the thing, because from Vancouver to Sydney goes the teaching that the ward committee appoints to office, and every ward committee from one end of this country to the other usurps the place of government. Who is responsible for the work of the departments? The deputy head and the minister whose deputy he is. But you overturn the pyramid absolutely when you take away from them the choice, under proper conditions, and the possibility of having proper conditions, of the very best man, and put it into the hands of a distinct and partisan patronage committee. Now, I have freed my soul as regards the patronage.

Mr. PATERSON. What minister is responsible for that?

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the best the Minister of Customs has to say on that subject?

Mr. PATERSON. I think so. Is not the minister responsible to parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, leave it that way, if the hon. gentleman wishes. Now, we have in this country the semblance of an examination system, but it is only a semblance. You appoint your civil service examiners, you empower them to examine, and they do examine. In the first place, who comes up to the examination? No one can enter unless he belongs to the party in power with any hope that he will get a position. The Prime Minister shakes his head. Will he deny that that is the tendency?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no such information.

Mr. FOSTER. But will he deny that that is the tendency? Is it not well known that all the chances are in favour of the man who belongs to the party which is in power? I think we can go that far—all the chances. Now and then one gets in, there may be the personal influence. I, as a Conservative may have a very strong friend who is a Liberal, and if I pass the examination he may secure my appointment. But that is very seldom done. I am right then in saying that the whole trend is in that way. So our present system is an advertisement of all those who do not belong to the party at present in power, not to offer for examination to the

civil service, because they don't have much of a chance to get in. Then what is the next thing? Those who do come, having the party imprimatur, and who pass the qualifying examination, where do they go? Into an absolutely confused limbo of names. They pass the examination, and they are notified that they have passed. But where is the register that is kept, where is the register of the dates when they passed and their standing when they pass? And where is the obligation, when the appointing power comes along, to take a man from the top or to make a choice of men from the top? There is none of that. Consequently there is no merit system at all. All that you gain is that before a man gets in he passes a small qualifying examination or a small preliminary examination, and it is not a very tedious affair to the young man or the young woman fresh from school. It would be a pretty hard thing for the Minister of Customs or myself to pass it, but those who are fresh from school easily pass.

Mr. PATERSON. We could have done it once.

Mr. FOSTER. I have passed different examinations in my time, but I would not like to tackle this examination now. So we have no competitive system for making appointments. You may say we have promotion examinations. True, we have, but here is the thing about promotion examinations. If you have a good head and a good deputy you will have good square promotion examinations; if you do not, you will have a lax system so that you have no uniformity and there is contrast between one department and another, one in which there is some desire to fill the spirit of the Act, the other in which there is no desire, no uniform direction, consequently there is contrast and heartburning.

Out of this state of things comes, in the first place, lack of principle. Of course we all agree that the principle that should animate a young man going into the civil service is the desire to do his country's work and to do it well. Our effort should be to bring out the best that is in him to do that work. This can only be done under certain conditions and the present conditions are not favourable to that, so in too many cases the young man's determination degenerates into this : I will do my regular day's work as well as I can and get out when the hour of closing comes, or : I will try to make myself agreeable to my next chief and maybe I will get on his good side and be helped up. While the civil servant ought always to try to please his chiefs, his first aim should be to do his work, and it is foreign to all proper principles that he should simply do his work so as to please his chief with the idea that the chief will secure promotion for him. Then the loss of spirit comes very rapidly. What do we find, with reference to the British people ? The hold they have on the world, in India and other countries is due to the general opinion that they deal justly and fairly. That is a wonderful thing for a nation, a wonderful thing for a service. Is it or is it not a fact that in this service there is a loosening and a diminution of that idea that people are dealt fairly by and a growing idea that there is partyism, favouritism and pull and that the sharpest fellow will probably get along the best. That is the tendency and of course out of that comes a lack of efficiency. That is my observation and if I should read portions of this report of the Civil Service Commission it would be strengthened and confirmed by the findings of the commissioners. To summarize, the commissioners say that the servce is deteriorating, that more inefficients are entering and fewer efficients are remaining. To that we will all subscribe. I have heard the Minister of Finance and other ministers say in this House how difficult it was to keep the best men. It is equally difficult to get the best men. If inefficients are coming in and the efficients leaving the service, it must be to the great deteriment of the service. Disclipine is affected, the commissioners say. Discipline is inevitably affected unless you have just rules, uniformly applied and carried out with fairness through the different departments. The Act is not enforced. The Civil Service Commission point to the 50 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary' votes and to grading under other names.

Mr. PATERSON. Do the Uuited States never depart from their system ? Suppose that an officer shows exceptional merit, would they not waive the strict provisious of their system ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, every system has a process by which that can be done. In the United States it is done by reference to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. PATERSON. Here we do it by the judgment of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. That is where the great check comes. The Civil Service Commission wants to secure the best results for the service. The head of the department says : That is the very man I want for this position, the commission look up the man's record, examine him, put him through a course of sprouts and if they coincide in the opinion of the head they have power to advance him in practically the same way as the Civil Service Commission in Great Britain have power to advance men. It must be that way because these exceptional circumstances must be provided for.

The commissioners find that the patronage evil is everywhere, and everywhere it is deleterious. The government in their commission said they thought the principle of the Civil Service Act was right. The com-

mission take issue with them, they think that all political patronage should be eliminated, that the Act should be repealed, that the merit system after competitive examination should be brought into force, that there should be a board of civil service commissioners, with rigid probation and careful inspection. I notice that the Australian Act provides for plenty of inspection and for a board of inquiry.

One word as to what the civil service is. The country at large, I think, has probably a very inadequate idea of what an important thing the civil service of a country like Canada is. To my mind the civil service is more important than governments. I do not think a cabinet is as important as the civil service itself. The civil service is really the most important thing we have. What is the civil service ? It exists for the state. The civil service is not a sort of charity place in which to throw people for whom you want to provide. That is foreign to the idea of a civil service. It is not for any particular part or any particular ministry, it is there to do the great, unending constantly pressing business of the country which can be carried on in absolutely no other way and by no other instrument. So we want the best civil service we can get and no state is where it ought to be until it gets the very best possible civil service obtainable. We should have in our civil service the best men that Canada can produce, for carrying on affairs as are carried on by the civil service. What are its functions, its great work of managing the affairs of this country ? Look at it. We come here and are small lords in our way as representatives of constituencies, and then we have a few of these greater lords, the ministry, for the time being. They are important in their own estimation and in reality as well. But these are all evanescent, we come and go, ministers are here to-day and there to-morrow ; but there is one force, one power, one mechanism, which is here always and constantly at work and on the quality of its work depend members and ministers and all the outcome from the best talent in the way of political work that we can bring to bear. Where do we get the money to carry on our work ? It is collected by a tireless, honest, competent civil service and in proportion as they lack these characteristics the revenue does not come to us as it ought to. We vote the money and it has to be expended, and then we go about our various business, political and otherwise.

What becomes of the $100,000,000 that is voted by parliament? It passes through the avenues of the civil service and upon the honesty, capacity and loyalty of the civil servants depends whether that money is well expended or not. The vote for public works goes to the Public Works Department ; your draftsman draws his lines, your engineer makes his plans, your supervisors watch the expenditure of every dollar and the quality of the material and the diligence of your workmen, and the work is done not by the minister or by parliament, but by an efficient or inefficient civil service as the case may be. In the Department of Agriculture maybe the minister knows a little about agriculture and maybe he does not, but whether he does or not, on the civil servants he must rely. The minister has men in the department who have learned in the school of experience, and without that your process of public agriculture would not be worth a snap of the fingers. In the forestry branch, it is the men to whom often we pay small salaries who bring their stores of information, and if the minister is active and wise to avail of these stores a perfect forestry system will be the result. Who is carrying on the great work of forestry and irrigation in the United States? There is Roosevelt at the top, and the secretary of the Interior is at the head of the department, but it is the men of the civil service who furnish the ideas and practical knowledge to put the best projects through. In this Dominion it is the knowledge, honesty, and capacity of the civil service which makes for success in every department. So I say, the civil service of Canada is of the utmost importance to Canada and the people of Canada should think more of it and we as legislators should think more of it. We should appreciate what the civil service is; we should not look to it as a mere machine for party or personal ends ; we should not bedevil the public service, we should be its staunchest defenders and its strongest upbuilders. I have very strong views on this. Look at Britain's great imperial empire. Her warriors by sea and by land did something to acquire it, but the best of Britain's acquirements were her acquirements through here unrivalled civil service. Her armies, her guns, and her swords were good in their way, but the strongest defence of the outlying parts of the empire lies in the sense of justice and fairness that has been inculcated in the subject races by the civil servants of Britain. India is a monument to the civil service of Great Britain, a monument not only in its inception but in its progressive development and in its loyalty. The guns and the soldiers of Great Britain could not keep India for the British Crown had it not been for that permeating influence for good of the civil service, and their work in the Indian empire. In New York, four or five years ago, I had the pleasure of attending a representative meeting and I was glad to be a British subject when I heard one of the brightest and most cultured and most experienced minds in the United States say : If England has a broad empire to-day; if she has vast and loyal colonies she owes it to her civil service more than to anything else; the United States has nothing in comparison with the civil service

of England; we have no trained diplomatic service, we have no trained and independent civil service. England owes her unrivalled supremacy in the acquiring and good government of colonies to the capacity of her trained civil servants. That was the remark of a man who was proud of his own country and who would have been glad to be able to say that of his own country, but he was honest and frank enough to give the honour to England.

We should have freedom in our civil service. If it is a civil service for Canada, every boy in Canada has the right to present himself at the open door and to say: I want to do something for my country, I want to engage in the civil service. Every boy who goes through our schools should have inculated in him loyalty to Canada and pride in its progress and development so that there might be stirred within the hearts of all an intense and burning desire to do for Canada what great civil servants have done for Britain. We are not a conquering country but we have a domain of our own to conquer and develop and we need the best of the best of our people to do it. Every boy in Canada—led by no worn politician, led by no member of parliament led by no cabinet minister; every boy in Canada has a perfect right to say: Give me a chance to show my mettle ; I will try your examination and if I succeed let me have a chance as a citizen of Canada to work for my country. And once in the service he should have the same freedom all the way through. He gets in by merit let him go ahead on his merit; let there be nothing between him and the highest positions but his own diligence, his own loyalty, and his own capacity, and if he is able for it let him go to the top. You will never get the civil service Canada ought to have until you make the civil service free for the best man who wants to win the best place. How can you have a thoroughly efficient civil service in Canada unless every ambitious youth shall have an opportunity to work his way to the top without the fear of having somebody else who has never paid the price for it in servitude, being put over his head ? I would have the civil service system of Canada wide open to the best men to fill the best offices clear up to the deputy heads. There is an awful amount of bosh talked about the uecessity of having a deputy head in unison with the political ideas of the minister. As a matter of fact it does not happen. To-day the Liberal government have Conservative deputy heads and to-morrow the Liberal-Conservative government will have Liberal deputy heads. What we want is the capable man, the loyal man, the honest man, and when you have him you have all that is necessary. I would open every place in the civil service clear up to the deputy head to the best man on his merits, his character, his capacity, and his record. There may be and there will be some few confidential positions where this open competition will not come into effect. A minister naturally wants to select his own private secretary. That is conceded everywhere under all civil service systems, and there may be some other positions of a like kind. But as a rule, there is no reason why, in such departments as the Customs and Post Office, the highest prizes should not be open to every one in the service, so that the young man who begins at the bottom may have the feeling that he has a chance to get to the highest position immediately under the minister. What is so great a spur to activity, to the acquirement of knowledge and competency? Every waking hour is given to it, every thought is directed to it. You would not have men worth a groat in the nation if they had not that incentive. The merchant has it, the carpenter has it; but when you come to the civil service, you put up barred gates and say, these shall be opened only to such and such. I would throw down the bars, and give every position to the man fit for it. With freedom, and with this horizon and scope, I believe we could have a very fine civil service in this country. I enter my plea for a civil service based on merit, on freedom, on manliness, so that no man need take off his hat to get a chance to work for his country, but every man can march straight up, a free man, beholden to nobody, and get the opportunity to make good if it is in him to make good. Then you will have a loyalty in the civil service which will take little account of political advantage, or of the passage of parties to and fro, but which will give its whole heart and soul to the great work of administration and development in this country, and through its loyalty and its hopes will have the efficiency that is required, and will be among all these evanescent passages of the men of a day or the men of an hour, the one solid, enduring thing in this country which makes for progress and prosperity.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, the words of the motion which my hon. friend has placed in your hand are not in themselves objectionable, and the same may be said of the greater part of his speech. Indeed, if we except a small portion towards the close of his remarks, I will frankly say that he has given us an informing speech. which should be useful to us all, and has handled the question in the non-partisan spirit to which he has referred. Towards the close, however, I am afraid that he strayed away from that firm faith and yielded to the temptation to present to the country the idea that such evils as are alleged to exist in the civil service to-day are evils which have largely arisen under the administration of the present government. To that portion of my hon. friend's speech I must take exception, and I must tell my hon. friend that, with

hardly an exception, every one of those defects, so far as they are grave and serious, existed in the civil service in the days when he was a minister of the Crown, every one of them was brought to my notice by a previous Civil Service Commission, and my hon. friend was not moved to find a remedy. My hon. friend may say that is importing the element of partisanship into the discussion, but it is only for the purpose of defence. I find no fault with any argument my hon. friend may advance, whether based on the experience of former years or on the experience of the present time, looking towards improvement in the civil service ; but I do say that he must not found that argument on the assumption that those evils, as far as they exist, are evils which have grown up recently. Take, for instance, the matter of the statutory increases. In the ten or twelve years that this administration has been in power, the law and practice respecting statutory increases has been exactly what it was in the days of the preceding government. The law respecting statutory increases never made it matter of obligation to give a statutory increase to every official, but contemplated giving it only to such officials as were worthy to receive it. My memory is that for two years greater restrictions than were formerly in existence were placed on the payment of the statutory increases ; and this necessarily led to some process of selection. My hon. friend says that that process was political. I am bound to say I hear that accusation to-day for the first time. I know that so far as the matter came under my observation, politics never entered into it at all. What each minister was told was that the policy of indescriminate statutory increases should not be followed, but that he should make a selection of those deemed most worthy to receive it; and in making that selection, I am quite sure that the element of political partisanship was not considered at all. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that we have sometimes introduced into the estimates the words, 'notwithstanding the Civil Service Act,' and contends that we are deliberately contracting men out of the Civil Service Act. That is true, but I want to say to my hon. friend that if he takes all these cases and compares them with the large number of people in the civil service of Canada, he will find that the number of exceptions has been insignificant. Is it possible to adopt a general law in a matter of this kind? Can you lay down hard and fast rules, by which every man shall get a certain salary and no more? Put into a department two men on the same day, under equal conditions and at at the same salary. Five years later look at their record. One will prove to have been a man of routine, doing good and useful service in his way, while the other will have developed a power which is valuable, and which it is necessary to recognize in order to keep him in the service. When he reaches the maximum of his class, it is necessary to make some exceptional arrangement in order to give him the recognition to which he seems to have become entitled. I grant that it is not desirable that this should be done too frequently ; but when a man dispalys exceptional fitness for the public service, the minister should not be tied down by a hard and fast rule which would prevent him paying that man one dollar more salary than the other man, who may be a good and worthy man, but whose place could be filled at any moment if he left it. So that these exceptions to which my hon. friend referred are not very great in proportion to the whole. This claim as to political influence in the service is largely magnified. I do not say such influence is not an evil. I am not contending against civil service reform; I am not objecting to the general rule laid down by my hon. friend, but it is a pity he should have let his imagination run riot and seek to persuade the country that this evil is of such an enormous extent. My own observation is it is not, and I say this from the experience of the years I have been in federal politics, and I say it also from information I had in the earlier period when I had no connection with this parliament. My hon. friend said that down in St. John county they had a patronage committee. That seems something dreadful, the way he puts it. But let us think for a moment and see whether there is any great evil in having a patronage committee. I am not a sufficient admirer of the system to have such a committee in anything I have to do with myself, but if an appointment has to be made in a distant portion of the country, one must get information somewhere, and where is one more likely to get reliable information than from the intelligent men who are the leaders of the party in that district? Undoubtedly they will give the preference to men of their own party, but if I am to make a selection in a distant part of Canada of some man to serve my department, what better course could I pursue than to get the advice of some of the leading men in that locality? Whether you call these gentlemen a patronage committee or a committee of any other kind makes no difference. The name should not alarm people. It was said that the patronage committee nominated the postmaster in Toronto. Well, I am confident that under no system could you have got a better man to fill the office than the one chosen. Reference is made in the report of the commissioners on the civil service to the case of the postmaster at Kingston. Well, I have not the pleasure of knowing the gentleman, but I am informed that he is an eminently well qualified official. I prefer myself in anything I have to do to avoid the forming of a committee in a matter concerning my own constituency, or anything like that, but in dealing with affairs

at a distance one has to get advice from somebody, and if a number of gentlemen of good standing and repute associate themselves together, the fact that they are called a patronage committee should not by any means lead to the conclusion that the representations they make are not fair and in the interests of the government service. My hon. friend was not as fair in the latter part of his speech as he was in the beginning or he would not have expressed the opinion that there are evils now which did not exist formerly. If we frankly admit the evils and seek to bring about a remedy, that is what the public expect and appreciate. But what I cannot understand is why my hon. friend should choose the present time for bringing forward his motion. He has given us a very interesting speech, save the small portion to which I take exception, but it does seem strange that he should feel it necessary to follow his excellent sentiments with a motion which takes the form of a motion of non-confidence. There is nothing in this question which should lead him to approach it with the desire of dividing the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Then accept the motion.

Mr. FIELDING. The better way would be not to make it as a non-confidence motion or not make it at all, and having drawn attention to it, I trust my hon. friend will see that there is no occasion to divide the House and will withdraw it. Another reason why the time is not opportune is this: Some time ago my right hon. friend the First Minister announced the intention of the government to deal with this question of civil service reform. Last week the House was informed that a Bill would be brought before parliament dealing with the subject. On Friday last the Minister of Agriculture placed on the order paper the customary notice that a Bill would be introduced to amend the Civil Service Act, and on the order paper to-day I find Bill entitled an Act to amend the Civil Service Act standing in the name of the Minister of Agriculture. That Bill would be probably on the table to-day but for the fact that my hon. friend is necessarily absent, owing to circumstances both sides of the House deplore. What strikes me is that when a Bill is on the notice paper dealing with the whole matter in a concrete form and likely to come forward in a few days, there can be no reason why my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) should challenge discussion and divide the House on the abstract question. Having drawn attention to the matter, I certainly think no good purpose can be served by his dividing the House. Let him wait for the Bill which the government has announced, and then there will be ample time to discuss the whole question. A premature discussion now is neither desirable nor expedient.

Mr. SPROULE. I shall not take up much time as I have given but little attention to this question outside of observations since I have been in the House. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says the patronage committee is a good thing. He defends political patronage in the selection and maintenance of civil servants. Well, in that respect he is entirely out of accord with the judgment of the Civil Service Commission which he helped to appoint to look into this question and give the House the benefit of their observations.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is not quite accurate. What I did was give instances in which the patronage committee had nominated men to office, and I said that so long as we had no competitive examination the nominations received in that way were deserving of consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said that if somebody had to be appointed in a distant locality, how are you going to get the information you required? But it is not with regard to remote parts of the country that the patronage committees are appointed. They are at work right here in the capital, and their work is more apparent and effective to-day in Ottawa than it is in any other place in Canada. To show that the patronage committees nominated excellent men the Minister of Finance gave us some examples, and the only conclusion we can draw from his argument and his illustrations is that the patronage committee is the proper system. But that is not the judgment of the Civil Service Commission, because they say that patronage is radically wrong. My hon. friend says that this is a non-confidence motion and asks why it was moved on the motion to go into Supply. But, on similar occasions, motions of this kind have been accepted and then they become no longer motions of want of confidence. There is nothing to prevent the Minister of Finance from admitting that the principle laid down in that motion is a good one and one the government should accept. There would then be no controversy between us. The next point made by the minister was that there is a Civil Service Bill to be laid before the House in a few days, and therefore there is no necessity of dealing with the question now. Could there possibly be a better time to present all the data to the House, that the House might be in possession of all the facts? The government itself could take all this data into consideration, and even if it were necessary for them to delay their Bill for a few days in order that they might bring the measure into accordance with the best and soundest information afforded them, they could make a much better Bill and one more acceptable to parliament. Surely there could be no more opportune time to discuss this question than just before the introduction of a Civil Service Bill.

Certain facts have directed my attention to the need of civil service reform. As I have already said, I speak rather from information than any thing else. I have been in this House for a somewhat lengthened period and have heard of civil service reform over and over again. It is said that the opposition is always in favour of introducing civil service reform and the government is always against it. I do not know whether the government's position on the question is due to the fact that it is a large question and difficult to deal with, or due to the fact that a real reform would wipe out the patronage system on which they depend for keeping in power. Whatever the cause, they do not seem to be in favour of civil service reform.

That the object proposed by this resolution is a good one must be patent to every member of the House ; it would give us a better civil service, one more useful to the country and one more independent of political parties. The establishment of the Civil Service Commission was for the very purpose of setting forth to the country what defects existed in the civil service, and the appointment of such a commission was in effect, a declaration by the government that they desired to remedy these defects. The Civil Service Commission has shown that many reforms are needed, and it is the duty of the government to take advantage of the information furnished by the commission. The commissioners say, among other things :

It was the universal feeling amongst the officials who gave evidence before the commissioners that this patronage evil was the curse of the public service.

Mr. FIELDING. Which report is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) reading from?

Mr. SPROULE. I am reading from the Civil Service Commission's Report, page 13.

Mr. FIELDING. Not the old report ?

Mr. SPROULE. The report of 1908.

Mr. FIELDING. It sounds very like the old one.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Finance rather resents the statements of the commission, judging by the arguments he has used before the House. The report proceeds :

Many of the witnesses were very frank on this subject, and the commissioners earnestly recommend that all persons who are interested in the maintenance at a high state of efficiency of the administration of the affairs of the Dominion should very carefully consider the evidence submitted on this point with this report.

Then they go on to draw attention to the fact that, though we have a civil service law, in many cases it is violated. They say that in 1906, over fifty votes were put through this House containing the old stereotyped clause 'Notwithstanding any thing in the Civil Service Act.' This is an absolute violation of a principle in the Act that should be held sacred. The commissioners go on to point out that while many members of the civil service carry on their work with zeal and with scant remuneration, there are many others who give very imperfect service to the country. It is to be supposed that it is for the purpose of remedying the evils pointed out that the government are introducing the Bill which they are about to present. Why should they object to any one giving such information as will assist them in perfecting this Bill?

One of the great existing evils is that the civil service to-day is not open to the fair competition of all. Why ? Because political pull has destroyed fair competition. The Civil Service Act of 1892 was intended for this purpose, but it has been warped from that purpose in one way and another.

Mr. FIELDING. Under the Act of 1892, was the civil service open to the competition of all ?

Mr. SPROULE. So far as the civil service examination was concerned, it was open to every young man and woman in the country.

Mr. FIELDING. The same is true to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. And that was a great step in the right direction. It made it clear that there must be a certain standard of excellence on the part of those who aspired to positions in the civil service. I frankly admit that politics entered more largely into the section from amongst those who had passed the civil service qualifying examination than ought to have been the case, but at least the Act gave assurance that those from amongst whom the choice was to be made had certain necessary qualifications. And the promotion was to be solely on merit. Is it on merit to-day ? I am told it is not, but that political pull controls the situation.

Mr. FIELDING. There is not a shadow of evidence to support that statement.

Mr. SPROULE. Need I point to any other fact than the fact that the civil service has so many appointments based upon nothing but nepotism ? There are ministers and ex-ministers who have sons in the civil service who never passed the examination. And there are sons-in-law and relatives of leading men in the government party who have been put in regardless of their qualifications. Had I the time to collect them, I could give the names of dozens of such cases. Why, it is a burning scandal the way members of parliament and min-

isters have been able to get their relatives into the civil service whether they were qualified or not to the exclusion of many who were well qualified but who were without the political pull which was used to such good effect for the benefit of their rivals. It does not need a civil service commission to point this out, it is apparent to every one.

Let me point out just a few of the benefits that would accrue from an improved system if it were adopted. First and greatest would be the improvement in the civil service; the work would be better done and at less cost. There is no doubt that there are many members of the service who give faithful and conscientious service, who do their very best. But there are others who cannot exert their best powers because they have not the necessary stimulus to their ambition. They know that, no matter what their merit, they cannot get permission without political pull. If the civil service were ruled by merit these men would be spurred on to give better service to the country. Another great advantage would be that members of parliament and the government would be relieved from very unpleasant work which now they are compelled to go through. Members waste a large portion of their time giving excuses to those for whom they cannot secure appointments in the civil service, many of whom are not qualified and should not be applicants for positions in the service. Then it would relieve members of parliament from all that, and from what I know of the feeling of the members with regard to it, in my judgment 24 out of 25 of the members of this House would gladly welcome the introduction of such a system. If they were supporters of the government they would be able to give the one answer, that they had lost the power of patronage. It would relieve them from a very onerous and a very disagreeable work. Then it would prevent the government and their supporters from the exercise of patronage in order to keep themselves in power. Why is it that in England the governments do not live as long as they do here? It is because they have no political patronage to exercise. In England as soon as the government begins to live it begins to die. By-elections almost invariably go against the government, because the government has no political patronage by which to influence voters, and they cannot keep themselves in power by that means. What was it that kept Sir Oliver Mowat and G. W. Ross in power for so long a time, over 34 years? It was the most scandalous nepotism, it was the abuse of political patronage, the worst that has taken place in any country in the world. It was not merit, not faithful service, not the administration of the government in the public interest; but it was the power they were able to exercise over the people through political patronage, the power they had of appointing thousands and thousands of persons to office that kept them in control of the government year after year. A reform system would make the governments more useful, and it would do away with the nepotism which is exercised by the Prime Minister, the other ministers of the Crown, and members of parliament in their desire to appoint their own relatives to office.

Then I say that all civil servants should stand on exactly the same basis as other citizens of the country. In my judgment they should be compelled to pay their debts the same, they should be compelled to pay their taxes the same, and they should be allowed to exercise their right of franchise, but not to become political partisans by going on the stump and actively supporting a political party. I think they should certainly have the right to vote. There are several other things that I would like to say, but as it is six o'clock I shall have to forbear saying them now. I agree with every word the motion contains. It would be in the interest of the government that this motion should pass, and in my judgment the government should say: We believe in the principle enunciated in this motion, and we accept it. In that way this motion would cease to be one of want of confidence.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SASKATCHEWAN POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 153) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company—Mr. McCraney.

Mr. McCRANEY. Since the House was last in committee on this Bill I have received a wire from the mayor of Saskatoon with respect to it. It will be remembered that the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) took some exception to the powers which were given in the Bill, especially with reference to the length of time within which the company will have to go into operation, and he suggested to me the advisability of sending a copy of the 'Hansard' containing the discussion to the council of the city of Saskatoon. I did that and the reply that I have is as follows:

Saskatoon, May 22, 1908.

G. McCraney, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

Council satisfied with Power Bill as printed.

JAMES R. WILSON,
Mayor.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the hon. gentleman not received any other communication?

Mr. McCRANEY. Prior to this time I received a wire from the mayor saying that a delegation might come to Ottawa with respect to the Bill but this was received by me subsequently.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I may say that I had a communication from Saskatoon in which it was stated that the hon. member was being wired by either the mayor or the council saying they were sending a deputation of two, that they considered the Bill too sweeping in its character and that the people's interests were not sufficiently safeguarded. I understood the hon. gentleman's telegram was subsequent to the telegram he has read.

Mr. McCRANEY. I did receive such a wire as the hon. member mentions, but as this wire which I have read was received subsequently I felt that it revoked anything that the previous telegram contained.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. You received the other telegram since the debate occurred a week ago?

Mr. McCRANEY. Yes. The telegram that I have read is the last telegram I have received on the subject.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend remember the purpose of the amendment of which I gave notice the other night?

Mr. McCRANEY. I have no objection whatever to the amendment which the Finance Minister has proposed, and had the matter laid before the law clerk of the House. If it is still satisfactory to the minister I shall move it.

Mr. FIELDING. I was going to suggest the omission of the words I inserted 'agreed upon,' as the word 'appointed' would be sufficient, that is 'at such time as the board appointed' would be sufficient.

Mr. McCRANEY. I accept that.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

Mr. McCRANEY moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some inquiries were made by the hon member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) with respect to the interest of the city of Saskatoon.

Mr. LENNOX. An explanation was made in your absence.

Mr. McCRANEY. I have sent over to the hon. member a copy of a telegram which I have received from the mayor of Saskatoon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is perfectly clear then that the city council are satisfied with the Bill in its present form.

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

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 172) to incorporate the Dominion Power Development Company.—Mr Hall.

SUPPLY—THE CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM.

House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Fielding for Committee of Supply and the proposed amendment of Mr. Foster thereto.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution I heartily congratulate the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) upon the able manner in which he has placed his facts and figures before the House and the non-partisan way in which he has dealt with the question. We appreciate the work the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did in gathering such valuable information, and I hope that every member of this House agrees with him that civil service appointments should be filled only on account of merit and after proper examination. The words of Gladstone, quoted by the hon. gentleman, ought to be convincing, and ought to teach us that we should no longer continue in our present slipshod and haphazard manner of conducting the affairs of the country. The hon. gentleman referred to the superannuation system and the necessity of making it part of our civil service law. The patronage system has been one of the greatest curses to the civil service, and the sooner it is done away with the better for the country at large. The report of the Civil Service Commission has distinctly laid it down that improvement must be along the lines of securing better examinations and granting greater powers in dealing with the civil service. The report of that commission confirms the view of the member for North Toronto that partisan favouritism and pull are largely the cause of the irregularities which have occurred in the civil service. The money which this Dominion receives from the people of Canada is largely expended through the instrumentality of the civil service and hence the necessity for an honest and competent staff in every public department. I regret that the Minister of Finance was rather inclined to introduce party politics into the discussion. It may be true, as he said that the evils in the civil service are not peculiar to the present administration, but if he compares the report of the Civil Service Commission of 1892 with the report of the last Civil Service Commission, I am sure the comparison will not be satisfactory to him. On the very first page of the last Civil Service Commissioner's report I find :

The commissioners report that in the short and possibly inadequate time at their disposal it has become very evident that in the present state of the development of Canada important changes are required to maintain the civil service as an efficient, contented and useful part of the machinery of administrative government.

On page 11 the commissioners state :

The commissioners also beg to point out that besides a certificate of good health no person should be admitted to examinations unless his character is such as to qualify him for employment in the service. As only one certificate as regards moral character is required by the Board of Civil Service Examiners it is quite within the bounds of possibility that there may be collusion between the candidate and the giver of the certificate.

On page 13 the commissioners make use of this strong language :

From the inquiries made by the commissioners and the evidence submitted to them, they are constrained to declare that they are unable to agree with the expression of opinion contained in the order of reference, and they are of opinion that the repeal of the Act is really the best course to pursue in the public interest. What should be given in its place the commissioners will state when they come to that part of the report in which they make recommendations.

Suffice it to say that the strongest possible condemnation of the present administration of the civil service of Canada can be found within the pages of this report. As representatives of the people we cannot too soon provide a remedy for the evils therein pointed out. We need not only a strict civil service law but we need a civil service commission of independent men who will not only look after the interests of the civil service but the interests of every department of government as well. We need a purchasing board ; a board not composed of party politicians who will purchase supplies for the government under the wretched patronage system that has prevailed for the last number of years, but of men who in purchasing these supplies will always keep in mind the best interests of the people of the whole Dominion who contribute the money. The resolution before the House deserves our enthusiastic support. It is universally admitted that those who were leaders of the country in the earlier years had not to contend with many of the evils of the present day. Corruption now seems to be an element in the daily administration of our affairs. Partisan tyranny and debasement, the outgrowth of contention for patronage, office and power, were almost unknown in years gone by, whereas to-day they run riot throughout the land.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Why do you not read the civil service report ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to read more from that report ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Certainly, and wake up.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I shall be able to accommodate the hon. gentleman in that regard before I have concluded my remarks. The patronage system is now recognized as a great problem in our public affairs, and I believe the Prime Minister recognizes that fact. There is not a minister administering a department who does not recognize that to the patronage system, and to party interests he has to devote a large part of the valuable time which under good government should be devoted to the interests of the country. Few thoughtful men are so blind as not to see that a great reform is essential to prevent a great national calamity. Older nations have found that good methods, clean administration, honest, wise, prudent, faithful, men of worth and capacity in the civil service, demand the serious attention of their legislators. Intrigues, bribery and want of principle hung over the administration of public affairs in Great Britain and the United States before the introduction of radical civil service reform. In a young country such as ours abuses will naturally grow as our wealth accumulates, our population increases and the duties and responsibilities of public men multiply.

Therefore it is our bounden duty as members of parliament to put on the statute-book a civil service reform law that will be of benefit to our people and our public men, who to-day, from the Prime Minister down to the latest addition on the government side, squander much of their time in looking after the political aspirants in their constituencies instead of devoting their efforts to the public good. The people of Canada have little to say in running this country. The Prime Minister has more power than a king. He appoints the men in his cabinet. They in turn appoint civil servants. He appoints members to the bench. He appoints commissioners and representatives in foreign lands. He appoints members of parliament to positions of emolument. He appoints men to the Senate. He appoints lieutenant governors and is credited with appointing premiers in some of the provinces. Members and ministers under him in many instances are afraid to assert their rights for fear of losing patronage in their ridings and their positions as members of parliament. While reforms have been carried on in other lands, we in Canada have continued our careless and almost reckless policy. I firmly believe that the day is not far distant when a radical change must take place. These abuses must be removed. The man who says no is not acquainted with the proper meaning of our constitution or the kind of people who compose our nation. We as a country must realize that peace, prosperity and the general advancement of our interests de-

pend not only on the men in high places, but on the fidelity and ability of those in the public service, down to the very lowest. We must not let prejudice or partisan interests stand in the way of improvements to our civil service. Let us make searching investigation into every department, and obtain information from other countries so that we may have the best system available, and do it now. The surest way to correct abuses is to investigate and expose them. No business man can carry on a successful business with loose methods and careless administration such as has been exposed in the departments of this government. Prussia set an example by investigating her civil service in 1815. France followed in 1830. Great Britain made a thorough investigation of the civil service in 1854. The United States made a thorough investigation in 1879 and since that time, but Canada in 1908 is still following the abandoned principles of the 18th century. During the last three quarters of a century a complete revolution has taken place in the civil service of other countries. Rigorous and impartial tests of qualifications have been applied to civil servants and where formerly incompetency, routine and peculation were uppermost, efficiency and fidelity have taken their place. The prosperity and development of Canada will largely depend on our civil servants, for they materially assist in developing our resources and by public economy and good judgment husband our strength. The civil servants should not be instruments to serve the ends of any political party. It should be our pride and ambition to make the standard of our civil servants so high that each department could be pointed to as conducted and carried on by servants of superior character and capacity. The conduct of the civil service in Great Britain at the time of the war with the United States is largely blamed for the loss of the country to the south of us. If the United States could take out of the quagmire of corrupt poltical influence, the civil service of that country, and place it where it is to-day, surely we with our small population, are not going to say that we are helpless to deal with this question. When you see prominent politicians of both parties in the United States favouring advanced legislation in regard to the civil service, when you see the presidents one after another promoting civil service reform, and vieing with each other to carry it forward, and when you find that under the present civil service system the people of the United States are able to save on the average $10,000,000 a year, we in Canada should at least take into consideration whether it is not possible for us to remedy the defects that exist in our civil service system. Public administration in Great Britain is reduced to a science, having its principles, methods, theories, tests of character and capacity, along with responsibilities, so arranged that the officer dare not depart from these principles. The abuses we have in Canada to-day were endured half a century ago by other nations and the arguments used by this government were used then in defence of similar abuses. The most important lessons a nation can learn from its own history are to be found in the exposure of its own errors. Surely we have had sufficient historical facts dealing with the careless conduct of our civil servants to warrant a progressive step towards reform. No excuse can be offered why the basis of our civil service should not have as high a position as that of any other nation. If we think our methods perfect and allow false pride and conceit to stand between our duty, and self inspection, we shall continue to be blind to the peril of a decline in the moral and intellectual tone of our official life. If partisan leaders, and political majorities are to be the domineering spirit of our national life, then will the voice of truth be silenced and our nation drift on to a day when there will be a national awakening, and our people rise to curse the men who for party gain who were afraid to undertake a reform that would elevate our people and place us in the front rank of the nations of the world on this important subject. Look at our position from an outsider's standpoint and compare our advances in civil service reform with those other nations, and we will feel humiliated.

The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) tried to show this afternoon that the civil service of to-day was fully up to the standard of 1892. But let him take the civil service report of 1892 and compare it with the last report and he cannot help being convinced that the standard of the service, as a whole, is not an enviable one and that instead of the service growing better from year to year it is being undermined by the party system of patronage and is growing worse.

In 1825 public offices in Great Britain were purchasable like merchandise in the markets, also offices in the army, state and church. This practice was stopped in 1871. Read the history of the civil service reforms in Great Britain, it is a history of struggles to gain positions they hold to-day. From 1834 to 1868 both parties seem to think that a strictly partisan system of administration was no longer practical and from that day it was doomed, and any party trying to resurrect it would court defeat.

Why cannot we, as two great political parties, deal with this question on its merits and deal with it quickly? Are our offices public trust for the common good or are they partisan outposts for the special benefit of those who can capture them? I see before me the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) and I well remember when a few years he practically defined his position as minister by stating that in the appointment of any man on the Intercolonial Rail-

way, even down to the very navvies, he would take into consideration the interests of his party and not the welfare of the country. Surely we cannot expect from the civil service the best return if we allow party system to be carried on in the way I have pointed out.

Should parties seek the approval of the people by their strength of a sound policy and principles, or should they seek it through patronage and manipulation of elections? Should members of parliament grasp all the patronage possible and use it to discharge election pledges or partisan spoils and political intrigue? Should members come here free from these incumbrances and devote their energies to promote the welfare of the Dominion or should they come merely to look after the patronage in their riding? These are questions we should deal with. We are not living in the 17th century, neglecting to educate our people and denying them the right to vote. We are in the blaze of public opinion; we are public servants of a reading, writing, thinking people who do not say to their members: Go to Ottawa and devote your time and talents towards planning and scheming to get your friends into office whether they are competent or not. They do say: Devote your time and talents towards improving legislation; see that the money is properly expended, that our people are not over-taxed, and that the civil servants are doing their duty. If appointments were to be increased in Canada one hundred fold, is it not clear that party struggles would be still more bitter and politics more corrupt than they are to-day? Is it not wise, therefore, that we should consider the question at present and deal with it effectively? Should we not make a determined effort to rid the politics of this country of the patronage system and clear the civil service of this dead weight on its efficiency? Were we to do this, not only would members on the government side be greatly benefited, but the ministers would have more time to devote to the public interest. For every person or faction conciliated by an appointment there are generally speaking many offended who sought the appointment. Any party relying on patronage and spoils and not on the basis of principle and good administration is not worthy of the confidence of our people and must suffer defeat. The duty of a member of parliament is plain; he should have a constant regard for the old laws of the land, and also see the need of new ones for the common welfare of the people.

This resolution may appear to the government side a new and radical step towards civil service reform, but I feel satisfied that if we should take that step, the duties of the Public Accounts Committee would be to a considerable extent done away with, because there would no longer be abuses in the departments of this government, the exposures of which have taken up so much of the time of that committee. Instead of the members of the government devoting their independence, dignity, time and talents to their duties as representatives of the people and parliamentarians, we find them in many instances devoting them to party patronage and becoming really patronage brokers. They go from office to office, begging or bullying. To-day it is one thing, to-morrow another. To make a place to-day perhaps for a needy dependent or perhaps an unscrupulous supporter seems to be their chief duty in public life. Departments are beseiged and the time of the officials wasted, while if we had civil service reform that would be largely done away with.

Mr. JOHNSTON. You should stop it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. My hon. friend is not one of the men who want to stop things of that kind. He is one of the men who believes in opening the door to the grafters and boodlers and heelers. He is the very man who can stand up in the Public Accounts Committee and defend the civil servants of this country in not furnishing the people with the information they should. There is no man more ready and willing to defend this government in its nefarious transactions than the hon. gentleman. I am not, therefore, surprised to see him averse to taking any part in considering a resolution of this kind which is for the general benefit of our people.

As members of parliament they hold the pistol of their prestige at the heads of departments, and the result in many cases is to force into the public service such of their relations or friends to become a drain on the treasury for the rest of their lives. Were such officials compelled to undergo a preliminary examination, conducted by an independent and competent board of examiners, this could not happen.

Mr. EMMERSON. From whom is my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) quoting?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am quoting from my own knowledge of what is going on in the departments of this government. And, as the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) well knows, a large portion of his own time, when in office, was taken up with men who were begging and bullying him for appointments on the Intercolonial. He knows that the time of members on his side was largely taken up with this patronage system.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is drawing on his imagination.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am not; I am drawing on the actual experience of the ex-Minister of Railways himself. He knows that he felt compelled to defend in this

House the system of appointing none but politicians to positions on the Intercolonial. He knows that, never during the time that he was in charge of that railway, did he ever appoint any but partisans to positions in that service. And when we find ministers of the Crown ready to defend the system of party spoil and party pull, we cannot expect from them a Civil Service Bill that will institute reforms of great benefit to the people.

Members having this power make promises for votes and the results are frequently disastrous. Official life is lowered and many of our best men do not offer themselves for parliamentary honours, owing to the results that inevitably follow. Patronage distribution by members tends to bring the public service into disrepute and has a tendency to convert public officers into active politicians.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) is reading his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, the rule is plain; an hon. member is not permitted to read his speech.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The statements I have made within the last five minutes have been mainly dealing with the ex-Minister of Railways and others on the government side of the House. I have a number of notes to which I wish to refer, and I think it is for the general good that they should be placed before the House. I am surprised that the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) should take such a decided stand in this regard. Perhaps he will allow me to read the words of the Earl of Dufferin on the civil service. In a speech delivered in Toronto, he dealt with the civil service. He said:

But, after all, the chief danger against which you have to guard is that which concerns the civil service of the country. Now, the civil service of the country, though not the animating spirit, is the living mechanism through which the body politic moves, and breathes and has its being. Upon it depends the rapid and economical conduct of every branch of your affairs; and there is nothing about which a nation should be so particular as to secure in such a service, independence, zeal, patriotism and integrity.

Perhaps, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) might take note of these remarks of the Earl of Dufferin.

But, in order that this should be the case, it is necessary that the civil servants should be given a status regulated by their requirements, their personal qualifications, their capacity for rendering the country efficient service, and that neither their original appointment nor their subsequent advance should in any way depend upon their political connections or opinions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. FIELDING. Would the hon. gentleman give us the date of that speech?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The date was September 24, 1878.

Mr. FIELDING. Just the time the Conservatives came into power; and to the day they went out of power they did not introduce any reform Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is a very broad statement for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to make. He knows that he has before him the Civil Service Bill of 1892. He held it up before us this afternoon.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not produce a Bill of 1892; it was the report of that year. The Civil Service Act had been in force for many years and had been amended from time to time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We will say, then, that the minister held up the Civil Service Report of 1892, and threatened this side that if we tried to show that the civil service at the present time was not up to the high standard he would like to lead the people to believe it to be he would quote from this report. But if the hon. gentleman will allow us to quote extensively from the recent report of the commissioners, we will show that, so far as the civil service is concerned it is degenerating rather than improving, and so far as the Earl of Dufferin was concerned, he was not finding fault with the civil service as it was in 1878. Lord Dufferin went on:

If you take my advice, you will never allow your civil service to be degraded into an instrument to subserve the ends and interests of any political party. The success of a political party ought to depend upon its public policy and the ability of its chief, and not upon the advantage likely to accrue to its individual adherents. In fact, the more the area of personal profit consequent upon a change of government is limited, the better for the country at large. On the other hand, the independence thus conceded to the members of the civil service imposes upon them a special obligation, namely, that they should serve their successive chiefs—no matter to which side they may belong—with a scrupulously impartial zeal and loyalty. There is no offence which should be visited with swifter or more condign punishment than any failure in this respect. A civil servant who allows his political sympathies to damp his ardour, devotion, zeal and loyalty to his departmental chiefs is a disgrace to his profession.

These are strong words from the Earl of Dufferin. When we find men attempting, as some are, to burk inquiry into the civil service, we cannot but feel that the time has come when civil service reform becomes imperative.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention, once more, to the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) is reading his speech.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a letter in my possession which will show that the patronage system is carried to its utmost, is carried on in most reckless fashion under the present government. I am sorry the hon. member for Halifax is not in his seat, because I have a letter here, and printed on top of it are the words 'M. Carney & Co., Halifax, N.S., February 19, 1906.'

Gordon Farnell, Esq.,

Dear Sir,—Your letter received. We recommend you to tender $1 below what Stewart has the contract for. We think he will be as high as before, maybe higher. Get the contract. Afterwards it may be in order to get more.

We are, dear sir,
Your obedient servants,
WM. ROCHE,
M. CARNEY.

This goes to show the extent to which the patronage system is carried in Canada. When we see the present system carried to this extent it is high time that we should put forth our best energies to see that a civil service reform Bill is placed before this parliament with the least possible delay. There is not a doubt in my mind that as the Minister of Finance says that the ministers are responsible for what occurs in their departments, he will say that the Postmaster General is responsible for the letter that was printed by these men, possibly down in Halifax.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly I say that the Postmaster General is not responsible for a letter which is not written by him, or by any of his officers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thought I understood the Finance Minister before dinner to say that the Postmaster General was responsible for the party patronage, and that the patronage committee were practically the source from which he gets his information. If this is a sample of the patronage committee that they have in the city of Halifax, and the way they are distributing the patronage in the different departments of this country, it is high time some investigation was made in regard to that system.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no reference there to the patronage committee, as the hon. gentleman quoted the letter. I did not hear anything in it about the patronage committee. I heard that the representatives from Halifax advised a man to tender low. There was nothing wrong in that. He said they might afterwards be able to get some more. I do not say that that was right, but the Postmaster General is not responsible for that. If the hon. gentleman can say that the contractor got anything more improperly, the Postmaster General would be answerable.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is not wrong for a man to say that he would likely get more, and to tender $1 below the other man?

Mr. FIELDING. Not $1 below the other man, but $1 below the existing contract price. That would be a perfectly legitimate advice to give, with the expectation of getting more. I would not write such a letter. Although I do not think any harm came of it, the Postmaster General could only be held responsible if he gave more.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think I should read this letter again so that the Finance Minister may understand it fully.

Gordon Farnell, Esq.

Dear Sir,—We recommend you to tender $1 below what Stewart has the contract for. We think he will be as high as before, maybe higher. Get the contract. Afterwards——

This is the nice point.

—afterwards it may be in order to get more.

We are, dear sir,
Your obedient servants,
WM. ROCHE,
M. CARNEY.

Mr. FOWLER. Who are they ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand they are the members for Halifax.

Mr. EMMERSON. Did they get more?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have not investigated that, perhaps the ex-Minister of Railways will look into the question for us and see if they did get more.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would take your word for it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It seems strange that they would make this promise that he should get more, if they did not see that he did get more. However, I can only say that I strongly support the position taken by the hon. member for North Toronto. I think that members of parliament on both sides of the House are desirous of seeing a civil service reform Bill brought down that will not only be of benefit to the civil servants who are doing their duty in carrying out their contracts in a proper manner, but that will fill the public offices by men who are worthy of the position, and who will faithfully protect the public interest. Every dollar that these men are distributing through Canada belongs to the people of Canada, it does not belong to any government. Therefore I say that we should have the very best civil servants that this country can produce. I hope the resolution which is now before the House will obtain the support of members on both sides of the House.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). If what has been read by my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) who has just taken his seat, is to be considered as orthodox,

while the platitudes he has expressed are of a very high altitude, I fear that I cannot be considered entirely orthodox. I think the same evil arises in politics that frequently arises in religions, because hypocrisy pervades every class of politician, as it pervades many of the religious classes in this world. Now, sir, it seems to me that we are dealing with a question of civil service reform. My hon. friend from Lambton closed his speech with a reference to the distribution of patronage. I understand civil service reform and patronage to be two entirely separate questions. It may be true that there are evils in connection with the civil service, it may be true that occasionally men who are not qualified are appointed to public offices. If that is true to-day, it has been true in Canada for the last 25 or 30 years, even before that time. But I think it can be fairly said in respect to the public service of Canada, that in the main it is filled by men of high character, men well qualified to fill the positions to which they are called, whether you refer to the inside or to the outside service. While it may be fashionable in a sense to declaim against this so-called evil, imaginary in the main, and while this criticism may be indulged in in a stereotyped way, yet to look at the question fairly from a practical standpoint, is there a man in this House or out of it who can say that the evil, in so far as it is an evil, would not exist after the institution of competitive examinations? I do not oppose that principle but in my judgment it will not cure the difficulty. There is influence and influence. Political influence is not the only influence that is exercised in connection with the appointment of men to office, and when we talk about competitive examinations, it seems to me that we do not reflect as to what those examinations are. I heard a reflection with respect to the appointment of postmasters, because, forsooth, they had not been called upon to pass an examination. What is the nature of an examination ? The young man from school is fitted perhaps to pass that examination, but I venture to say that if the members of this House were called upon to pass it, to answer the questions asked, nine-tenths of them could not do so, as they are so far removed from their school days. Would it be claimed that because they could not pass those examinations they are not fitted to fill positions such as that of postmaster ? My own experience and observation with respect to the civil service at Ottawa and elsewhere is that the young man who has been forced to work his way, who has been schooled by experience, who has had to battle with the ups and downs of life, and who seeks and secures a position in one of these departments is the man who in nine cases out of ten will fill the position with greater credit to himself and with greater satisfaction to the country than the university student who steps out from his college halls and can pass the examination. Can it be said that the answering of certain examination questions is a thorough test? Does it indicate qualifications of capacity, originality and initiative? The best civil servant is the man who has originality of thought, who can initiate an idea and carry it into execution, not the man whose memory is the best and who can answer questions, geographical, historical, mathematical or otherwise. Any hon. member who reflects will realize that it is not the man who graduates from college at the head of the honour class who makes the successful business man or the successful man in the real conflict of life. Very often the man who does not succeed in those examinations is, from a practical standpoint, the best man and scores the highest successes in the battle of life. So I hold that the competitive examination will not cure these evils.

There are influences apart from political influences. My hon. friend referred to my experience in connection with the Intercolonial and the Department of Railways and Canals. I can say in all honesty and seriousness that men were appointed and are being appointed to-day in connection with that railway because of their qualifications, because of their fitness. I will admit and I have admitted on the floor of this House that under existing conditions of party government in this country I, as a man, if it came to a question of selection between a political friend and a political opponent, other things being equal, would favour the political friend. Why? For the simple reason that I want a man who will work in concert and in sympathy with me. There is political influence in the service but it is not always political influence favourable to the party in power. There is as much political influence in the civil service in the departments at Ottawa to-day in favour of hon. friends opposite as there is against them. It will be admitted that such influence does not prevail on either side to any great extent, but in so far as civil servants indulge in their political convictions, in so far as they may be led to favour this or that side, the evil does not exist against the Conservative party to a greater extent than it does against the Liberal party. If our hon. friends opposite will but admit it, they know that they have as many friends politically in the civil service, not only at Ottawa but throughout the country, as have the Liberals. I am not confining my remarks to the inside civil service. I refer to the outside service as well. As to the Intercolonial, and I know the men of the Intercolonial as well as any man in Canada, there are more men in the service of that railway whose political prejudices are against the Liberal government than there are men politically in favour of it. Hon. friends opposite know it, and any one from

New Brunswick or who has knowledge of those employees will admit that to be the condition in that province and from end to end of the Intercolonial Railway.

My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) assumed a very high altitude and delivered an essay very well in its way but certainly not practical. The essay was pleasant to listen to as he read it, but, Sir, we are dealing with practical things. During my political experience I have often listened to those who have favoured legislation with a view to reforming human nature. My experience has been that this cannot be done by legislative enactment, and I believe that if you base all your hopes upon making human nature different from what it is, from what you find it, by an attempt at legislation, failure will be written in large letters wherever that attempt is made.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How is it that other countries are able to accomplish these things ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Other countries have not accomplished it. My hon. friend has referred to Great Britain and they have had civil service reform in Great Britain, but go to the departments of the public service there and see if you can find the evidence of it. Do the English civil servants who come to this country stand any higher in intellect, in capacity, in common sense, in initiative than our civil servants do ? I appeal to any one who has experience in this respect to say if he thinks the introduction of what is called civil service reform in Canada would bring the benefits which the hon. gentleman has dwelt on. I have some experience of the administration of affairs both federal and state in the United States and I can say that my experience is that the standard of the civil service in the United States is not as high as is the standard of the Canadian civil service. I say that the officials in the outside and inside service of Canada will more than favourably compare with similar officials in Great Britain or in the United States. It is true there has been a real attempt on the part of all governments to live up to our Civil Service Act, but it is also true that there has been failure and I will not agree that such failure has been a disaster to the country. The success of the civil service in my opinion lies more in the common sense that is exercised in the selection of individuals to fill positions than it does in the administration of the Civil Service Act. I see gentlemen sitting on the opposite benches who I believe could not pass the civil service examination, but am I to be told that because of that they are not fitted to be postmasters or officers of the excise, or officers of the customs, or to fill various positions in the public service ? Is it to be said that a man who has had experience in the public affairs of this country, a man who knows the working of our constitutional system and a man who has knowledge of our business life is not fitted to fill a position of trust and responsibility simply because he cannot answer certain questions in mathematics or give the dates of historical happenings ? I fear we are carrying this idea too far. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) told us that time and again during political contests, presidents of the United States have advocated civil service reform. That is a high sounding phrase and we have heard of it in this country as well as in the United States. I hold that men should be qualified for the offices to which they are appointed, but I also hold that the test of qualification is not to be found in an examination on set questions any more than is the capacity of a man who comes out of college to be measured by the examinations which he has successfully passed even if he be in the honour class. The school of experience best fits men for positions of trust and responsibility. When my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) spoke of the want of probity that has been found here and there among the thousands of civil servants, does he think that lack of probity would be removed by an educational test or a competitive examination ? Training and environment may be taken into consideration, but the answers a man may give to set questions on an examination paper will not alone qualify him from the standpoint of integrity and probity to fill a public position. Among the thousands of the employees of the government how few there are who fall in the way of temptation. Take the history of Canada since confederation, go into the postal service, the excise service, the customs service, go into every service of the government and see how few have fallen. The hon. gentleman spoke of the temptation that arises in connection with the distribution of patronage and incidentally he referred to the desire of men to get all they can from the government. That in a measure is true but after all it is human nature, and it is not alone in the political arena that such weakness is to be found. In the management of our charitable organizations, in the management of our church organizations if you like, human nature will be found to be equally weak. It is my opinion that the cant and hypocrisy that is indulged in in connection with this question is calculated to mislead the people of this country as to the practical working of our governmental system. As between the two great parties in Canada it would seem to me that honours are about easy in the sinning in connection with civil service appointments. During the eighteen years that hon. gentlemen opposite were in power I had an opportunity of observing their methods, and I can truly say they ignored all these principles which they now advocate for the civil service. My hon. friend from North Toronto has joined the army of latter day saints but he was a member of a government

whose methods were not above reproach. When the Conservatives came to power in 1878 they dismissed nearly 500 employees from the Intercolonial, and they replaced them next day with their own partisans. Even a Civil Service Act would not have prevented these gentlemen from pursuing that course.

Take the men who were high in office in the Intercolonial in 1878. There was Mr. Brydges, one of the most competent railway men who has ever been on this continent, and certainly one of the most efficient who has ever had a home in Canada. I will not say that he had to walk the plank; perhaps that is not a high sounding phrase; but his services were dispensed with. Mr. Luttrel, who came from Ontario and went to the maritime provinces, was a railway man of capacity and efficiency, and he too was told that his services were no longer required. One after another of those in the employ of the Intercolonial at that time were obliged to step down and out, and their places were filled by partisan friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they continued for eighteen years to hold those positions. And where to-day are the men whom hon. gentleman opposite appointed in 1878? They are holding high positions in the railway service of Canada. The manager who was there when this government came into power in 1896 is there to-day, and almost every head official, every one who could give effect to his political prejudices quietly is allowed to remain. Would it have been any better if these men had been under a Civil Service Act? Does my hon. friend from Lambton propose to work out a system of civil service reform by which every official and employee of the Intercolonial shall be called on to pass a certain educational examination? Are they to be put through their p's and q's? Is it to be determined whether they will properly dot their i's or cross their t's? There is an educational system on the Intercolonial. The men employed in the various branches of the service where technical skill is required have to pass examinations; the men who run the trains, the engineers, the firemen, the brakemen, the conductors, even the switchmen, are all required to submit to certain educational and other tests, physical as well as intellectual. My hon. friend, in the remarks which he chose to address to my humble self in reference to the period when I had the honour of presiding over the Department of Railways and Canals, said there were hundreds of partisans appointed to the Intercolonial Railway service without regard to fitness or qualification.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Oh, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend's remarks meant anything, they certainly meant that, because my hon. friend was making an argument in favour of the submission of a civil service that would require these men to pass a civil service examination. I then innocently, and I thought mildly, suggested to my hon. friend that he was speaking without any knowledge of the facts—that he was simply drawing on his imagination; and I want to tell him that if he will better acquaint himself with the conditions that have prevailed on that railway for a number of years past, he will find that qualifications are the first essential when men are appointed to positions on the Intercolonial Railway. In what way would civil service reform affect conditions on the Intercolonial? My hon. friend called attention to the examinations that have been held in the Public Accounts Committee, and there again he drew upon his imagination. Would the hon. gentleman have a civil service reform Act that would include the foreman of dredge scows, or the inspectors and foremen appointed from one end of the Dominion to the other? Many of these men are employed temporarily. Many, it is true, are permanent; but they are continued as permanent in the departments because of their efficiency. If any one will speak from a knowledge of what is transpiring daily in the departments in Ottawa, and will tell the truth and the whole truth, he will be forced to admit this. I can speak with some knowledge in respect of the Department of Railways and Canals, and I want to say that in the main and on the average the employees in that department will compare favourably with those of any department of government in Canada or the United States. And with regard to the men on the Intercolonial Railway—I am referring now to the great army of employees who are entrusted with the management of our trains—our telegraphers, our conductors, our brakesmen, our locomotive engineers, our firemen, even the men who are entrusted with the duty of looking after the track, the section foremen and the section men—they are men who will compare favourably with the same number and the same class of men connected with any railway on this continent; and it seems to me that when hon. gentlemen seek to condemn and criticise in a sweeping manner the employees of the government, no matter under what conditions they are serving the interests of this country, they are creating an impression that is false and should not go abroad. I referred a moment ago to the English civil service. I do not wish to condemn sweepingly the men who fill positions there; but I will say this, that from the opportunities for observation which have been mine, they do not stand higher, either in point of intellect, capacity or integrity, than men to be found among the same classes in Canada. I would illustrate it in this way. It is true that when we sent to South Africa the best of our brawn, we sent men who had not in many instances been trained in the colleges, who

had not even been trained in respect to military edication. But when Paardeberg, occurred, who were the men who distinguished themselves? Were they the trained men who had been disciplined under the rules of the British military service or were they Canadians who had originality of thought, who initiated ideas, who could exercise the eye and the brain and the hand? That was the class of men who made the British arms victorious at Paardeberg. You can carry that illustration into this question and compare the civil service of Canada with that of Great Britain in the same way. Many of our civil servants have not been trained in university halls, but they have been trained in a harder and better school. Many of them had to start out from the farm and work very hard, and what schooling they could secure they got at the night school. They worked all day in order to take advantage of that night school. To-day these men are the equals of any to be found in the civil service of the United States or Great Britain.

It seems to me that in uttering these sincere convictions, while I am not orthodox, while I am not indulging in the cant and hypocrisy apparently too prevalent throughout this and other lands—in uttering these sincere convictions I am but doing justice to the practical conditions which prevail in this country. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) read to us a lesson with respect to our duties as representatives of the people. Well, it occurs to me that our highest duty is to study the conditions in the country and provide for those conditions. I am not averse to a Civil Service Act, but if the key note of that Act is to be the passing of certain educational tests, which are simply a test of memory—if that is to be the standard, and that alone, then I shall not favour any such legislation, whether it comes from this or any other government. We should apply common sense to this question, and I think I can say this on behalf of those who have been charged with the responsibility of administering government departments from confederation down that—in so far as I have had personal knowledge of or acquaintance with the gentlemen who have held positions in successive governments—they applied in the main the proper and the best test when making appointments—and that is seeking a knowledge of the capacity and breadth and ability and integrity of the men who were looking for office. My hon. friend very much mistakes the routine of the lives of ministers if he thinks their time is taken up in selecting men for positions.

Some reference was made to the patronage committee. I rather like the term. I want to say in all frankness that I have in every section of the riding I have the honour to represent a patronage committee from whom I ask opinions, and when certain positions are to be filled, I write to these men—who are men of capacity and integrity and I know will not mislead me—and ask them about the capacity, qualifications and character of the applicants and their political proclivities as well. Because wherever responsibility is thrust on me, if I can get the necessary qualifications within the ranks of my own party I shall do it. And there is not an hon. member opposite who, if he is true to himself, will not say the same thing. They did it when they had office, and if this country should ever lie under the misfortune of being misgoverned by them, they will continue to do it. Let us be honest about these things. Let us not endeavour to deceive ourselves. We are certainly not deceiving the people. And in doing that, we are meeting the views of the great masses of the people throughout Canada. Why, it is an outgrowth of party government. The same thing occurs in Great Britain and the United States despite their Civil Service Acts, and in making these remarks I am not in any way reflecting upon these high and moral reflections of the Pecksniffian type or these flights into a higher atmosphere attempted by our hon. friends.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Higher criticism.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, this species of higher criticism indulged in by hon. gentlemen opposite, but never put into practice when they had the opportunity.

There is one thing I want to say before sitting down, and that is with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) regarding political influence in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I have said before, and I repeat, that there are influences not always political, but which move the great railway system of Canada and the United States. These influences are just as baneful—if political influence is baneful—as the small amount of political influence exercised or attempted to be exercised in connection with the government railway system of Canada. I have said that political influence, in so far as it is exercised, is most insignificant as compared with the community of influence which is exercised through the boards of trade, and the latter will be admitted as not political in its character. The Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Northern and the other great railway systems of Canada are moved by influences which you may not term political, but which are to be found in all the avenues of our business life, our social life and our church life. All these influences must be recognized. They are to be found in the church synods, in the conferences, in the associations, in the conventions. And they are an incident of human nature. No Civil Service Act will remove them from being exercised, nor will

it change the human nature which is necessarily a part of our system.

It seems to me that this amendment might very properly have been dealt with on another occasion, and might better have come up in another form. Certainly, no good can result from it, for, while it speaks of the principle, it does not show in concrete form how that principle is to be applied, the details worked out in practice, or the abuses which are complained of remedied. When the Bill of which the government has given notice is placed before us it will be well for us to discuss its details, for we can see whether it is far-reaching or limited. But, holding the convictions I do, and holding them sincerely as I do, I could not refrain from giving utterance to them. I want the country, if I am wrong, to know that I am wrong. I want the country to know just where I stand in this matter, and I am not ashamed of the position I take in reference to it.

Mr. GEO. W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert). Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt the country is intensely interested, I have no doubt it is waiting and watching with bated breath to know just the position the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) takes upon this important question. I am glad the hon. gentleman has at last taken the country into his confidence and told them what his position is. And I must congratulate him upon having proven to his own satisfaction, and, I think I may say, to that of the hon. gentleman beside him —judging from the applause with which his remarks were received—that education is a serious handicap to any gentleman who enters the civil service of this country. The hon. gentleman said in so many words that to be an honor graduate of a university absolutely and utterly unfitted a man for occupying a position in the civil service; that the less he knew the better he was qualified for the position.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will allow me, I made no such statement, nor did I use any language from which such an opinion could fairly or properly be inferred. I was pointing out that educational qualifications or the examination by which they were proven were not the sole test.

Mr. FOWLER. With the hon. gentleman's usual misfortune, he has been unable to make clear to the members of this House just what he did mean, for, taking his words as they were uttered, and reasoning logically from the statement no other conclusion could be reached than that education was a real handicap to a man——

Mr. PATERSON. No, no.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) does not agree with that. And yet that hon. gentleman pounded his desk when the hon. member for Westmoreland made that statement. I assumed that that statement struck a responsive chord in the heart and intellect of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. PATERSON. He did not say that.

Mr. FOWLER. That is exactly what the hon. gentleman did say, and 'Hansard' will prove it to-morrow. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman on that point. I will admit this—that a man may be a graduate of a university, and still be a fool, if you will. The bare fact that he has a diploma from the university does not confer common sense upon him, and without common sense no man can be successful in any walk of life. But, to say that education is not necessary and to say that we should do away with all educational tests, is, to my mind, to utter an absolute absurdity. Why, my hon. friend from Westmoreland would turn back the clock altogether. Why are we in this country spending tremendous sums of money to endow our educational institutions if education is a handicap and if in any walk of life the less education a man has the better he is fitted for almost any position he may fill? The hon. gentleman would have us conclude that the most successful members of our civil service, the gentlemen who render the best return to the country for the salaries given them, are men who have least education. He would do away with educational tests altogether. Why? Because, as he tells us, they are only a test of memory and therefore worthless. Would he have members of the civil service without memory? Is it not an advantage to a man in the service that he should have a good memory? The hon. gentleman does not understand, apparently, the accepted idea of the uses of education. He seems to think that education means simply a jumble of dates, mathematics and that sort of thing. He forgets that the idea of education is the training of the intellect, the development of the mind. And how are you to know whether a man has that training or not unless you subject him to examination? How is it in the case of men appointed to the care of technical matter on the Intercolonial, for instance? They must pass examination, they must show diplomas to prove that they are capable of filling the positions to which they seek appointment. If a man looks for appointment as a mechanical engineer, he must have a certificate that he has had the training of a mechanical engineer, or he will not be employed. I had almost ceased being surprised at any statement that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) might make, but I must confess that I was surprised when I heard him speak as he has spoken with reference to this matter.

Now, while the civil service of Canada is a very creditable service in the main, I do not agree with my hon. friend, for I think it can be improved. I think there is room for

improvement everywhere, in point of fact. My hon. friend would say that we stand still in Canada. He compares the civil service in Great Britain with the civil service in Canada, greatly to the disadvantage of the former. He speaks of some members of the British civil service who have come out here. I do not know to whom he can refer. I have never met any of these dunderheads that he speaks of as belonging to the British civil service. The civil service of Great Britain has given to that country some of the brightest minds the world has ever known. It gave a Milner to South Africa, a Cromer to Egypt and a Hart to China. Why, I could occupy the time from now until morning giving a list of the great men of the civil service of Great Britain, if it were necessary to do so ; but it is not. The hon. gentleman spoke of the Intercolonial. That is a favourite topic of his. And the terms in which he spoke of it, and of the people employed upon it, has given me a contrary opinion to that which I formerly held with regard to one subject. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) is going to be a candidate again. It has been rumoured that he would not be a candidate. I judge that he is making a bid for the vote down there. He states that a majority of the people engaged in the service of the road are of the Tory persuasion. Now, Sir, that is a statement on which I must take issue with the hon. gentleman, and any person who looks over the statistics in connection with the elections in the county of Westmoreland will know very well that that is not the case, and I want to say here now that if it were the case, the hon. gentleman would not be sitting in the seat he occupies to-night. The hon. gentleman is only elected by the votes of people employed in the shops at Moncton ; outside the city of Moncton the hon. gentleman does not and cannot get a majority.

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume that my hon. friend wants to be accurate, therefore I may tell him that my majority outside the city of Moncton at the last election was some 300 or 400. My majority was between 1,000 and 1,100, and I only had a majority of between 600 and 700 in the city of Moncton. Therefore I had some hundreds outside the city.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. But I say that at the last local election the majority outside the city of Moncton was very much the other way, and I think the hon. gentleman, when he faces his electors again, will find that to be the case. The Conservative majority outside the city of Moncton was a very large one, and had it not been for the vote of the railway shops, the four Conservative candidates would have been elected in that county. The hon. gentleman would have us think that all the old men who were appointed on the Intercolonial during the Conservative regime, in the city of Moncton, were continued, that no changes were made. He spoke of the changes that were made in 1878, and he cited two cases, I think Mr. Brydges and Mr. Luttrell. The hon. gentleman forgets that the chief engineer of the Intercolonial was dismissed after his party came into power.

Mr. EMMERSON. After investigation, and for cause.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, for cause, because he obeyed the order of his superior. Now the hon. gentleman also denies most strenuously that there were strained relations between himself and the then Minister of Railways, because he would not accede to his attempts to secure the dismissal of the present manager of the railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. That statement is very far from the facts, nothing ever transpired in that direction at all. My relations with Mr. Blair were in no way affected by reason of that.

Mr. FOWLER. I can only say that it was very current at the time and that the statement came from his close friends and relatives, just as close blood relatives as you can get. I suppose the hon. gentleman will also deny that there were strained relations between himself and Mr. Blair.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, our relations were almost of the most friendly character. Mr. Blair and I—if this is pertinent and relative to this discussion—were always the closest personal friends. He thought differently on some political matters, but not in connection with the officials of the Intercolonial.

Mr. FOWLER. So far as that is concerned, we must accept the statement of the hon. gentleman, no matter how much we know to the contrary. Now, Sir, this is not the first time that matter was referred to. Mr. Blair was at that time alive, and was in this House, and I myself had the honour to refer to it, and the hon member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) did not then deny, because Mr. Blair was here, I suppose that was the reason that Mr. Emmerson would not deny it.

Mr. EMMERSON. If he were here and heard my hon. friend's statement he would deny it, because it is not in accord with the truth.

Mr. FOWLER. My hon. friend was here, and the scene that took place between the two gentlemen, the scene of reconciliation, was most pathetic, when the hon. gentleman as I stated then, fell upon the neck of Mr. Blair and admitted that he had sinned —that is, that Mr. Blair had sinned—and Mr. Blair admitted that he had sinned and

was willing to be forgiven. That is within the memory of hon. gentlemen in this House; and then my hon. friend did not get up and deny it, as he has denied it tonight.

Now, Sir, so far as civil service reform is concerned, I think this resolution is certainly along the line of improvement. It does not seem to me that it is the correct thing for us to stand in the way of this improvement. What argument has been put forward against this resolution? The sole argument of the Finance Minister to-day was, you were in power for 18 years, you had a civil service reform report made in 1892, and nothing was done under it. That is the sole argument. Is there to be no advance in this country? Is there to be no improvement. Twelve years have elapsed since our hon. friend's opposite came into power, they have had the advantage of that 1892 report, because it was not a report to the Conservative party but to the government of Canada; they are now the government of Canada, and that report has been before them. Therefore if the Conservative government, if the Conservative party, who were in power in 1892 were remiss in their duty in not acting upon that report up to 1896, four years, how much more reprehensible has been the conduct of this government who have been in power 12 years, three times as long, and have still delayed acting upon it. Therefore they are threefold as guilty as the old government. I listened to the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto, I think his speech was absolutely non-partisan in its tone, and high in its character. How was it met by hon. gentlemen who spoke from the other side? With sneers, that is all. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) spoke of the high character which the civil service should maintain, spoke along the lines of obtaining for the civil service the highest possible character in the men who are appointed, and in the promotion that would be thrown around those men, yet my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has answered that with a sneer. He drags in the church, as the hon. gentleman always does when he speaks. Surely that is not very high statesmanship on the part of our friends opposite. Surely if they are going to persist in their present line, if they are going to retain the civil service as it is at present, and the civil service system as it is at present, surely they have some better defence for it than sneering against the propositions of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I would think that we have a right to expect from the government that is in charge of the affairs of this country a very different line of argument.

Now what do we desire to do? What does the hon. member for North Toronto, by his resolution, desire to do? He desires to remove as far as possible the civil service of Canada from the influence of politics so that merit should be the only thing to be recognized. What to-day is the only thing recognized? Is it merit? No, it is political pull. That is the way promotions are made, not by merit but by political pull. So much the better for the country if it sometimes happens, as I have no doubt it does happen, that political pull and merit happen to be united in the same person. But there is many a man in the civil service to-day, meritorious, thoroughly equipped, able in every way, yet he gets no advancement by reason of the fact that he is suspected of being sympathetic towards the party that is now, and will be for a week or two yet, in opposition in this country—only for a brief time, however, I may say, for the benefit of my hon. friends opposite. Now what we propose is to remove that political influence with respect to promotions in the civil service of this country; what we propose is to throw a protection around the civil servants of this country so that they may no longer, if they wish to speak on political subjects to a friend, whisper it where no one can hear; so that they may be able to vote as their conscience dictates without having to watch to see if anybody is trying to find out how they vote, if that vote happens to be cast against the party in power. Because I hold that the civil servant in this country has just as much right to exercise his franchise as has the member of this House, he has an absolute right to vote either for or against the party in power. I do not believe that he should go upon the public platform and advocate the principles of either party; if he does that, if he goes that far, he must fall with his party and should resign when his party goes out of power.

Mr. R. SMITH. Does not the right to vote carry with it the right to use legitimate influence for a principle ?

Mr. FOWLER. Logically that may be correct, but it would open the door to a great many difficulties that must be avoided by simply allowing the civil servant the right to vote and to express his opinions, not on the public platform and not taking an active part as a canvasser. There seems to be a distinction there, even although my hon. friend does not seem able to perceive it.

Mr. R. SMITH. I am following this debate. I have heard that statement by different speakers, but I have not heard a good reason why it should not be done. If this government employ men and forbid them to use legitimate influence in favour of principles that they consider good for this country, would it not be just as reasonable for employers of labour to forbid men who happen to work for them to ex-

press opinions because those happened to be against their own ?

Mr. FOWLER. No employer of labour would permit his employee to go out and become an active canvasser on behalf of the rival institution over the way.

Mr. R. SMITH. In England it is a common thing to find men on the public platform with their employer advocating opposite political principles.

Mr. FOWLER. There is no objection to their advocating different political principles, but I say if the employee of one manufacturing concern was advocating the advantages of the opposition manufacturing concern over the way, he would not hold his employment very long and that seems to me to be a fair illustration of the position in so far as the civil service is concerned. I have nothing further to add, I have simply to say that I believe the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is along the right lines and is a resolution which every man should feel himself able to support. I think the government should adopt it. It is not necessarily a vote of want of confidence. The government can consider it not a vote of want of confidence and the whole House can vote for it. Let us try to improve the conditions of the civil service if we can, let us improve the conditions of the civil servants in every way in which it is necessary to make improvements. If we are not paying enough let us pay more ; let us be sure, however, before we increase the salaries of the civil servants, that the salaries are not large enough now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). As no hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House seems disposed to continue the debate, I would like to say a very few words before it closes. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) treated the House to a very frank declaration of the stand which he takes on this subject, but let me say that if he did touch and I do not think he very closely touched the real question, everything that he said and fifty times more, was answered in Great Britain more than half a century ago by men like Mr. Gladstone and Lord Macaulay, whose utterances on this subject would most completely dispose of every possible argument that has been advanced to-night by the hon. member for Westmoreland and would dispose also of a great many more formidable arguments which he did not advance.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has dealt in the first place with the time at which my hon. friend for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has brought this subject forward. He did not allude to the fact that this motion was placed on the order paper on the very first day of this session, that its consideration was postponed from time to time for the purpose of having before the House the report of the Civil Service Commission, and finally when that report did not come down until the government had taken practically every day for their own business the hon. member for North Toronto dropped his motion from the order paper with a distinct statement that he would renew it after the report of that Commission was available to members of this House. Therefore, so far as the question of time is concerned, there is nothing with which to reproach the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

The Minister of Finance also relied upon the claim that this was a motion of want of confidence in the government, being a motion in amendment of that proposed by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the House should resolve itself into Committee of Supply. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) did not put this forward as a motion of want of confidence in the government ; he deliberately abstained from introducing matters of a controversial nature except in reply to some observations made during his speech by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and even then he touched the matter with a very light hand and his speech, on the whole, might he said to be of an absolutely uncontroversial nature. Over and over again this government, since it came into power in 1896, has accepted amendments proposed in a very much more controversial spirit and they have passed, in some cases by a majority and in most cases by the unanimous consent of this House. In 1899 Sir Charles Tupper proposed a resolution as an amendment to the motion for Committee of Supply, touching the responsibility of political heads of departments. The government accepted the motion and it passed the House unanimously. In 1900, Mr. Russell, then member for the City and County of Halifax, proposed a resolution with regard to preferential trade with Great Britain. The motion was accepted by the government and passed by a majority. In 1901, Mr. T. O. Davis, then a member of this House, proposed a motion with regard to the test case touching the taxation of Canadian Pacific lands in the west. The government accepted the motion and it passed unanimously. In 1902, Mr. Bourassa proposed an amendment with regard to the embargo imposed by Great Britain on Canadian cattle. It was accepted by the government and passed this House unanimously. In 1903, Mr. Costigan, then a member of this House, proposed an amendment with regard to the question of Home Rule for Ireland. The government accepted the amendment and it passed by a majority. In 1905, Mr. Armstrong, the member for

East Lambton, proposed a resolution in amendment for an efficient system of cold storage. The government accepted the amendment and it passed unanimously. In 1905 the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) proposed a resolution with respect to the interference of civil servants in Dominion and provincial elections. The government accepted the amendment and it passed unanimously. All these were amendments to the motion for Committee of Supply. During this very session, I myself proposed a resolution in this House in amendment to supply touching the rights of parliament to original documents in possession of departments of the government. I did not take the course which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has taken to-day ; I proposed that resolution in a very controversial spirit indeed and challenged the government to vote it down if they dared. They accepted the motion and it passed this House unanimously. It is idle then for the government to pretend that they must reject this motion to-day on the ground that it is an amendment to the motion for Committee of Supply.

The Minister of Finance dwelt very lightly on the subject of civil service reform and he and the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) justified appointments to the civil service of Canada by means of patronage committees in the different constituencies. They qualified the real object of patronage committees by suggesting that it is to afford to the government or to the head of a particular department information as to who may be the best man available. But every one who knows the real object of the patronage committee knows that such is not the purpose for which it is formed, nor the motive which actuates its work. Nine times out of ten what influences the patronage committees is not whether a particular man is the best man for the public service, but whether the amount of party service he has performed entitles him to the position. The question debated above all others in the patronage committee is whether or not a particular appointment will do the party the most good in the particular district from which the man is appointed. My hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) spoke a great deal about hyprocrisy in religion and politics and I shall not follow him in that, but I do say that if he has the slightest knowledge of these patronage committees, he will understand that I have correctly described their purpose and motive. Is it advisable in Canada to continue the system of making appointments to the public service through the instrumentality of the political organizations of one party or the other ? If it is a good system, as the Minister of Finance and the member for Westmoreland seem to think, then why not allow the patronage committees to recommend promotions in the service, why not refer the question of promotion to the patronage committee of the particular district from which the appointee in the first instance came. If you analyze the suggestion in that way you will see how utterly absurd and misleading it is to say that any such system can be in the interest of this country or any other country possessing self-governing institutions.

My hon. friend from North Toronto has made a very able and exhaustive speech in support of his motion and so I shall not deal with the question at any great length. Let me quote the words of a well known writer in the United States which expressed very distinctly and very forcibly the maxim that public office is a public trust. I take this citation from a pamphlet written by Wm. Dudley Foulke, a member of the National Civil Service Reform League of the United States:

> Public office being a trust, the man or party who administers it has no more right to bestow it for personal gratification or political advantage than a judge would have to take away the property of a litigant on personal or party grounds. If it is asked then, why we want appointments controlled by rules and examinations, why we are not willing to trust the discretion of the executive or that of the legislators by whom the executive functions are now so largely assisted, we answer: For the same reason that we insist that the judge who passes on our lives, liberty or property, shall be governed by fixed rules of law.

My hon. friend from Westmoreland was very strong in his contention that we should apply common sense; let me quote from the present Attorney General of the United States, who has made a careful study of this subject :

> I want to tell you then, in a very few words, what civil service reform is. It is nothing in the world, ladies and gentlemen, but the application of sound sense and sound morals to the choice and retention of your public servants. You place in the hands of a president, or a mayor, or a governor great powers of patronage. He holds those powers, he is entitled to fill the offices in his gift, solely in the public interest. He received those offices, or the right to fill them, from the people; he did not create them. The salaries of those officers are paid by the people's money; they are not paid out of his pocket. The duties of those officers are fixed by the people's laws; he has no more power than any other citizen to fix their duties, although he himself is bound, by the same laws, to see that those duties are properly performed. In short, the offices in his gift belong to the people, and he holds them as the people's steward and trustee.

And as to the history and objects of civil service reform perhaps I cannot do better than to quote the Hon. Carl Shurz, a man of international reputation :

> The reform of the civil service as we advocate it, aims at two objects: to secure to the people an honest and efficient public service, and to eliminate as much as possible the demoralizing element of patronage and political and personal favouritism from out political

life. The first is accomplished by subjecting candidates for public employment to examinations and probations testing their fitness for such employment; and the second by making such examinations competitive, so as to give the fittest man the best chance for appointment and to exclude appointment by favouritism, personal or political, and thus the use of the office concerned as party spoil. This is not a matter of abstract theory, but of simply practical common sense.

I do not know that I can add much to the arguments in favour of civil service reform which are contained in these three citations. Let me ask what will be accomplished by civil service reform ? In the first place we will accomplish better service to the state. No one pretends, as my hon. friend from Westmoreland, seemed to think we pretend that appointment by competitive examination will in every case bring the best man into the proper place. I do not believe competitive examination will accomplish that, but I do believe that by that system you will get an infinitely better class of officials than you will get by the exercise of mere party patronage and mere political pull. In the next place you will bring about a more assured status for the civil servant, and it is important that the civil servant should have an assured status. The man who understands that the exercise of political influence can put over his head in the government service another man who upon a fair test of merit would never get the position, will surely not feel himself inspired with the same interest in the public service as if he knew that faithful and intelligent work done by him would in time bring about its fitting reward. In the next place it will remove the power and therefore the temptation to appoint to public office for personal or party ends. I do not know any distinction between bribing a man by money and bribing a man by the promise of public office, and when you have a system under which any man engaging in political work feels himself assured at some time in the future of obtaining a public office because of the mere fact that he has done that political work, you do not get very far away from bribery. In the third place, the reform which my hon. friend from North Toronto is advocating will strike down that political corruption which does more or less arise from the use of party patronage.

The present system causes many and various abuses to flourish. In the first place, the heads of departments do not appoint their subordinates. In some cases at least subordinates in the different departments are appointed when they are not required. The head of the department would not select the man whom he is bound to receive if he were left to exercise his own good judgment. Inefficient appointments are made. There are useless men in the departments in Ottawa to-day ; every minister of the Crown knows that. I do not mean to say that the men now on the treasury benches are responsible for all of them. I am not making this statement with any idea of casting discredit on the government. The same system as has flourished under this government, perhaps in the more intense degree, has also flourished under the previous administration. Under both, I believe, not only have inefficient appointments been made but places have been created in order that political supporters of one party or the other might be satisfied in their demands. The political influence of appointees is exercised. That more or less destroys discipline. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson)—who has left the chamber, I regret to say—spoke of the Intercolonial railway and the marvellous condition of affairs under his administration. I have been told, on authority which I respect as highly as I do that of the hon. member for Westmoreland, that there are men on the Intercolonial to-day who cannot and dare not keep their subordinates under them in a proper system of discipline simply because they know the effect which the political influence of these subordinates, appointed by political pull, can exercise upon them. Does that tend to good service or good discipline ? Political support is bartered for promise of office, and the time of ministers and members is needlessly and absurdly taken up with patronage. My hon. friend from Westmoreland was rather inclined to deny that. I have discussed this subject with hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are sincerely desirous of seeing reform in this connection brought about. I have not discussed it with ministers, and do not know what their experience may be ; but members of parliament on the other side of the House have told me, in some cases that half their time, in other cases that three-fourths of their time, was taken up in dealing with matters of appointment to public office, and in that way they were prevented from giving that attention to public affairs that they would like to give and that they would be able to give if this system were abolished and a system of competitive examinations were substituted for it. In the United States, according to the pamphlets to which I have just referred, the abuse previous to the inauguration of their present system, existed to an enormous extent. One of the writers whom I have quoted describes a visit which he made to one of the departments at Washington, where he found a regular book like a ledger kept in which every member of Congress and every senator was charged not only with every appointment which had been made upon his recommendation, but with the salary and position described, so that it might be known exactly by a

glance at this book from time to time, to what extent his power of recommendation to office had been exercised. It reached a ridiculous extent in the United States, such an extent as influenced public opinion, and brought about the establishment of the National Civil Service Reform League, and created such a public agitation that civil service reform has made enormous progress in that country. While they may not yet have attained the standard that has been attained in Great Britain, no one can deny, notwithstanding the vain remarks of my hon. friend from Westmoreland, that their system is many years in advance of that which we have in Canada. It is idle to pretend that the civil service of Canada, under a system of party patronage, is equal or can be equal to that of Great Britain. The civil service system of Great Britain is the admiration of the world, and when any hon. gentleman arises in this House and declares that our system is equal to or at all approaching it, he merely shows that he has made no study whatever of the subject, and does not in the least know that which he professes to discuss. I do not deny that we have splendid civil servants in Canada ; but their value is great, not by reason of our system, but in spite of it. It may sometimes happen, it does very often happen, that an appointment made for political reasons is a very good appointment, and the man so appointed may render excellent service to the state. But we must not on that account shut our eyes to the abuses that have arisen, and to the general demoralization in the public life of the country when the reward of office is regarded as a fair exercise of the party power. If a party continues in power, as it very often does, for eight or ten or twelve years, even for eighteen years, as in the case of one administration, the result is that the appointments, made almost altogether from one political party, leave a large minority in the country absolutely unrepresented in the public service. In other words, you exclude from the civil service of the country the ability, the capacity, the good character, of nearly one-half the population, who, by reason of this system of party patronage, are not considered as eligible for appointment to the public service. Is it not time that we in Canada should do away with that system ? Suppose any great banking institution in Canada, any great railway corporation, any great commercial corporation, made appointments to their service from political considerations or the equivalent of political considerations, do you imagine that it would have the splendid service which many of these great organizations possess ? And is there any reason why the government of this country, which ought to be the greatest and most efficient organization in Canada, should not have the very best and most efficient service that is to be found in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific ? Surely there is no reason why it should not be so. The public service presents certain attractions, and men are ready to enter it. If it were put on a reasonable, business, common sense basis, I cannot bring myself to think that it would not attain the same standard as has been attained in Great Britain, and that we should not have vastly improved results to the people of the country as a whole. I am glad to know, if I am properly advised, that the province of British Columbia in the present year is leading the way in establishing a system of open competitive examinations by a non-partisan board, and that in connection with the system which they are so establishing, they are making efficient provision for the old age of public servants of that province by proper superannuation allowances. We have this example. We have the example of all our business institutions throughout the country so far as superannuation is concerned. I agree with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Hon. Mr. Foster) that the two should go hand in hand. We want in Canada a system of appointment by competitive examinations, to be under the control of a board which shall give to that subject the whole of its time and energies, and endeavour to bring about in Canada the same conditions which have prevailed so many years in the mother country. That alone will not be sufficient. We have to put our civil service on a proper basis of remuneration and in the possession of the assurance that when old age comes, after reasonable service to their country, they shall not be turned out with the fear of poverty and distress before their eyes, and that they and those dependent upon them shall be provided for by that same country which they have served for years.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has proposed this resolution in no controversial spirit. He has proposed it as a motion which he thinks might reasonably be accepted by the government and which ought to be embodied in the measure they propose to submit to the House before many days. I sincerely trust the government will reconsider the attitude of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and thus take a great step forward in the progress towards civil service reform. We can all unite in the declaration of this principle—a principle which is not a new one, which is not an experimental one, which has been tried and tried successfully, in the mother country for half a century at least and which, during the past ten or fifteen years, has met with the same success in the great republic to the south.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Under ordinary circum-

stances, I would have no fault to find whatever with the motion moved by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I may say to him at once that, in the principle laid down, I am disposed to very largely agree, if not absolutely. But in my humble judgment, the time is singularly ill chosen to present such a motion. My hon. friend had many opportunities in the earlier part of the session to move this resolution. You, Mr. Speaker, had hardly taken your seat, when the hon. gentleman put on the notice paper the motion now in your hand. It was called again and again, he had every opportunity to move it, he did not do so for reasons better known to himself, he withdrew it at last in order to bring it on now as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply. But I would call attention to the fact that this very day, were it not for an unfortunate event which we all deplore, my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) would in all probability have introduced a measure of civil service reform. It is not for me to say at the moment what will be the character of that measure; but when such a Bill was on the order paper, and when the cause why it was not brought before the House is known to my hon. friend, I would have expected that he would have waited until the Minister of Agriculture introduced his Bill. Then if the Bill were not to his taste, he could move his present motion by way of amendment or move it as an amendment on going into Supply. This is the only reason why we cannot accept the motion of my hon. friend. I am not discussing the merits of the Bill. If the rules of the House had permitted an amendment, I would have moved one which would have explained our position, but since we cannot explain our position by a motion, it is open for us to explain it by giving our reasons against the motion. We do not want to enter into a controversy on the merit of my hon. friend's motion. We shall have every opportunity to do this when the government Bill comes up, as it certainly will in a few days, if not to-morrow.

This would be a sufficient answer at present, but in courtesy to my hon. friend perhaps I may notice some of the arguments he has offered to the House. Let me say, first of all, that I do not want in this matter that we should appear better than our fellows. We have, in the twelve years we have been in office, accepted the system, which has been in existence since confederation, of making appointments on party lines. In this we followed the example set by all our predecessors. In the eighteen years the party opposite held office, appointments to the service were made on party lines also. It is said by my hon. friend that this system is not the best. I agree altogether with him, but even if the service has been recruited on party lines, I think it only fair to say that the present service is a very efficient body of men. For eighteen years it was recruited from the ranks of the Conservative party, yet on the whole I am satisfied that the great majority of the members, whether appointed through Conservative or Liberal influence, have ceased to be partisans, and while retaining their own convictions, they are, in the discharge of their duties, nothing but public servants. That recalls to me a conversation I had, shortly after taking office, with an eminent member of the service. He said to me: Of course I would not deny my convictions to you. I was appointed by the late government, but is it unnatural that I should act towards the government as honestly as I can ? Lawyers are all party men, but when a lawyer gives his services to a client, he does not know the politics of his client. In the same manner a public servant does not know the politics of the government which employs him. But allowing this to be the case, I am not blind to the inconvenience and the condition of the service as it is to-day. There is a great deal in favour of a system of having appointments made simply on merits and not from other considerations. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has given the history of the service in other countries. He has stated truly that whilst in the beginning the civil service was recruited by every government from the ranks of the party in power, abuses crept in which induced first one government and then another to adopt the system advocated by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The British government led the way, the American government accepted the same principle, but I would observe to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto that it is a task of some difficulty to establish that system in a country like the United States. The first law adopted by congress goes back twenty-five years, if not more and then, after twenty-five years, it is not as much in force as it is in Great Britain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That indicates we should lose no time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It indicates that we should lose no time. I quite agree with that. But we are ready. We have a notice of a Bill on the Order Paper, certainly we cannot go faster than that. And if we are to lose no time, my hon. friend should have told the hon. member (Mr. Foster), who sits next to him, because he has taken a good deal of time. He had his motion prepared six months ago, but it is only to-day that he has presented it to the House. We shall have, I hope, more diligence. But there is one thing we should do for the civil service. My hon. friend from North Toronto has spoken lengthily and well upon the great benefit the civil service has rendered to the public. He has stated—in words not too strong for me

—the great advantage that a country like Canada derives from a good civil service. But perhaps he will agree that there is one duty that we owe to the civil service, a primary duty above all others that we should never forget. And it is very pressing—we should pay them promptly the money that is due for their diligent service.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I am a little disappointed that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not see fit to deal with this question at an earlier period in the debate. However, he is an old parliamentarian and he perhaps knows best the time to take the matter up. We have had complaint and excuse by both the First Minister and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the time is inopportune for dealing with this question. I have listened carefully to their arguments, but I have not been convinced; I have not been able to see that the time is inopportune. It would seem to me, with all deference to their opinion, that no more opportune time could possibly have been selected than now when we are about to discuss a Bill and before that Bill has been actually introduced. We know how difficult it is for the government to preserve its face after it has actually introduced a Bill, how difficult it is for them to come down from a position they have taken on the formal introduction of a Bill, and, therefore, how desirable it is that before they commit themselves to any scheme we should have a full discussion of the subject in parliament. Especially is this true with regard to this matter.

Now, the Prime Minister complains of the delay of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). He says that, almost before the Speaker has taken the Chair at the opening of the session, the hon. gentleman had given notice of a motion along these lines. So he did. Does the Prime Minister complain that he has had too timely a notice of this discussion? Let me say that, whilst I appreciate as a member of the House the fact that we have had ample notice so that we could take this matter into our careful consideration, I want to call attention also to the fact that he is hardly fair when, in dealing with the matter, he omits to mention that the hon. member for North Toronto was prevented from early and timely discussion of this question by the fact that the Civil Service Commission's report had not been brought down. And when the report was brought down the opportunity had gone by for dealing with this as a formal notice of motion. What does it propose ?

That the civil service system of Canada should be based on merit and character alone——

Does the Prime Minister object to that? Does he think the civil service system of Canada should not be based on merit or character, but should be, as it has been in the past, a subject of patronage, a subject regulated and controlled by politics as in the past, as admitted by every honest member of the House? This existed to some degree under former administrations, but it exists to a most dangerous and humiliating degree under the present administration. The discussion of this question, so far, has been very moderate—too moderate, I think, taking the attitude of hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side into consideration. I think it is no harm, probably to remind the Prime Minister that the country has become aroused to the position, particularly since the report of the Civil Service Commission which is studded with statements of the evils of the patronage system, and is aroused to the determination that the element of patronage and political interference shall be eliminated from the public service. The resolution goes on :

—and the appointments thereto should be made only from candidates whose competency has been established through open competitive examinations conducted under a non-partisan civil service commission.

Do hon. members object to that? Would they say that candidates should not be appointed by reason of competency? Do they claim that it is improper that competency be established by open competitive examination conducted under a non-partisan Civil Service Commission? Now, it seems to me that the only controversial point in this is the Civil Service Commission. There is not an hon. member on the other side who will join with the government in voting down this resolution who would dare to go to his constituents and say that he is opposed to any principle enunciated in that resolution unless it be by possibility the provision for a Civil Service Commission. That may or may not be a desirable solution of the question. But we have the example of other countries, notably Great Britain and the United States, in support of the principle of a Civil Service Commission of a non-partisan character conducting these examinations. While the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance oppose this amendment they show no reason except—and I say it advisedly because the right hon. Prime Minister has used this language—the quibbling reason, that the motion is brought at an inopportune time and even that reason is opposed by every fact connected with this matter. I say that hon. members who support the government are called upon to vote down this resolution upon reasons which will not commend themselves to the public. Let me examine some of the statements made in this connection by the Minister of Finance. And, I must say, in passing, that I never saw that hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) more

embarrassed, more agitated, I might almost say more confounded, than he was this afternoon. And what is the reason? The right hon. gentleman who leads the House could give the answer, perhaps, if he saw fit. But the fact remains that the minister spoke for fifteen minutes without giving one substantial reason why this amendment should not be concurred in. The leader of the opposition has put it beyond question that the government is not bound to take the attitude that they have to vote against this amendment as a motion of want of confidence. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has shown that not only in cases where a motion was brought forward that was not controversial in a party sense, but even where it was put forward in a controversial sense, and the government were challenged to vote it down, as in the case of the production of documents, they accepted the motion. What is their position to-night ? They ask their followers from one end of Canada to the other to vote down this proposition, and if they do so, perhaps nine-tenths of their followers will find it very embarrassing to them when they come to seek election within probably a very short period.

Now the Minister of Finance said that almost every one of the evils referred to by the hon. member for North Toronto existed under previous governments, and were mentioned by the previous commission. It may be so, but I have never found it in the report of the commission of 1892. It is noticeable that the hon. gentlemen who say so do not venture to give quotations from that report. But did not these hon. gentlemen say they were going to do better than the Conservatives ? Have they fulfilled their promises yet? The people do not think so. It was their duty to take up the report of that commission when they came into office and deal with it, but although eleven years have passed since then, they have done nothing towards reforming the abuses pointed out in the civil service system. Now the Minister of Finance says that the hon. member for North Toronto complained of the increases that were made from time to time as having been made on a political basis. I did not so understand my hon. friend from North Toronto. I rather think that the Minister of Finance felt guilty in that regard, and that he imagined something had been said that was not said. If the hon. member for North Toronto did not say it he could have said it. Any one who has watched the discussions in this House, as I have for eight years, knows perfectly well that when we have asked in reference to these increases the conclusion was irresistible, from the specious explanations given, that many of these increases had been made for political reasons alone, and a good many were denied their statutory increases where there could be no substantial reason given. The Minister of Finance attempted to answer the complaint of the Royal Commission regarding the virtual amendment of the Civil Service Act by the introduction of the words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' That has been an abuse during all the time I have been in the House, and it is growing yet. It is almost always inexcusable. An extraordinary attitude was taken by the Minister of Finance, I might almost say a damnable attitude, when he said that the evil of political influence was magnified. Mr. Speaker, it is scarcely possible to magnify the evil of this pernicious system of political influence, and political patronage. You cannot confine it, as the Minister of Finance suggested, to mere patronage committee alone, it is the patronage of the politician from one end of the country to the other, in regard both to the inside and the outside service, and the employees of the government who are not in the civil service. as well. Take up the report of the commissioners. Almost on every page of their report they speak about the influence of politics. On page 23 they say :

> Owing to the good times which have recently been prevalent and the large revenues received from customs, the old-fashioned notions of frugality and living within one's means have to some extent been departed from, and instances have been found of departments giving orders for stores and other services to be delivered within a year in excess of the vote granted by parliament. Large amounts have been spent at several places in the Dominion for supplies bought from those enjoying political patronage at what may be called retail rates.

I said a moment ago that it is not patronage committees only that we complain of but it is patronage lists that exist wherever stores or supplies of any kind are bought. Almost every official that was examined before the Royal Commission spoke of these lists as a matter of course, that of course everything was bought with a view to politics, that no service was performed, no person was employed, no goods were purchased, as a rule, except in view of some political advantage to the party.

> As a rule your commissioners found in the outside service that politics enter into every appointment, and politicians on the spot interest themselves not only in the appointments but in subsequent promotions of officers.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition said, to follow out the argument of the hon. the Minister of Finance, that not only would you dictate the appointment but you would regulate the promotion afterwards. The commissioners have found that not only is the appointment controlled by the politician in the first instance, but the promotion, the status the man shall occupy from time to time, his progress, is guided by the hand of the politician.

In the outside service those who have the 'political pull' use it for all it is worth; they pass by their superior officers and bring pressure to procure anything that may prove to their advantage.

Again—and this is in the Customs Department, I am sorry the Minister of Customs is not here:

The chief positions in the outside service of this department are political appointments. Every collector of customs has been appointed from the ranks of the party in power at the moment.

Again in the Inland Revenue Department:

Of course in the Inland Revenue Department political appointments to the public service prevail, and as a rule the officers in one district are confined to that one district.

A great deal has been said about that district business, particularly on the Intercolonial Railway and services of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is my hon. friend reading from the report about the Intercolonial Railway or is that just put in by my hon. friend himself?

Mr. LENNOX. That is a remark of my own, but in order to be altogether within the book I shall give some references to the Intercolonial Railway. I read now from the evidence of Mr. Butler on page 1185. He is asked:

Q. Most of the copyists are women?—A. Yes.
Q. Did politics have anything to do with their entering the service, do you know?—A. I imagine that influence was exerted in their favour; I imagine that political influence insured their appointment.
Q. But except in the case of one man you had nothing to do with it?—A. No.
Q. Nine-tenths of the copyists are women?—A. Yes.
Q. And the greater part of the extra clerks are women—A. Yes.
Q. Is that because they are content to enter the service at a lower rate than $500?—A. I think that is the case. Of course, there is a great deal of pressure to get women into the service.
Q. From whom?—A. From political friends.

Again:

Q. There is a Treasury Board minute of 1879 about the use of political influence by government employees. Did you ever hear of it?

And the deputy minister, Mr. Butler, one of the most efficient officers we have in the service in Canada answers:

No.

Mr. GRAHAM. In 1879?

Mr. LENNOX. It was passed in 1879 but it is in force. The minister apparently thinks that it should not be enforced because it was passed in 1879, just as although time was spent by a royal commission in 1892 and valuable information collected, and it was shown that some evils were capable of being remedied, he still thinks after eleven years in office that they ought not do anything but fold their hands. The chairman says:

I think you had better get a copy of the minute. It lays down the principle that no officer should use political influence. By the mere use of political influence, pro tanto, he renders himself subject to dismissal.

And the deputy answered:

I was inclined to issue such a circular to the men in the outside service.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is concerning promotion, it is for increase of salary, not appointment.

Mr. LENNOX. He was pointing out the fact, as I understand it, that not only was political influence used to get these men into positions, but when they are in positions they use influence to get promotion and defy the head of the department to some extent. For that reason Sir John Macdonald had that minute passed so that every civil servant should know that if he dared to use political influence he was for that reason liable to dismissal forthwith. I hope the minister will take it into his consideration very seriously, because the department referred to is one of the most vulnerable except perhaps the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Political influence is used on that railway in another way.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will note that he did not answer my question. He has not read an item or an extract concerning the Intercolonial Railway or its employees as yet.

Mr. LENNOX. Why not?

Mr. GRAHAM. Because it is a fact.

Mr. LENNOX. I am dealing with the evidence of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not concerning the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. LENNOX. We will come to the Intercolonial Railway all right. This will refer to the Intercolonial Railway.

We have heard a discussion as to whether the road was used for political purposes, whether the rates were controlled by political considerations. There has always been a continual wrangle about the rates on the Intercolonial Railway?—A. People down there may not appreciate the fact that they are getting the lowest freight rates on any railway in the world.

Mr. GRAHAM. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. Why? For political purposes and for political purposes alone, there is no getting over that fact.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was not political influence, that originated at the time of confederation, for the purpose of giving to the Canadian manufacturers access to the maritime markets.

Mr. LENNOX. We have not finished with this question, but I understood the matter in a different way. I understood we constructed the railway for the purposes of giving communication from the maritime provinces to these provinces and back again, but I did not understand that we ever advertised that we were going to give them anything more than a fair, square deal having reference to the rights of all the people of Canada.

Mr. EMMERSON. The only communication between Ontario and the maritime provinces previous to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, was by way of American seaports and American transportation lines, and in order to divert the traffic through Canadian territory the Intercolonial Railway was constructed and for the same purpose the rates were made inviting.

Mr. LENNOX. I have heard that discussed in this House repeatedly and have heard hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces as familiar with this matter as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and with just the same facility in expressing themselves as he has, and they have said that there was no discrimination in rates, that they got nothing better than the ordinary rates prevailing on other railways, and no advantage more than they would get from any company railway. We have on the other hand the evidence of the deputy minister that the people in the maritime provinces are getting such rates as no other people get in any portion of the world. That is according to the evidence of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Butler.

I wish to give another quotation in that connection.

Q. I mean to say it should be run for the least possible money and made an efficient machine all round?—A. We have got the most efficient railway in Canada, the best roadbed and the best passenger service you can find in Canada to-day, and we are doing the work for practically 50 per cent less than it costs the other railways, that is to say we are taking out of the customers of the railway not much more than one-half what the other railways are taking.

Q. What do you mean by that?—A. We are not charging the customers of the railway much more than one-half what the other railways are. Our freight rates are much lower, our passenger rates are much the same for the short haul but for the long haul they are lower and we are paying our men as good wages as the other railways and keeping our standard up to the highest pitch.

I venture to say that evidence will be construed by the majority of thinking people as showing that the railway is used to serve local and political purposes rather than the interests of Canada, and we know that to a large extent the deficits on the Intercolonial Railway are attributable to that fact.

Mr. GRAHAM. Pardon me. That is a very trite question just now, and I know the leader of the opposition will appreciate the question I am going to ask the hon. gentleman—In view of the remarks of my hon. friend is he in favour of increasing the rate for freight and passengers on the Intercolonial ?

Mr. LENNOX. I am not going to assist my hon. friend in that regard.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the rates are wrong the hon. gentleman ought be able to say so.

Mr. LENNOX. We may have to consider that question at an early date.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who gets the benefit?

Mr. LENNOX. Let me answer one question at a time. We may have to take the matter out of the hands of the Minister of Railways at a very early date and when we do we will deal with it in a way that is fair to all classes interested. Let me refer to another quotation which will deal with the Intercolonial but in another way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the question before us for discussion is the civil service not freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. SPEAKER. A discussion of the rates charged on the Intercolonial Railway is not relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. LENNOX. I am sorry the right hon. gentleman did not mention the matter sooner because I have finished my reference to it. The witness was speaking about the employment of men on the Intercolonial and the following evidence was given :

Q. Who has the appointment of trackmen?—A. The roadmasters would have the general supervision of the force, say from Rivière du Loup to Chaudière Junction and then another roadmaster from there to Montreal. The roadmaster holds the foreman of the track responsible for the carrying on of the work. The men are appointed generally on the recommendation of members of parliament in the case of vacancies. That is to say, a man must be a good man; he must be able to make good or he is dropped from the service, but when a vacancy comes the member in whose county the vacancy occurs has the say as to who shall succeed.

I think the patronage system here is more serious than in the aspect in which the Minister of Finance dealt with it this afternoon, because here we are dealing with

the lives of people who travel upon the Intercolonial railway and we are making appointments not with regard to who are the best or fittest men but upon the recommendation of the member for the county, continuing he is asked :

Q. Do you not consider that objectionable?—A. Well it has worked out fairly satisfactorily.
Q. What about the appointment of engineers and firemen?

That is a more serious matter still because the engineer has the lives of the passengers in his charge and the answer is :

A. In the first instance the fireman or the trackman is liable to be appointed upon the nomination of some political friend, but once he is appointed he has to make good. He joins the brotherhood immediately and works up step by step.
Q. And the majority of the employees, are appointed politically or do they come under the brotherhood?—A. They belong to the brotherhood but they all enter the service in the first instance, I fancy, on the nomination of some member of parliament.

Again Mr. Giroux is examined with regard to the service on the canals and he says :

Q. How did all you people get employment in the beginning?—A. I have been employed two years through Mr. Rivet, my deputy.
Q. Then the member for the district sends your name to the department and you get employment?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. That applies generally throughout the canals?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. There is no passing examination or anything of that kind?—A. No.

Let me now quote from the evidence of Mr. Pottinger :

Q. Then, in all the shops in the month of August you had 2,467 employees?—A. Yes, all over the line.
Q. Are all these 2,467 men employed in the shops appointed primarily by political nomination?—A. Primarily they are recommended by some supporter of the government. Of course there are exceptions to that sometimes. For instance, mechanics of the machinist class have been very scarce and we have been compelled to employ any one who came along in that capacity.

And only when they are compelled do they neglect politics in the matter.

Q. If you found a good class of mechanics coming out as immigrants would the chief superintendent or master mechanic have power to secure their services if he needed them?—A. If he needed them.
Q. Apart from political pressure?—A. Yes.
Q. The appointment of one thousand and odd people in the shops at Moncton gives a good deal of political patronage to the member in that district?—A. I may explain that the Moncton shops have been considered to belong to the whole line and not merely to the county in which they are situated although in practice the county gets the majority.

They belong to the whole line for what purpose ? For political pull and nothing else. These men tell all this without a blush :

Q. It has nothing to do with the by-elections?—A. Nothing whatever.
Q. The trackmen are exclusively appointed from the district?

They are dealing with the question of men being confined to a particular district and that they dare not be appointed out of their district or else there would be an insurrection amongst the politicians.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Who said that ?

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Pottinger I think. Any how it was sworn to.

Q. It has nothing to do with the by-elections?—A. Nothing whatever.
Q. The trackmen are exclusively appointed from the districts in which the tracks are laid I suppose; you don't get your trackmen from the county of Rimouski to go into the adjoining county?—A. Well, the track district runs from Ste. Flavie to Campbellton and goes through the counties of Rimouski and Bonaventure and a small part of Restigouche. These trackmen are local people. They are on a certain definite piece of line about six miles long, so that they will naturally fall into the county in which they are employed.
Q. I have heard that trackmen in Rimouski are stopped at the border and replaced by other trackmen in Bonaventure, and that these again are stopped at the border and replaced by trackmen from the next county?—A. I have not heard that in regard to Rimouski, and it would not be the case with respect to trackmen. But there is a class of men that we employ going about on trains cleaning ditches and so on, and it may have occurred in regard to that class of work. It has occurred in Cape Breton.
Q. I have heard the story that at Cape Breton you went through four or five counties, and at the county line one carload of men was dropped and another carload was taken on?—A. That has been the case sometimes, but they were extra men.

And they were engaged at a time when an election was coming on, for extra political purposes.

Mr. EMMERSON. That statement is not in the evidence, is it ?

Mr. LENNOX. No.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a remark of your own ?

Mr. LENNOX. That is a remark of my own.

Mr. EMMERSON. You are drawing on your imagination ?

Mr. LENNOX. No, I am not drawing on my imagination. It is borne out by the evidence I have read and the statements of

the Royal Commission appointed by the government; it is borne out by facts that we have had established before this House from time to time; and it is true to the knowledge of my hon. friend who has just spoken. Here is another passage:

Q. Now we come to the working expenses. Do you purchase all your stores by lowest tender after advertising?—A. The general storekeeper sends out circulars to the different persons in the trade who are recommended by the members.

Q. But in the case of big purchases?—A. In regard to ties and lumber we send out posters which are put up at all the stations along the railway, and everybody can tender that wishes to do so. In regard to the large works, they are advertised in the newspapers, and every one who wishes can tender.

Q. Take coal, for instance, do you call for tenders for the coal supply for the line?—A. We call for tenders from all the companies in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are no others.

Mr. LENNOX. There are no others in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, but you need not be confined to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, I suppose.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Where else?

Mr. LENNOX. The United States, I suppose, for one place, and in British Columbia there is lots of coal.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would you run the Intercolonial in that practical manner?

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman's experience will be enlarged after a while, if he is patient. The evidence goes on:

Q. A great part of your expenditure, covering several pages, is for castings and all that sort of thing?—A. The castings are got by tender. We do not make our own castings; they are made at River du Loup for the province of Quebec, at St. John for the Moncton shops, and at Halifax for the eastern part of the system. Tenders for castings are asked by circular——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will see that he is again drifting away from the subject.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. If I am obliged to rule, I shall have to rule.

Mr. LENNOX. If you rule, I will stop that branch of the inquiry; but if you had not ruled, I would have imagined that the question of how the administration is being carried on in regard to the civil service is very pertinent to the question whether the system proposed in the motion is a better system than the one that has been pursued in the past. However, I have given enough for illustration, and I have referred only to one department. The Department of Marine and Fisheries is full of very much more startling evidence than that which I have read in reference to the Department of Railways.

Now, the Minister of Finance says that the civil service is open to all. The civil service examinations are open to all, but that is as far as it goes as a matter of actual fact. All can pass the examinations if they think fit, but a very large percentage of the young men and young women of this country who would pass the civil service examinations are deterred by the fact that they know that it would be a mere farce to do so because their chance of getting an appointment is so exceedingly remote. The Minister of Finance knows as well as anybody else that the civil service is not open to all in any other sense than the mere passing of the examinations. To give authority for that statement, let me quote what the Civil Service Commissioners say. At page 15 of their report you will find this statement:

The commissioners also beg to point out that in the list of passed candidates published in the 'Canada Gazette' no attention is given to merit.

A matter that was particularly dwelt on by the hon. member for North Toronto, and that merit should be one of the means of securing employment in the civil service, it is essential that a record should be kept of those who have passed the examinations and the order in which they have passed; but no such record is kept. The one who merely scrapes through is just as likely to get an appointment if he satisfies the political pull, as the candidate who has passed exceedingly high, and the minister knows that as well and even better than I do, if he would only say so. The commissioners go on to say:

The candidates are gazetted alphabetically. No doubt it has happened that the candidates who have just fluked through the examination by means of greater political influence have receivd appointments over the heads of more worthy and better qualified candidates.

In the matter of promotions the same patronage fear is apparent. Your commissioners found in their rounds that a collector of customs, a city postmaster, a post office inspector and others were appointed politically. The recent appointment of a postmaster at Kingston was on the recommendation of the patronage committee; the last appointment to the postmastership at Montreal, the most important in the Dominion, was given to an aged member of parliament, 67 years old.

I will not say more upon this question now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. If it were not effective I do not think the hon. gentleman would be anxious for me to sit down; but as it is not suiting their purpose and is not advancing their interests, they are anxious that I should give it up. Well, I am not going to

try my case in their court. I am going to a higher and more responsible tribunal. When I find that hon. gentlemen opposite are restless, it rather inspires me with the belief that I am doing good service to the country by proceeding a little further.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will you stop if we cry 'go on'?

Mr. LENNOX. I will stop when I think I have fully discharged my duty. I want to refer to a few extracts from the report of the royal commissioners. Speaking of the Militia Department, they say:

There are officers enough in the department, both inside and outside, to do all the work efficiently, if they were properly trained and organized; but there is no efficient organization. The only attempt at it is the appointment of men whose titles would seem to indicate what their duties are; but those duties have never been specifically defined. There is no record of anything of the kind, and there are no written or printed rules and regulations known in the service, which your commissioners think is lamentable.

It is practically impossible to fix responsibility on anybody. The deputy is supposed to shoulder responsibility for everything as his signature shows; but that means that he speaks for 'the department,' and 'the department,' like the King, can do no wrong. There seems to be a huge redundancy of work which proceeds in a lumbering, haphazard way, giving rise to constant blundering and confusion. There is no sign visible of a single directing head, or an intelligent purpose, unless it be that of spending as much money as possible. Zeal for economy and good management, or pride in the work, is not visible. Perfunctory and mechanical discharge of duties is the rule, with apparently no perception of any need for improvement.

Then the commissioners go on to deal with the question of bookkeeping by the Faulkner Company. They point out:

After months of work by the highly paid experts the result has been at least greatly improved books as far as mechanical reform is concerned, but probably little else; and this achievement has been accomplished at an almost fabulous expense.

There is not only a lack of efficient organization and method in the department. There would also seem to be a lack of conscience. In connection with the enormous expenditures which are deemed necessary, the word 'discount' never appears. It is tacitly assumed that there is no such thing; but the whole commercial world knows otherwise. If no one gets any benefit from trade with the government except the trader, then it must be clear that in these great purchases made for the government, without discount, its officers must be assisting the trader to get better prices from the government than he can get anywhere else; for, everywhere else he has to give discount. In other words, some of the government's officers are serving two masters, and apparently succeeding with both—scripture notwithstanding.

It is certain that under such a state of things it must be impossible to develop high character in the service, or rather to prevent the deterioration of what character there is.

As some evidence that the heads of the department have been quite aware of it, we find on one of the files a memorandum by one of the officers dated May 31, 1905, regarding expenditures in connection with lighthouses. 'I am of opinion that in the Quebec agency alone a saving of at least $25,000 per annum can be made by compelling the agent to obtain authority for his expenditures over ordinary supplies and maintenance. If this is not carried out, the department can look for an overdraft for the next fiscal year of from $50,000 to $100,000.'

The cure suggested is too ludicrous to be taken seriously, but, as evidence of the condition of things, and the department's knowledge of it, this memorandum is significant. It was marked approved and initialled by the minister at that time.

Coming to the question of the lighthouse board—this scheme which was adopted for purposes which I do not think the government would like very fully to explain—the commissioners say:

Between June, 1905, and June, 1907, this board approved of and passed applications for new and improved aids to navigation amounting to $1,691,813. With the voting away of this vast amount of money the responsible minister had nothing to do. He was simply asked to initial the minutes of the different meetings of this most powerful but irresponsible board. The effect of this state of things is disastrous. It means practically the removing of all responsibility from those to whom extensive powers of administration and expenditure are granted.

When one realizes the enormous pressure being constantly brought to bear on the government of the day in favour of grants and bounties of all kinds from one end of the country to the other, it would surely seem to be a most unwise thing to create a board with extensive powers, which can be and are used in sympathy with this universal outside pressure, and without being accountable to anybody.

The two outside members of this board simply represent the shipping interest, which is their own. They cannot serve the country and themselves equally well in the same matter. The other members of the board are government officials, who, whatever their standing may be, personally or officially, are not independent of political influence or departmental pressure. They are in no proper sense qualified to fill such a position of trust as a seat on this lighthouse board should mean—where the most absolute sense of justice, with complete independence, is called for; with a keen desire to administer the people's money with the utmost economy and good judgment, and with all prsonal considerations sunk.

There can be very little question that the lighthouse board has been the means of greatly increasing the expenditure of the department, and that much of the increase has been wasted.

It is pretty clearly urged, so that I need not stop to emphasize it, that that board

is an utterly irresponsible body, utterly unconstitutional and one which never should have been created. And when the opportunity now presents itself, we should avail ourselves of it to have a better system than we now have. Again :

Your commissioners have to confess that the general conclusions which they have formed regarding the administration of the department are most unfavourable. It seems to have few redeeming features; although there are some, one of which is the presence in the department of some good men, chiefly, but not wholly, in the lower ranks. . . Organization, discipline, zeal for the public service, and regard for economy are all conspicuous by their absence.

A word or two about the Department of Militia may not be out of place. The commissioners say :

The expenditure in this department is going up by leaps and bounds. In 1903-4 the total expenditure, both in capital and consolidated fund, was in the neighbourhood of three and a half million dollars. In the estimates lately submitted to parliament for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909, appropriations are asked for aggregating $6,500,000. That is to say, in four years and three-quarters the expenditures will have increased, if the supply asked for is granted, to the extent of $3,000,000.

About the Militia Council also they have something to say :

In addition to the council an officer has been appointed, called the inspector general, at a salary of $6,000 per annum. In Great Britain the appointment of inspector general was made for reasons which do not exist in Canada; but as the inspector general in Canada has only to report, your commissioners are very doubtful, however valuable the reports may be, that the retention of an officer at such a large salary is beneficial and altogether in the public interests. From past experience, it would seem as if this office were being made a stepping stone to the retirement of high military officers in Canada on large allowances.

Then summing up they say :

In conclusion your commissioners have to point out that the expenditure has grown in a little over four years from three and a half millions to six and a half millions; that the permanent and headquarters staff have increased to the number of about 220; that in addition to the general system of high pay the favoured men of the militia service in Canada draw pensions ont only for themselves but for their wives and children; that the staff is sufficient for a corps of one hundred thousand men according to the evidence submitted; that the desertions have been one in three; that the number of militia trained in the annual camps is about 40,000 men; that according to the evidence of Major General Lake the men attached to the rural battalions have no drill except at the annual camps, and it is arguable whether the city corps are as efficient as they were some years ago; that while only 40,000 men came out for drill of ages from 18 to 50, yet compared with the population of over a million men in Canada between the ages of 20 and 40, the proportion seems small. Whether with all the large expenditure of public moneys the result as detailed shows efficiency, your commissioners leave to the consideration of Your Excellency.

I had intended to read the account submitted through the commissioners of the difference in expenditure in the Militia Department now and in 1904, but I will not now take the time necessary for that purpose. I think the instances given prove with abundant clearness that the time has come when we should have a thorough revision of our civil service along the lines marked out by the resolution of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). And, whatever the right hon. Prime Minister may say as to this being an inopportune time, I am sure the country believes that the time is most opportune for bringing in a measure along these lines. We shall await with interest the bringing in of the government measure to see if it carries out the main recommendations of the Civil Service Commission which the right hon. gentleman appointed and whether it is framed along lines which will leave these appointments and promotions free from political influences. In the meantime I shall have great pleasure in supporting the amendment.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Foster).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Armstrong,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Avery,	Morin,
Barr,	Northrup,
Bergeron,	Owen,
Borden (Carleton),	Perley,
Brabazon,	Porter,
Broder,	Roche (Marquette),
Daniel,	Schaffner,
Foster,	Staples,
Fowler,	Taylor,
Herron,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Jackson (Elgin),	White,
Lake,	Wright (Muskoka)—30.
Lennox,	
Lewis,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,	Lavergne, (Drum. & Arth.),
Beauparlant,	Loggie,
Bickerdike,	Lovell,
Bole,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Bourbonnais,	McCraney,
Boyer,	McIntyre (Strathcona),
Brodeur,	McKenzie,
Brown,	McLean (Huron),
Bureau,	McLean (York C.),
Caldwell,	McLennan,
Calvert,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Carney,	
Cash,	

Chisholm (Antigonish).	Martin (Wellington),
Copp,	Meigs,
Crawford,	Michaud,
Cyr,	Oliver,
Demers,	Paterson,
Dugas,	Parent,
Emmerson,	Pickup,
Ethier,	Pugsley,
Fielding,	Ross (Cape Breton),
Finlay,	Ross (Rimouski),
Finlayson,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Galliher,	Savoie,
Geoffrion,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Girard,	Stewart,
Graham,	Talbot,
Hunt,	Telford,
Johnston,	Templeman,
Kennedy,	Tolmie,
Knowles,	Turcotte,
Lachance,	Turgeon,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Turriff,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Verville,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Watson,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wilson (Russell)—72.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Clarke,	Marshall,
Gordon,	Ames,
Black,	Elson,
Burrows,	Lennox,
Tobin,	Monk,
Reid (Restigouche),	Ganong,
Devlin,	Stanfield,
Macpherson,	Bristol,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Wilmot,
Lemieux,	Haggart,
Caron,	Barker,
Carvell,	Beattie,
Dyment,	Bennett,
Conmee,	Blain,
Fisher,	Chisholm (Huron),
German,	Christie,
Grant,	Clare,
Hall,	Clements,
Harty,	Cockshutt,
Hughes (P.E.I.),	Crocket,
Fortier,	Forget,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Henderson,
Law,	Hughes (Victoria),
McColl,	Kemp,
Macdonald,	Lalor,
McCool,	Lancaster,
LeBlanc,	Leonard,
McIntyre (Perth),	Macdonell,
Miller,	MacLaren,
Pardee,	McLean (York S.),
Wright (Renfrew),	Martin (P.E.I.),
Adamson,	Osler,
Proulx,	Paquet,
Ratz,	Pringle,
Schell (Glengarry),	Reid (Grenville),
Schell (Oxford),	Seagram,
Sinclair,	Smith (Wentworth),
Sloan,	Sproule,
Sifton,	Thompson,
Smith (Oxford),	Ward,
Zimmerman,	Wilson (Lennox).

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LENNOX.

House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the intention of the government to keep us longer here to-night ?

Mr. PATERSON. I would like to pass one or two items.

Mr. FOSTER. We came here at 3 o'clock this afternoon, and it is now after 12. We have debated a very important resolution this afternoon. We are, we will suppose, Christians and men, and I do not think we have any right, either on one side or the other, to strain our endurance to an unnecessary point. It does seem to me that if we are called upon to sit much later than 12 o'clock at night it is straining to a point of endurance which is unreasonable, at this time of the year and in this kind of weather. The plea is made that it is necessary to get through business. So it is; but there is other business than the estimates that are before the House, and this House cannot prorogue until the other business as well as the estimates are carried through. We might as well be frank with each other, and say that there are some points of legislation about which there is a difference, that difference has existed for some time, and although it has existed for some time, we seem to be no nearer getting a decision from the government as to whether they propose to press that legislation or not. I think the government ought to treat us fairly and frankly, and they will find the opposition anxious with them in putting through the other necessary business of the session.

Mr. PATERSON. I have no desire to keep the House late, but I will tell you how the thing stands. I want to get $2,074,500. It is all in one item, it generally passes like that. We are only asking for what is necessary. To-day we should have drawn our cheques to pay our outside officers. I suppose there are 2,000 men who, if you do not give them this money, will have to go without their pay. The hon. gentleman speaks about it being un-Christian to sit late. Would it not be more un-Christian to put us in the position of being unable to pay men who, we have been told to-night, have been faithful men and who have well earned their wages ? At any rate, so far as I am concerned, and I think I have my colleagues and the Prime Minister with me, I will make an effort to get the money, so that these men who are under my charge cannot at any rate lay the blame upon me if they go without the wages which they have fairly earned. I will give what explanations members may desire. I suppose there are a hundred men in this city alone who will have to go without the pay they have earned if I do not get this money, and others are scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific; too many of them, as hon. gentlemen opposite know, do not get salaries that enable them to do without their money when it is due. Therefore

I desire to stay long enough at any rate to let those gentlemen know that the head of the department is not to blame if they do not get their money.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another way in which the situation can be stated. I do not propose to be put in the wrong by the specious reasoning of the Minister of Customs. It is perfectly right that these men who do the work should have their pay and these men would have had their pay many days before this if the government had not obtruded between them and their pay obnoxious legislation, obnoxious to a large portion of this House and the country. The government have it within their power in a very short time to allow these men to get their pay by withdrawing, or by putting aside, a portion of the legislation which is not necessary to the well being of this country, either to the Department of Customs or to any other department of the service. It is a party interest purely and simply which is involved in that legislation, and it is obtruded, not in the interest of the service of the country but of the party.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a large batch of legislation proposed, which stands on the Order Paper, but because the hon. gentleman differs from us as respects some portion of that legislation, therefore the customs officers shall not get their money. We are not discussing the legislation to which my hon. friend refers; he is welcome to his view upon that, and at the proper time and in the proper manner he may discuss that legislation as much as he pleases. We are proposing now to ask this House to grant supplies to carry on the public service of the country. We decline to mix up any other question with that. We now ask the House to grant the necessary supply, and no excuse that the hon. gentleman may urge with regard to some other item will be accepted by the country as a sufficient reason for withholding the necessary supplies.

Mr. A. A. MACLEAN. We have been here now for six months, I cannot get home every Friday night like some members of Quebec and Ontario. Four months are sufficient to pass all the public business, I think the government are to blame for the length of this session. During the last four months the supply could have been taken up at almost any time.

Mr. FIELDING. The charge of the hon. gentleman, I am bound to say, is entirely unwarranted. Again and again during the greater period of that six months we have brought forward some part of these estimates and again and again we have been blocked—I will not say obstructed—we have been blocked by hon. gentlemen opposite, who in the exercise of their rights have brought forward motions, many of which, in our judgment, were entirely unnecessary, useless motions such as the one which has engaged the attention of the House this afternoon, an utterly uselss motion which could only have for its purpose to anticipate the action of the government in a matter which stands on the Order Paper, and we have had hon. gentlemen spend the whole day in tactics of that character and now when we reach the hour when we want to do business, they say : Oh, we are tired and want to go home.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has failed to represent properly my position with reference to the motion I brought on to-day. He may have his opinion as to what the motion is worth, I am wiling to leave that to the country, I am willing to put the principle involved in the motion I moved this afternoon and the result that would flow from its adoption with reference to the best interests of this country alongside of his section No. 1 of a Bill with reference to the electoral law of Canada, a Bill which the government promised two years ago, which they referred to in their speech from the Throne at one time, an election Bill which at long last they have placed on the Order Paper at what time ? Nearly five months after the session opened. And they have imported into that Bill a section of a highly contentious nature, a section which carries out what in 1904 some hon. gentleman on that side of the House wished to carry out but which they were prevented from carrying, which they had printed at the Government Bureau and would have put through until they were baulked by a Minister of Justice who had some energy and force.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order, I would like to know what item we are on.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. Now they have placed that on their programme and have let five months of the session pass before taking it up.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. Now will not the Finance Minister——

Mr. DEPUTY MINISTER. I think I will have to call an item so that we will be in order.

Resolution No. 266, page 82, Customs,

Mr. FOSTER. If the Finance Minister—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know in what I am out of order.

Mr. TALBOT. Does the hon. gentleman require an answer?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not asking you.

Mr. TALBOT. The resolution was not read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (reading):

Seven-eighths of $2,074,500 and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (reading):

Including pay for overtime of officers notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,705,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is not carried and if hon. gentlemen will not keep quiet it will not be carried in a good while.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance characterized the resolution of this afternoon as a silly and unnecessary resolution

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say silly.

Mr. FOSTER. It is about tantamount to that.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not object to that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. But that resolution was given notice of by me and was on the order paper the first day of the session.

Mr. TALBOT. I rise to a point of order. Is the speech that the hon. member is now making pertinent to the resolution before the chair?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that these are merely preliminary explanations.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance knows very well that those resolutions were, as I have stated, placed on the Order Paper at the very opening of the session. He knows also that it was expected that we would have the report of the Civil Service Commission by January 1, but that it was delayed, owing to the length of the excursion they took and the interesting objects they met in the course of that excursion, beyond the first of January. He knows that I gave as a reason; and it was a perfectly valid reason, that I was waiting for the report to be brought down before I discussed the resolution. He knows that the report was not brought down until probably two months after he had expected it and when that report was printed and placed before the House, we had reached a stage of the session where it was impossible for me to get at my resolution and he knows that I stated in the House that as it was impossible for me to reach it on that order I proposed to drop the order and would bring it up again at the first convenient opportunity when we were going into Supply. That I have done and I think that explanation is quite sufficient to make it impossible for a fair-minded man to taunt me with keeping that resolution back in order to bring it up at this late day for the purpose of obstructing the work of the government. If the Finance Minister will look back over the history of this session he will find that the government has been the chief obstructor. This opposition has a duty to perform in this House, it is its duty to examine into the way in which the finances are managed, it is its duty to examine into grievances and it has been doing that duty very effectively. There is not a single motion that the opposition has preferred before this House and has carried out in debate that has not been of great importance with reference to the well being of this country and to the way in which its affairs have been managed. It has been our duty to do this as well as our right. What did the Finance Minister and the First Minister do? They have put forward their obstructive power to prevent us from getting the information we needed. Have hon. gentlemen opposite forgotten how long they withstood the demand for the production of the original documents, a demand which was as fair and reasonable as any demand ever put before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. order.

Mr. FOSTER. They obstructed that and debated it for days and days.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. order.

Mr. FOSTER. Until at last they had to give way and we saw the original documents as we wished. So with reference to other parts of their legislation, especially with reference to this legislation; their Election Bill should have ben brought down in the early part of the session.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise again——

Mr. FOSTER. At the very opening of this House and then this House——

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Chairman, if I understood your decision a minute ago the hon. gentleman was supposed to make preliminary remarks, and he has been going on, wandering all over the country——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood that certain explanations were being given on both sides of the House preliminary to the work going on. Of course the hon. gentleman will understand that these explanations must be limited.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to limit them, I am pretty close up to the limit now.

Mr. GALLIHER. I ask if the discussion since you have taken the chair has not all been out of order? You have read a resolution with regard to certain items and any controversy pertinent to those items is in order, but I submit that this discussion since you have taken the chair is not in order and I ask your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My ruling is that we are in committee at present and

such latitude has always been allowed with the consent of both sides that it is difficult to apply the rule. Strictly speaking, the vote before the House is this matter of Customs and of course anything else is irrelevant.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite true and I submit that at this late hour we should not be called upon to pass this large item, $2,000,000 for the customs service all over the country. The plea I have been trying to make is that as the government has delayed its legislation we should not be made to bear the brunt of their fault by their attempting to carry their estimates at an unreasonable hour. There is other legislation equally as important as the estimates.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Customs and the First Minister and the Minister of Finance have it within their power to expedite matters.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. How ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my hon. friend frankly: By letting us know what the government proposes to do with reference to their Election Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then we are to understand that unless we take up the Election Bill and make it to suit my hon. friend there will be no estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, we have discussed that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No this is the time to discuss it. The attitude of the hon. gentleman now is a very apposite commentary upon his whole conduct to-day and upon the attitude taken by the opposition. We have had speeches and resolutions to affirm that positions in no branch of the public service ought to be in the appointment of the government, but that all these appointments should be made by an independent body, and now that we have brought a Bill in which we offered as a compromise, that certain appointments made by the government should not be made by the government in future but should be made by judges ; in the face of that the hon. gentleman says: We will not give you supply unless you do what we want you to do. That is the object of the hon. gentleman; that is the attitude of the opposition, and the country will understand it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I be permitted to say that the statement just uttered by the Prime Minister is a complete misrepresentation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In what respect ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In this respect, that the men who make the revision at the present time are the same judges that the Prime Minister says he proposes to appoint, and yet in the face of that he has stated to the House that the opposition are inconsistent in that they object to the appointment of men selected by judges. Either the Prime Minister must have forgotten his own proposal—his memory must be even shorter than usual—or else he was not frank with the House in his statement. I confess I don't understand him.

Mr. PATERSON. What you want about your Bill, or what you don't want about your Bill does not interest me just now; I want this money. The explanation is that there is an increase of $80,000 to provide increases of salaries for the officers and to appoint any new officers that may be found necessary. Hitherto the House has had a good deal of confidence—I must thank hon. gentlemen for it—in passing the Customs estimates. They have generally gone through in five or ten minutes and I do not think longer than that will be necessary to-night for the reason that they are based on what has been fully understood. The increase as hon. gentlemen see is very moderate. Last year we went into a general increase and I have a list of all to whom increases were given, but it is very long and I suppose I need not read it. There will be some deserving cases this year and we would like to have the money if it is decided we should grant them. There are continual demands on the Customs Department for new ports and officers are required at these ports. This is not all for the collection of revenue because we have had during the past year 15 or 20 men who do nothing in the way of collecting revenue but who are safeguarding the revenue. We have adopted a more stringent system of inspection and put on an additional staff at several points near the frontier. The only question to be considered is: Is $80,000 too much to grant for deserving additions to salaries and for providing for the extra work that will come upon the department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the reason of the provision:

Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. PATERSON. Office hours are from 8 to 6 and we have officers who meet trains coming in at night and have to be paid for their overtime. In old times the transportation companies paid this charge, but some years ago parliament decided to pay it out of the public funds.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a matter which is very strongly criticised in the civil service report and that criticism I entirely concur in. If your Civil Service Act at

present does not permit you to carry on the business of the country as it should be carried on why not amend it ? It is not advisable to have a provision in item after item declaring that it is in contravention of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. PATERSON. This has been going on for years and years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And unless it is stopped it will go on for ever.

Mr. BERGERON. It has been going on more than ever for the last ten years.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the Minister of Customs explain what is meant by this statement in the report of the Civil Service Commission:

> The chief positions in the outside service of this department are political appointments. Every collector of customs has been appointed from the ranks of the party in power at the moment.

Mr. PATERSON. When vacancies occur you have to fill them. My desire always is to fill them with competent men, men of character and men of ability. That I try my best to do.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What examinations?

Mr. PATERSON. Collectors of customs have not to pass the civil service examination.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The position of the Minister of Customs is that there is no use in Conservatives passing the examination because they would not get the appointment.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not say that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, the commissioners say as much.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know what the commissioners may say. I have the recommendations, but I do not know the parties personally, and I have to avail myself of the knowledge of those who do know them to assure myself that they are competent ; and if a man is competent for the position, the fact that he is a Liberal is not a barrier to his appointment.

Mr. BARR. Has there been a Conservative appointed since my hon. friend has been Minister of Customs ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think the officers have been largely drawn from the Liberal party.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice that the commissioners distinctly state that almost all the appraisers in the outside service of this department, have been appointed without undergoing the civil service examination ; and yet the minister gave us to understand that they have undergone this examination.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not say that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. minister then not think it would be wise for them to undergo some examination and be properly fitted to fill these positions ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I think it would.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The report distinctly says they do not.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I do not agree with all that the report says. An appraiser does not undergo the civil service examination, but he has to undergo, under the authority of the Civil Service Act, a practical examination in the duties of his office. I do not care how literary a character a man may be, if he has not handled any dry goods, groceries, crockery, boots and shoes and other articles of merchandise, his knowledge, valuable as it would be in certain spheres, is not sufficient for an appraiser of goods. We have men of education and intelligence and also with a practical knowledge which enables them to know what line of goods come under a certain rate of duty, what item applies to them, and the character and value of the goods. That kind of an examination they undergo.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot help reading a few more lines of this report and asking the Minister of Customs what he intends to do regarding these statements made by the Commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. Write him a letter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am afraid the minister would not read it. I wish to impress this upon him :

> The only suggestion the commissioners can make in regard to the outside service is to have the service absolutely divorced from political influence and have all the appointments put on a basis of merit.

These are strong assertions. I do not see how the Minister of Customs can get over them. He frankly admits that he only appoints Liberals.

Mr. EMMERSON. They were mostly all Conservatives.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. My hon. friend would almost as lief appoint a Doukhobor on the railway as a Conservative, and perhaps rather. I think we are justified in asking the minister whether he intends to carry out the policy, in spite of the commissioners' report, that no men shall be appointed in the Customs Department, unless they are political partisans of his, and the commissioners distinctly state that the men are not fitted for the positions they are filling.

Mr. PATERSON. As I said before, I do not hold myself bound by all that the commissioners have said. They formed their opinions, and I think they did right to express them ; but I have my opinions too, and I think perhaps I know as much about the service, having been connected with it for ten years, as a gentleman who called up one or two of my officers and examined them. If my hon. friend reads that report, I think he will find that the testimony given to the commissioners was that on the whole the customs staff was a valuable body of men discharging their duties well.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the payment for overtime in addition to the ordinary pay of these officials, or is it deducted from their salaries ?

Mr. PATERSON. It supplements their regular statutory salary. Up to last year the rate was 25 cents an hour, but last year parliament gave me permission to raise it to 30 cents an hour. Where we require men to work overtime on Sundays, we pay them, and the amount is recouped to us by the transportation companies. Otherwise we pay them the extra amount.

Mr. DANIEL. Are many men affected by this regulation ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, a large number—in Montreal, in Halifax and in St. John.

Mr. BERGERON. These men must work many hours overtime, judging by the amounts they receive. A great many have advanced from $200 to $300. There is overtime like that to the extent of over $18,000. I cannot understand what overtime they do except on Sundays. Are the temporary employees, those who work on the wharfs in the summer—about $11,000 ? When are they employed and how long ?

Mr. PATERSON. There is overtime at the stations in winter but the most is in the summer.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not understand why a man under salary, when there is work to do, should not come back and do it. In commercial offices, if there is need for the clerks to go back after eight o'clock, they do so and are not paid overtime. This sort of expenditure used to be very much criticised by my hon. friend when in opposition but we have more of it now than ever.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total amount which goes for overtime ?

Mr. PATERSON. About $90,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How is that distributed?

Mr. PATERSON. It is distributed at Montreal, Quebec and the various other ports according as the work is done

Mr. FOSTER. How does the minister arrive at that $90,000 ?

Mr. PATERSON. The accountant makes up his estimates and he knows what was paid last year. He estimates whether the amount is likely to be increased. He cannot tell the exact amount. We may have occasion to appoint an extra officer during the year, which appointment could not be foreseen, and that might reduce a little the overtime at that particular port, but the estimate is fairly accurate.

Mr. FOSTER. What number of hours do these men work in their regular service?

Mr. PATERSON. Ten hours per day.

Mr. FOSTER. Who selects the men to do the overtime ?

Mr. PATERSON. The collectors at the different ports. Mr. White, collector at Montreal, apportions the men there. There is great desire among the men, who have small salaries, to share in the overtime, and Mr. White endeavours to divide it as fairly as he can. We have to trust to our collectors.

Mr. FOSTER. What supervision has the department over this matter of overtime ? Mr. White may be a very trustworthy collector but all collectors may not be the same. Here you have $90,000 voted by parliament, and that can be practically expended exactly as the collectors wish. In the first place is the overtime work necessary ? What check has the minister ? If necessary, what is the method on which the men are assigned to the work ? How does the minister satisfy himself that this $90,000 has to be expended ? If due diligence were used and if proper work were done within the hours, it would not be necessary.

Mr. PATERSON. The collector has to certify to the extra time.

Mr. FOSTER. But is the extra time necessary ? Is there any system of inspection or check ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it ?

Mr. PATERSON. We have a tide surveyor on the wharf at all hours of the night, and we have the surveyor of the port who will be up at night at all hours very often, and these have to certify, before the money is paid, that the work has been done. And the men get two hours and not more, as a rule, because we think that if a man works twelve hours that is enough. So, we do not allow him to work more than two hours overtime.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand the collectors make a demand for a certain amount for their ports, which amount is placed in their hands. They have to choose the persons who should do the overtime. But that is limited by the two hours maximum. I suppose it is possible that favour-

itism may be shown. I am not saying that it is shown, but such a thing is possible. But what check has the minister to prove that the men have actually performed two hours overtime and have done their work faithfully ?

Mr. PATERSON. The only check we can possibly have—the certificates of the men who employ them.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the collector, but he is not there at all hours.

Mr. PATERSON. He has his subordinate officers.

Mr. FOSTER. But who certifies ?

Mr. PATERSON. The tide surveyor on the wharf, or the landing waiter at the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. What work do the overtime men do ?

Mr. PATERSON. For instance, wait at the station until a train comes in to examine the baggage of people who want to go through that night instead of putting the baggage in bond. This is a convenience to the railways, so much so that in days gone by they paid for it themselves. Ships coming in also want facilities for quick unloading. And goods have to be watched at night. Of course, there are night watchmen, and I suppose that the man who is up at night is not up in the day time. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will think it over, he will see that it is difficult to suggest any other plan than the one we have. We cannot send a man from here to look after it. If we have officers upon whom we cannot rely, we might be lost, but we have confidence in them. Nothing of that kind could go wrong in the port without our hearing it.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose that John Jones and John Smith are detailed for overtime work at a railway station. Their regular hours end at what time ?

Mr. PATERSON. Six o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. If a train is due at eleven o'clock, are these men detailed to go at that time and do two hours' work up to one o'clock ? Or do you arrange that every train and ship should come in at six o'clock.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then how is it arranged ? Is a man detailed to go down at eleven o'clock and put in his two hours' work ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, if he did not start the two hours before.

Mr. FOSTER. That is pretty hard on the service, is it not ? A man must be roused from his rest at eleven o'clock to go down to do two hours' work. Or it may be that the train does not come in until one o'clock.

Mr. PATERSON. It is hard on them.

Mr. FOSTER. But is it not hard on the service ? When a man is engaged in extra work in this way, you can hardly expect him to be fresh for his regular ten hours' work next day. How does it work out in practice ?

Mr. PATERSON. It works out satisfactorily. The only other way would be to engage enough men to have a day staff and a night staff. Many of these men, if they had not overtime, would want their salaries increased, because they could not get on with the wages they have. So, not only would you have to pay the salaries of the larger staff, but you would have to pay these men more as well. Therefore, this is the most economical method. These men are not engaged in hard physical labour. They have to wait for an hour or two, perhaps, in order to do a half hour's work.

Mr. FOSTER. If the man waits there and is not called upon to do any work, does he get his time just the same ?

Mr. PATERSON. He does the work by being there. This to help trade and commerce. That it is a help is shown by the fact that the railways were willing to pay for it, but, instead of letting them pay, we pay it ourselves.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose a man goes down at eight o'clock and the train does not come in until ten, and after it comes in he does two hours' work. Is he paid for four hours?

Mr. PATERSON. No. He would be relieved by another man or the goods would go into bond.

Mr. FOSTER. But if he were not relieved he would get his pay?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, but the goods would probably go into bond after 12 o'clock at night.

Mr. FOSTER. From the minister's explanation it seems to be a very haphazard arrangement.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not see how it is more so than any other part of the system by which our $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 is collected.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as attending the trains is concerned, I should think you might embrace that in the daily duty of some officer, letting him begin his work in the day at a later hour. Of course, I can understand how he should have overtime if the train is late. But when you expect a train every day in the year at a stated hour, it is a matter almost of necessity to have some one there in order to transact

the business of the customs. Now, why should we call that overtime?

Mr. PATERSON. We are working overtime now. They put in their ten hours and if they put in two hours more we pay them for it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose a train comes in at 8 o'clock at night or 6 o'clock in the morning, and you know it is expected at that hour every day in the year, why is it necessary to deal with it as something unusual when you know that in the ordinary course it will come in at those hours?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman would not advocate an officer having two hours of his time taken up without paying him?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not suggest anything of the kind.

Mr. PATERSON. A train arrives at 8 o'clock, we will suppose, in the morning at Winnipeg or Montreal. The cartage company start working at 7 o'clock in the morning; they want to get their goods, and we must have certain officers there. It is a piece of economy to pay certain officers overtime instead of having a regular staff for the purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If you require the service of a man at 6 o'clock in the morning let him leave at a corresponding earlier hour in the afternoon, or if there is another train at 8 o'clock or 10 o'clock in the evening, let the man who has to deal with that begin his work at a later hour in the day.

Mr. PATERSON. What the hon. gentleman suggests can be done, but it can only be done by adding to the staff.

Mr. FOSTER. As the minister has shown us where $90,000 of this vote is to be found, what is the gross amount that is estimated for salaries?

Mr. PATERSON. It would be the balance of that vote.

Mr. FOSTER. No, there are other items. This brings out again the concealed nature of these votes and the impossibility of having any parliamentary control over them. You have here $1,750,000, and for anything that is contained in the direction of this vote you can spend a million of that on overtime, or half a million of it on contingent expenses, and you can call anything you like a contingent expense. Now, that kind of vote is the blindest, and that is the least responsible way of making up estimates. It gives the minister power that he ought not to have, because it puts the whole amount of money into his hands and he can appropriate just as much as he pleases to each of the three divisions. I would like to know what is the amount that the minister asks us to vote for salaries.

Mr. PATERSON. About $1,450,000.

Mr. FOSTER. And about how much for contingent expenses?

Mr. PATERSON. About $150,000. As a matter of fact, the expenditure for nine months for salaries to the 31st of October amounted to $940,895.

Mr. FOSTER. What was expended last year for salaries ?

Mr. PATERSON. Last year the expenditure was $1,601,000 for those three items.

Mr. FOSTER. That is exactly the demerit of this vote. It is a concealed vote, and I would like to have it definitely on 'Hansard' so that we may have something on which to bring the minister up.

Mr. PATERSON. For the nine months the salaries were $869,885.50 ; overtime, $60,636.35 ; and contingencies, $78,938.70.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the anticipated increase in overtime ?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot state definitely what portion of the $80,000 will be used but approximately it is estimated that we will require $50,000 for increased salaries and $30,000 for additional officers and increased expenditure on contingencies.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you divide that ?

Mr. PATERSON. We do not divide them, we cannot tell that until it is expended.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister should have his estimate.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think it is at all necessary. I am asking for the vote and it will be paid as it has been in the past.

Mr. FOSTER. The lack of definite estimate in these votes does not lead to economy of expenditure or to the clearness the House wants before giving money to the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. If I should give a definite estimate, say $10,000, it may not be correct. New lines of steamers may run to this country or new lines of railway enter and in that way the information given now might be misleading.

Mr. FOSTER. You have estimated for over time, salaries, and contingencies on the general run of your business in the past. All we want is that the minister should cut up his $80,000 into what would be required for each of these three divisions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is done in the estimates of other departments.

Mr. PATERSON. In the old times it used to be done for each province but if you ran short of your estimate for one province and had more than sufficient for another province you would not be allowed to take the overplus and a supplementary estimate had to be brought down for the province with respect to which there was a deficiency. We are one Dominion and it is the same service, and it is a far better plan to take the vote for the whole Dominion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not advocate any division by provinces. Why should not this huge item of nearly $3,000,000 be divided so that we might see how much goes for each service? I am opposed to supplementary estimates and for my part I would be prepared to give the minister a liberal allowance so that he would not be obliged at the end of the year to resort to a supplementary estimate.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Customs must not go away with the idea that I want the old division by provinces. We are one Dominion and the vote is for the service of the Dominion, but there is no reason why it should not be divided so that we may see what goes for each service. Under the English system the estimates are submitted to the House with great minuteness of detail and explanations are even given in the estimates, which is much better than trying to get it by question and answer from an unwilling minister as appears to be at present the case. We have got so far that we are told that there is $50,000 for increases in salaries; is that a guess of the minister?

Mr. PATERSON. It is an estimate.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not founded on making up your mind as to who ought have increases of salary.

Mr. PATERSON. That has not been considered yet. I have applications for, increases from various officers and I told them I had not money to pay their salaries to say nothing of giving them increases.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the minister asks $50,000 to increase the salaries of officers should he not lay before the House the grounds upon which he considers these officers are entitled to increases? Is parliament or is the minister to be the judge of that? If increases are asked for under the civil government appropriation we are told what officers are to get increases.

Mr. PATERSON. The Act provides for that.

Mr. FOSTER. The proper time to consider what officers you should increase is before you ask parliament for a vote for that purpose. It must be assumed that parliament will ask what officers are going to get increases of salaries and the minister should have that information. Will the minister tell us what collectors are to get increases?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister does not know he had better not ask for this appropriation.

Mr. PATERSON. If you don't give it to me all right.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all very well for the minister to say that, but we should have the information before we vote the money. The time for the minister to make up his mind as to what officers shall get an increase in salary is before he asks parliament for the money. The hon. minister had better take the trouble of getting the information for the committee before he asks it to vote. Why does he want this $50,000? Whose salaries is he going to increase? He does not know, but he wants to be the beneficent father and get the lump sum from parliament without giving the information as to what he wants it for, and then scatter it around as he pleases. It is parliament that should decide whether a man should have an increase or not.

Mr. PATERSON. How do you know whether a man should have an increase or not?

Mr. FOSTER. The government might as well come down at once and in a single line ask for $100,000,000 for the expenses of the government; that is the reductio ad absurdum of the hon. gentleman's position. The minister knows that that is not the proper way to put estimates before a committee. So I want to ask the minister again what he proposes to spend in extra overtime, what he proposes to expend in extra contingent expenses and what salaries he proposes to increase for this $25 increase with this $50,000, and what reasons he has giving any increases.

Mr. PATERSON. There was $150,000 odd voted last year for increases of salaries, and that was given without a word. The proper criticism would be, what did you do with the money voted last year? I have the list of payments here. The hon. gentleman asks me how much I propose to spend in overtime next year. I am asking for $10,000 more, but I do not propose to spend a cent of it if I can help it; but I may be compelled under our rule of paying thirty cents an hour to spend the whole of it, or perhaps only $6,000 or perhaps only $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister knows that he has to tell this committee what money he wants and the purpose for which he

wants it. After having been entrusted last year with money on these conditions, it is his duty to answer our questions as to what he did with the moneys entrusted to him last year, and then we will compare the results with his promises. But before he gets this vote, I want him to tell us what he proposes to do with the increase we are giving him this year. If he is going to increase salaries, let us know whose salaries he intends to increase.

Mr. PATERSON. Ask that next year.

Mr. FOSTER. I want it this year, before he has expended the money. The minister is clearly up against it. Before he gets this vote, he has to tell this committee what he proposes to do with this money. Is the minister ready to tell us that?

Mr. PATERSON. I have told you what I have to say.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have not told us what we want to know. The minister has no more information?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I will let that simmer for a while. What are the different grades of officers and how much money is devoted to the salaries of each grade ?

Mr. PATERSON. You will find the officers in the Civil Service List.

Mr. FOSTER. What are your principal officers?

Mr. PATERSON. The principal officer in Montreal is Robert White. Under the Civil Service Act we have collectors, inspectors, surveyors, assistant surveyors, tide surveyors, chief landing waiters. Then there are technical officers. Then there are clerks in the customs office.

Mr. FOSTER. You have collectors first ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What amount of this money goes to pay the collectors ?

Mr. PATERSON. The amount they are paid now.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is that ?

Mr. PATERSON. At the ports of Toronto, Montreal and I think Winnipeg they are paid $4,000 ; at Quebec and Halifax I think $3,200.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Is the minister going to take into consideration the services of the collector of customs at Charlottetown in a matter respecting the infringement of the Inland Revenue Act ? The charge was laid before him that a certain firm of tobacco manufacturers in Charlottetown had committed during 1907 infringements of the law with respect to the placing of stamps on the tobacco manufactured by them. The matter was represented to the officers of the Inland Revenue Department but they did not see fit to discharge their duty. Probably they did not know what it was or they may have believed that no infringement had taken place. The complainants consequently were compelled to go to to the collector of customs at Charlottetown, Mr. W. B. Robinson, a very worthy gentleman and a good officer. Mr. Robinson informed the commissioner of customs of the complaint made. Previous to Mr. Robinson's information to the department, some communications took place between the officers of the Inland Revenue Department at Charlottetown and the deputy head in Ottawa. At the request of the parties who were aggrieved, I moved for the papers and an order was voted on March 16, in consequence of which the papers were laid on the table. The case may be one the minister may not have heard of, although I know it was before his deputy commissioner and he referred it to the Inland Revenue Department. It is now I consider, my duty to lay it before the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue in order that they may see that justice is done the parties aggrieved and the public. The first communication is as follows :

Inland Revenue Division No. 1, Charlottetown,
Prince Edward Island,

August 5, 1907.

W. J. Gerald, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to state that rumours of tobacco being sold 'out of packages' have reached this office. Kings county seems to be the habitat. I have requested Inspector Burke to come over sooner than usual, although he is due some time this month when we might make some arrangements to make seizures. In the meantime I have sent officer Moore to one or two places to investigate and have also instructed him on his collecting tours to visit shops where tobacco is sold and seize in every case illicitly exposed tobacco. I have made requisition to-day for forms.

Question—Is it necessary to remove tobacco seized. I mean to take possession.

I am your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) SAMUEL C. NASH,
Collector Inland Revenue.

This is the answer :

Ottawa, August 8, 1907.

S. C. Nash, Esq.,
Collector of Inland Revenue, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Sir,—I am in receipt of your communication of the 5th instant respecting the rumoured sale of unstamped tobacco within your division and requesting to be advised as to the necessity for taking possession of such tobacco in case of seizure.

In reply thereto I beg to state that if tobacco is so seized it becomes the property of the Crown and if the facts warrant its seizure

they certainly necessitate taking possession of the goods seized.

In connection of the matter of seizure of tobacco, out of stamped packages, great care should be used by our officials to endeavour to ascertain if it is a case of fraud or of simple ignorance of the law. While it is true that the latter is no justification for the wrong-doing it is a factor that should have some weight with our officials.

In any case whether tobacco is so found or not our officer should explain to dealers visited the provisions of the law respecting the sale of tobacco and, if these dealers have not been supplied with circular G.—155, a copy thereof should be delivered to each person visited and should be mailed to persons who are not so personally called upon.

I remain, sir,

Your obedient servant,

Deputy Minister.

The next communication came from the Hickey & Nicholson Tobacco Company, Charlottetown. It seems that although these reports were made to the officers of the Inland Revenue Department, no notice was taken of them with the exception of the letter I have just read. The parties aggrieved are the Hickey & Nicholson Tobacco Company, Limited, who were doing business in Charlottetown as manufacturers of tobacco. They were informed by their selling agent that tobacco was being sold throughout Prince Edward Island with only one-half stamp upon the packages.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Surely this discussion is not in order in connection with the salaries of customs officers.

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely in order.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. These tobaccos were sold at lower prices than the ordinary manufacturer could sell them. The Hickey & Nicholson Manufacturing Company believed a fraud was committed, not only upon the public, but upon the government of Canada, and by reason of the fact that the company could not obtain the services of the Inland Revenue officials in order to ferret out the guilty parties they went to the collector of customs in Charlottetown.

But Mr. Nicholson thought he would not get justice at their hands and wrote this letter to Mr. Robertson.

Charlottetown, P.E.I.,
August 9, 1907.

W. B. Robertson, Esq.,
Collector of Customs.

Sir,—Our Mr. Harnett has drawn my attention to gross violations of the Excise and Customs Act and I have reported the same to other officers some time ago but up to the present no action has been taken or likely to. I therefore report same to you now and demand that you take immediate action and our Mr. Harnett will accompany you to the identical goods.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) HICKEY & NICHOLSON,
Tobacco Company, Ltd.
D. NICHOLSON.

Mr. Robertson, in pursuance of the information which he had received, went to Lower Montague and discovered irregularities with respect to some tobacco sold by the firm of T. B. & D. J. Riley, and that fraud had been committed against the people and government of this country. He reported it to the Commissioner of Customs.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I renew the point of order that I have already raised. All this has nothing to do with the customs and therefore is irrelevant. My hon friend (Mr. A. A. McLean) is reading from a return which he moved for with respect to certain violations of the excise law in Prince Edward Island. It has no connection with the customs, except that complaint was made to the collector of customs at Charlottetown.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there was a connection between the Inland Revenue and the Customs officer.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Complaint was made to the customs officer—but he had nothing to do with it.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, he had.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He wrote two letters. But that has no connection with the item under discussion. It has to do with the Inland Revenue Department. And if, when my items are under discussion, the hon. gentleman desires explanations and cares to read the entire return in order to get it on 'Hansard' there will be no objection. In this case, action was taken and a fine was imposed.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. No fine was imposed.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I submit that this has nothing to do with the item under discussion.

Mr. FOWLER. Speaking on the point of order—

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. A point of order is not debatable in committee.

Mr. FOWLER. I regret to see these evidences of jealousy between the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Customs. The Minister of Inland Revenue seems jealous of the fact that the officer of his department had nothing to do with it, but it was strange that he should manifest that feeling so openly in the House. This, however, is merely preliminary, and I believe that preliminary remarks have been held by the chairman to be in order. As

to the point of order, I think that the Minister of Inland Revenue has answered himself, for he stated that action was taken by an official of the Customs department.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I did not admit anything of the kind.

Mr. FOWLER. But the officer did act. Does the minister pretend to contradict a statement made in a report by this official? Surely he will not have—to use an expression of one of these hon. gentlemen this afternoon—the audacity to question the statement of the Mr. Robertson, the collector of customs, who is a reputable man, a man of irreproachable character.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My point is that it is not relevant.

Mr. FOWLER. But why not. The collector of customs was appealed to and acted.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. A point of order cannot be discussed in committee.

Mr. FOWLER. It must be discussed. How otherwise is the chairman going to know how to rule?

Mr. FOSTER. The salary of this same officer is included in this item.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes. And surely we have a right to discuss his salary. I appeal to the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) on this point. I would not appeal to either the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) or the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) because they are interested and could hardly be expected to give a fair opinion. But I would like the Postmaster General to say whether, when the salary of this officer is under discussion, we have not the right to discuss what this officer did?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. There are two reasons why I asked for this to be discussed and why I consider I have the right to discuss it. The first reason is that Mr. Robertson, collector of customs, has done a great public service in exposing fraud in the Inland Revenue. In the second place, the commissioner of customs authorized Mr. Robertson to undertake this investigation, and I will read his letter:

August 7.

To the Collector of Customs,
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, respecting the irregular stamping of tobacco at your port. You may inquire into and report such irregularities as you find in the tobacco sent out by T. B. and D. J. Riley.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
Commissioner of Customs.

Now here is the direct authority of the commissioner to Mr. Robertson, and surely I am within my rights in discussing this matter. I think that the minister should consider the smallness of his salary, and increase it. Here is the answer which Mr. Robertson returned after he had made his investigation:

Department of Customs, port of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

August 10, 1907.

Sir,—I beg to report that acting on the inclosed letter from the Hickey & Nicholson Company, Limited, I drove to Lower Montague, and called on the firm of W. A. Poole & Company, and while they have no tobacco on hand at the present moment irregularly stamped, I gleaned enough evidence from Mr. George Poole, a member of the firm, to satisfy me that things are not straight so far as the stamping of the tobacco sent out by the firm of T. B. & D. J. Riley, of this city, are concerned, and I am confident that the circumstances are such as would justify a searching investigation and trust that all may meet with your honourable approval.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. B. ROBERTSON,

John McDougald, Esq.,
Commissioner of Customs, Ottawa, Ontario.

Now Mr. Robertson went to the trouble of investigating this matter, and in order to impress upon the officials at Ottawa that his course was a proper one, he obtained declarations from the men who had knowledge of the irregularities complained of. The first declaration is marked 'A' and is as follows:

I, Donald Nicholson, of Charlottetown, a member of the Hickey & Nicholson Tobacco Company, Limited, do hereby declare that during the early spring I called Officer Theop. Moore's attention to the fact that insufficiently stamped tobacco was sold throughout the country, and he promised me to keep a sharp lookout for it.

About the last of July, on his return from Souris, I inquired if he had discovered any such tobacco, and he replied that 'he saw more than he wanted to see.' Viz., 3 caddies of Riley tobacco at Messrs. Mathew & McLeans' and had ordered the clerk to lay them aside as he might require them. He then accompanied me to Mr. Nash and we fully discussed the matter and Mr. Nash agreed to send for the inspector.

Mr. EMMERSON. I rise to a point of order. I do not think it is within the rules of this House that you can take up a return that has been laid upon the table of the House and have it transcribed in the 'Hansard.' The hon. member is doing that now.

Mr. FOSTER. What rule of the House forbids it?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that is a rule of procedure.

Mr. LENNOX. We will discuss the rule of order for a day or two.

Mr. EMMERSON. For several weeks, if you like. I want the point of order determined, and I ask the chairman's ruling.

Mr. FOWLER. I suggest that there is no such rule as the hon. gentleman refers to, this is a figment of the hon. gentleman's imagination.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a well understood rule of parliament.

Mr. FOWLER. That is a rule of the New Brunswick legislature. The hon. gentleman forgets that he is in the House of Commons and not in the New Brunswick legislature.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (reading):

On August 7 our salesman, Mr. Harnett, telephoned me from Georgetown that Messrs. W. A. Poole & Company, Lower Montague, had such tobacco on hand and suggested that I see the Inland Revenue officer at once, and I informed Mr. Moore of it on that date. Mr. Harnett returned home on the 8th, and on the 9th he and I called on Mr. Nash urging that they take immediate action and offering to drive the officer to where it was sold, but Mr. Moore being out of town and Mr. Nash, who treated the matter somewhat lightly, was too busy, so we called on the collector of customs and demanded that he take immediate action. On Mr. Harnett's agreeing to accompany him they left on the morning of the 10th for Lower Montague.

Inspector Burke arrived here on the 12th, and on the 14th sent for me, after a short interview we parted and he, I am told, left for home on the 15th, and so far we have not heard if anything has been done.

(Sgd.) DONALD NICHOLSON,
President of Company.

Signed and declared before me at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, this 22nd day of August, A.D. 1907.

(Sgd.) W. B. ROBERTSON,
Collector.

Mr. Burke who is referred to in this declaration is the inspector of Inland Revenue for the maritime provinces, I am told, and has jurisdiction over the officers in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. EMMERSON. Has he jurisdiction over customs?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. No, inland revenue. I want to show that if the Inland Revenue Department neglects their duty we have a good man in Mr. Robertson who did not fail in his duty and did this because he thought it was his duty as collector of customs, and he was instructed to do it by the customs inspector.

Mr. TALBOT. I press the point of order which has been raised in connection with this item. It is somewhat mixed up between the Customs Department and the Inland Revenue Department, and so far we have heard nothing that would make us believe that the Customs Department is interested in the question.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Robertson, the collector of customs at Charlottetown, P.E.I., was acting under instructions from the commissioner of customs.

Mr. TALBOT. He has nothing to do with the Customs Department.

Mr. FOWLER. He was acting under written instructions from the commissioner at Ottawa.

Mr. D. ROSS. As I understand the member for Prince Edward Island moved for a return in connection with some matters relating to the Department of Inland Revenue. He is spreading that return on 'Hansard.' There are really two points of order, first, whether the reading of this return is relevant to the discussion, and, second, whether the return can be put on 'Hansard' in that surreptitious way.

Mr. FOSTER. Returns are asked and brought down in order to give an opportunity to a member of discussing the subject matter of the return. I do not think that point of order can be seriously raised.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The collector of customs was notified that there was a violation of the excise law and the customs law, but it was found there was no violation of the customs law whatever. The Collector of Customs at Charlottetown communicated with the Commissioner of Customs and some correspondence between them ensued. However, the question referred absolutely to the Inland Revenue and the Commissioner of Customs could not and did not give any instructions in respect to the Inland Revenue Department. When the matter got into the hands of the inland revenue officers Inspector Burke went to the island and investigated and one of the manufacturers of tobacco was fined I think $200 for a violation of the excise law and then the matter ended. It is entirely an inland revenue matter and I submit it is out of order to discuss it on a vote for the Customs Department. Apparently the discussion is going on now only for the purpose of killing time.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister omitted to state the most important feature and that is that the Collector of Customs issued instructions in writing which I submit makes it relevant to this discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would like to deal with the point of order that has been raised.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I want to discuss the point of order. The Minister of Inland Revenue will find that the officers of the customs have something to do with the inland revenue.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Not in this case.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. It was the duty of the Collector of Customs to collect the duty on imported leaf and not to allow any infringement of the law.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The hon. gentleman is in error. The 10 cents a pound on the imported leaf is paid to the Inland Revenue.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Any child knows that that imported leaf has to be entered in the customs. Here is a declaration which was sent by the Collector of Customs at Charlottetown to the Commissioner of Customs and I have a right to read it.

Mr. PATERSON. Did the Collector of Customs ask you to bring this matter up ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. He did not.

Mr. PATERSON. How is the hon. gentleman concerned in this matter?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. As a representative of the people the same as you are when you do your duty.

Mr. PATERSON. You brought this up on the pretense that you are trying to right a wrong that is being done to an officer when the fact is that the real object is to attempt to prevent the customs officers of his country getting their wages paid, and that attempt is made under the leadership of the member for North Toronto seconded by the member for Beauharnois and advocated by the member for Kings and Albert and the member for Queens, P.E.I. It is well to know just who is determined to keep these men from getting their wages paid.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The minister is altogether astray. I came here in November last and from that day to this the government have never brought the customs estimates before the House. They have delayed the business of the country for some reason which nobody on this side of the House knows.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are bringing it up now and now is the accepted time.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. And I am bringing this matter up now.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I ask the ruling of the chair on the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that extracts may be read from any public document or newspapers or books but the reading of the whole document is not permitted. Of course it must be relevant.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I shall not read the whole of the documents. I wish to read this affidavit which shows the number of places where the goods were found which had been irregularly and illegally stocked :

I, Evelyn B. Harnett, a member of the firm of Hickey and Nicholson Tobacco Company, Limited, acting as travelling salesman for the Lower provinces do hereby solemnly affirm that I examined tobacco sent out by the firm of Mrssrs. T. B. and D. J. Riley, of Charlottetown on the dates and at the places mentioned below, and found it insufficiently stamped and noted same in my memorandum book viz.:

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Now, Mr. chairman, I think we have heard enough of this affidavit to clearly convince the House that it is not relevant to the question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. What the hon. gentleman is reading, I think, relates to inland revenue and not to customs.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. This is in a letter which was addressed to the Commissioner of Customs at Ottawa, by the collector of customs at Charlottetown, and it relates to duties which he performed at the request of the Minister of Customs.

1907.

August 26, Clarke Bros., Mount Stewart, 5 caddies with ½ stamps on.

August 26, R. and H. Cox, Morell, 1 caddy with ¼ stamps on.

May 1, P. McNutt, Malpecque, 8 caddies with ½ stamps on.

May 1, P. McNutt, Malpecque, 2 caddies with no stamps on.

May 9, Mathews and McLean, Souris, 9 caddies with ½ stamps on.

May 9, Mathews and McLean, Souris, 1 caddie with no stamps on.

July 9, J. H. Migrette, Tignish, 11 caddies with ½ stamps on.

July 9, J. J. Arsenault, Tignish, 3 caddies with ½ stamps on.

July 11, R. Ellis, Jr., Conway, 3 caddies with ½ stamps on.

July 17, M. Kennedy, Bradoltane, 1 caddie with ½ stamps on.

July 17, Mr. Kennedy, Bradoltane, 1 caddie with no stamps on.

July 18, Joseph Gallant, Rusticoville, 1 caddie with ½ stamps on.

July 18, G. S. McLeod, Hunter's river, 3 caddies with ½ stamps on.

July 23, Alex. Robertson, Red Point, 4 caddies with ½ stamps on.

May 24, Sherns Bros., Souris, 3 caddies with ½ stamps on.

July 24, A. McIsaac, Souris, 3 caddies with ½ stamps on.

July 24, Stern, Son & Co., Souris, 2 caddies with ½ stamps on.

July 24, J. J. Hughes, Souris, 2 caddies with ½ stamps on.

About May 15, last I met Mr. Moore of the Inland Revenue Department at our factory and in the presence of Mr. D. Nicholson informed him that I had seen insufficiently stamped tobacco and urged them to look into the matter.

On August 7, I visited Lower Montague, and found at the store of Messrs. W. A. Poole & Company, 5 caddies of Riley's tobacco, 1 full stamped, 3 half stamped and one without stamps and I reported this to Mr. Nicholson by telephone from Georgetown and suggested that he see the inland revenue officer at once. I returned to Charlottetown on the evening of the 8th instant, and on the 9th I

called on Mr. Nash to discuss the matter, and as he treated it so lightly, I in company with Mr. Nicholson called on the collector of customs and I demanded that he give it immediate attention, and I volunteered to where it was exposed for sale. On the 10th the collector and I drove to Lower Montague and called on Messrs. W. A. Poole & Company and was told that George Riley, of Charlottetown, a brother to T. W. Riley and father to D. J. Riley, drove to their store on the 8th of August and of his own free will and without being requested by W. A. Poole took possession and carried away two caddies without stamps, promising to return fresh stock instead, and left one caddie with half stamps on partly used on the shelf.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is this in order Mr. Chairmaan ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not hear the reading of the letter from the collector. I have some doubts whether this is relevant or not and I suppose the hon. gentleman should have the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. R. R. McLEAN (reading) :

On the 9th Mr. Moore who was out collecting samples of food called at Messrs. Poole's store and inquired if Mr. Riley had been there lately, and when told he was there on the 8th he looked over the stock of tobacco on hand. One caddie with stamps and one with half stamps partly used on the shelf, which was opened in the end, he, Mr. Moore, took the hatchet and opened it on the side remarking that was the proper way to open it, and after the collector held a conversation with Mr. Poole, one of the firm, we returned to town.

On the evening of the 13th I, in company with Robert W. D. M. Rattery, foreman of one factory, called on Inspector Burke at the Queen's Hotel, and after discussing the matter Mr. Burke informed us that he had no idea of the seriousness of the offence and promised to see Mr. Nicholson in the morning. Mr. Burke returned home on the morning of the 15th and so far as I am aware nothing has been done.

(Sgd.) EVELYN B. HARNETT.

Signed and declared before me at Charlottetown, in Prince Edward Island, this the 22nd day of August, A.D. 1907.

(Sgd.) W. B. ROBERTSON,
Collector.

September 18, 1907.

R. R. Farrow, Esq.,
Assistant Commissioner of Customs, Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 16th instant transmitting for the perusal of this department, customs file No. 69548 respecting the alleged improper manner of stamping of packages of tobacco by a manufacturer in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. I thank you for bringing this matter under the notice of this department.

Copies have been made of the correspondence and the case will be referred to the proper officer for investigation. Your file is returned herewith.

I remain, sir,
Your obedient servant,
Deputy Minister.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. You have already heard Mr. Chairman all the correspondence from the collector of customs at Charlottetown, the commissioner and assistant commissioner up to the time that correspondence was transferred to the Inland Revenue Department. The letter last read my hon. friend said was written by the Deputy Minister of Customs. He meant to say the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, written to the assistant commissioner of Customs. He is now proceeding to real a letter written by the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue to Mr. Lawlor, of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. This is part of the whole case.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The papers have been transferred to the Inland Revenue Department, where they should always have been. This is not a matter which effects the Customs estimates. It will come up properly on the Inland Revenue estimates.

Mr. A. A. MACLEAN. The Minister of Inland Revenue is altogether astray. He has forgotten what is on this file. There are not only letters there from his own department but letters from Customs officials which I will read :

September 23, 1907.

H. Lawlor, Esq.,
Inspector of Tobacco Factories, Inland Revenue, Montreal, Quebec.

Sir,—I beg to forward herewith copies of correspondence transmitted to this department by the Customs, representing irregularities in connection with the stamping of packages of tobacco.

This question should receive immediate attention and if you are, at the present time, unable to go east, would it not be well to place the papers in the hands of Deputy Collector Caven, who is thoroughly conversant with tobacco factory work, and allow him to investigate the report.

I remain, sir,
Your obedient servant,
Deputy Minister.

Department of Customs,

Ottawa, September 16, 1907.

W. J. Gerald, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, Ottawa.

Sir,—I send you the above noted file for perusal re stamping of tobacco sent out by T. B. & D. J. Riley, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) R. R. FARROW,
Assistant Commissioner of Customs.

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,
September 23, 1907.

T. Burke, Esq.,
St. John, New Brunswick.

Dear Sir,—I am forwarding you my contingent, incluing Officer Moore's account for the past year, in all $49.80.

I think your motion in sending Officer Fitzpatrick (a gentleman, officially and civilly) an

exceedingly wise one; and I am quite positive that the educative work he has executed, in all the places of business, in town and country, and they are many that he has visited, will be of real and lasting benefit to the department and result in making matters go with less friction even than heretofore. There is no doubt that a strange officer whose official knowledge like Mr. Fitzpatrick's is thorough, added to his pleasant manner, has greater effect on dealers than the duties of a home officer, however well meant.

Hoping you are well,

I am yours truly,
(Sgd.) SAMUEL C. NASH.

Inland Revenue Inspection, Canada.
District A, N.B., N.S., and P.E.I.,
St. John, N.B., October 2, 1907.

W. J. Gerald, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—In view of rumours I heard when in Charlottetown in August last with reference to tobacco stamping, &c., I decided to send Officer Fitzpatrick over to make a thorough investigation I beg to inclose herewith his report, also Collector Nash's letter to me *re* his visit.

Preventive Officer Kelly went over the ground years ago at the request of the late Inspector Borradaille and the local officer Mr. Moore has been frequently over the territory.

Mr. Fitzpatrick being thoroughly up in the business and absolutely unknown on the island was my reason for entrusting him with the case.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) T. BURKE, D.J.

The next letter is from Mr. Fitzpatrick to Mr. Blake, the report he made after leaving St. John :

Inland Revenue, Canada, Division No. 6,
St. John.
St. John, N.B., October 2, 1907.

T. Burke, Esq.,
District Inspector of Inland Revenue,
St. John, N.B.

Sir,—In compliance with your instructions to proceed to Prince Edward Island and see how the requirements of the law and of G—155 were being observed as to the stamping and opening of packages of tobacco and cigars, &c.'

I beg leave to report that I left St. John, N.B., at noon on Thursday, September 12, and proceeded to Charlottetown. Next day I called on Collector Nash and Deputy Collector Moore who advised me how best to carry out your orders. I travelled over the whole island from Charlottetown east to Souris and Georgetown, and west to Summerside and Tignish. In all I visited 19 towns as follows: Charlottetown, Mount Stewart, Morrell's, St. Peter's Bay, Souris, Souris West, Cardigan, Georgetown, Montague, Lower Montague, Hunter river, Bradalbane, Emerald Junction, Kensington, Malpeque, Summerside, O'Leary, Alberton, Tignish.

I called on 129 dealers, wholesale and retail, and did not find a single instance where I felt that I would be justified in making a seizure. I found several cases of tobacco out of boxes and of boxes improperly opened but in all cases satisfactory explanations were made. I explained the law, also the provisions of G—715, to the dealers and endeavoured to make clear what was required of them.

At the store of P. McNutt & Sons, Malpeque, I found a box of Empire Company's Tobacco (unopened) from which the corner bearing the stamp was missing and reported same to Mr. Collector Nash. Deputy Collector Moore stated that he had found the same package and was satisfied that the damage was done in opening the crate in which the tobacco was shipped and I fully agree with Mr. Moore in his finding. This was the only case where I found the stamp missing and I examined wherever possible the wholesale as well as the retail stocks of dealers.

At Souris I felt suspicious of a Frenchman named Chiasson whose place of business is a rendezvous for fishermen. Chiasson had considerable twist and other tobaccos out of boxes and claimed not to know the law. I reported the matter of the collector at Charlottetown. In the evening I drove over to Souris West to the store of Thomas Kickham who I am told has considerable dealings with St. Pierre and Miquelon. I found that he had tobacco out of boxes and used this as an excuse to get up stairs in the warehouse to show the clerk how to open packages and incidentally see if there was anything irregular. I did not find anything wrong and left a copy of the regulations. Mr. Moore will give both these people particular attention on his next visit.

After making a very thorough and careful survey of the island I can only report that outside of these little irregularities to be found in every place in Canada, the law is well observed particularly in Charlottetown, and in the places visited by Mr. Moore on his food inspection trips.

Collector Nash and Deputy Moore were very kind in giving information as to routes and best places to visit. Trusting that my work has been satisfactorily performed and that a better compliance with the law and regulations will result therefrom.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. J. FITZPATRICK,
Excise officer.

Now, section 136 of the Inland Revenue Act requires——

Mr. TALBOT. I appeal to you again, Mr. Chairman, is this in order ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion of an infraction of the Inland Revenue law could not be allowed, as it would not be relevant. But any thing connected with the customs would probably be on a different footing.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. But the papers were sent to the Customs.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That would not make a discussion of an infraction of

the Inland Revenue Act relevant in this discussion.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. But they sent Mr. Fitzpatrick over at the request of the Commissioner of Customs. Mr. Robertson was not enough, so the Inland Revenue Department sent over Mr. Caven. who went into the matter carefully, and he found out the report sent by Mr. Robertson to the Department of Customs was strictly correct. He did his duty.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. This question has been gone over with sufficient latitude surely.

Mr. TAYLOR. This man was sent by the customs officer and he was paid by the Customs.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This can be discussed under an Inland Revenue vote but not under a Customs vote.

Mr. A. A. McCLEAN. The next proceeding was a voluntary payment by D. J. Riley to the Department of Inland Revenue of the sum of $200, which this department evidently accepted in full satisfaction. The document signed by Mr. D. J. Riley reads as follows :

I hereby abandon the sum of $200 deposited with Mr. S. C. Nash, Collector of Inland Revenue, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. This abandonment is made under Section 136 of the Inland Revenue Act.

(Sgd.) D. J. RILEY.

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,
October 10, 1907.

Then Mr. Farrow, the Assistant Commissioner of Customs. writes to Mr. Robertson on the 10th of January, 1908 :

Sir,—On September 18 last, we transmitted to the Deputy Minister of the Department of Inland Revenue here your letter of August 22 last with declarations referred to therein, respecting the irregular stamping of tobacco by a manufacturer in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

The Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue sent to this department on the 7th instant the inclosed cheque No. 1859 for the sum of $50 being share in distribution of penalties imposed for violation of the Inland Revenue Act under the information contained in your reference to this department.

He requests this department to be good enough to procure receipts for this payment and forward the same to him.

Will you therefore be good enough to send us a receipt for this payment at your early convenience in order that the same may be transmitted to the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) R. R. FARROW,
Assistant Commissioner of Customs.

Inclosed cheque.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is persistently refusing to obey the ruling of the chair, and he is deliberately putting everything in that return on the 'Hansard,' and if you permit him to go on he will have the remaining pages on the 'Hansard.'

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not think the chairman ever made such a ruling. When I read letters from the Assistant Commissioner of Customs to the collector of customs surely I am within my rights. Then on the 16th of January, Mr. Robertson answered that letter in this way :

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,
January 16, 1908.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge yours of the 10th instant, under file 69548, with stated inclosure, which I return herewith for endorsement.

As it is not clear to me who is entitled to participate, and as you have the correspondence, kindly say what receipts are necessary.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient sevant,
(Sgd.) W. B. ROBERTSON,
Collector.

R. R. Farrow, Esq.,
Assistant Commissioner of Customs, Ottawa, Ontario.

On the 21st of January, Mr. Robertson received this answer from the Assistant Commissioner of Customs :

Ottawa, January 21, 1908.

W. B. Robertson, Esq.,
Collector of Customs, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th instant returning cheque No. 1859 of the Department of Inland Revenue for the sum of $50, as you state it is not clear to you to whom this money should be paid. It appears to me from the correspondence in this case that the original information upon which the investigation was based respecting the irregular stamping of tobacco was given by Mr. Harnett, a traveller for the Hickey & Nicholson Tobacco Company, Limited. Such being the case I am of the opinion that the amount should be paid to Mr. Harnett, and if you concur in this you will be good enough to so dispose of the money and forward Mr. Harnett's receipt for the same to this department for transmission to the Department of Inland Revenue.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) R. R. FARROW,
Assistant Commissioner of Customs.

Mr. Harnett was offered the sum of $50 mentioned in the correspondence and promptly refused to accept the same, as he believed the aceptance of the sum of $200 by the department was wrong and an inadequate punishment for the offence committed.

I bring this before the minister to show him that there is an officer in Charlottetown who knew how to do his duty and who taught the officers in the Inland Revenue Department how they should do their duty.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Just to have it on record, let it be known that the hon. member (Mr. A. A. McLean) has wasted two hours in an effort to prevent the salary of this man being voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want an explanation of this payment of $18,647 for overtime at Montreal. For the year that would be $24,000 for overtime. Would it not be better to hire more men and not have this overtime ? For instance, Mr. V. Balthazard received $299 for overtime.

Mr. PATERSON. He must have put in the time.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister misled the House for if this man had worked 365 days at 30 cents an hour for two hours a day, it would only be $219.

Mr. PATERSON. I am informed that in summer time they are allowed to work five hours if necessary during the rush.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the minister's statement is not correct.

Mr. PATERSON. It is, two hours is the rule.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then E. Bernard drew $235, J. B. Birks $253, L. Bryan $338 and there are a score of others.

Mr. PATERSON. We satisfied the Auditor General, it has passed him with the vouchers.

Mr. TAYLOR. The people's money is being simply spilled out in payment of this overtime.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a poor show for them this year.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not the fault of the opposition, why did you not bring down your estimates six months ago ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Why don't you vote them now ?

Mr. TAYLOR. They will not go through now. Let the government withdraw clauses 1 and 17 of the Election Bill and they will get their estimates in a very few minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Finance said the opposition had no rights in this House except such as the majority choose to give them. They have the right to remedy grievances on going into Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. They get that from the majority under the rules of the House which are made by the majority.

Mr. TAYLOR. We showed them what we could do by holding them here from Thursday night until Saturday night.

Mr. FIELDING. You can hold us here but that does not alter the facts.

Mr. TAYLOR. After the negotiations and promises made in reference to the Election Bill, I am surprised at the government trying to force their estimates through when every one thought the difficulty was settled. If the government is going to go back on it then we will stay here, as our leader said, until we are thinner than a pipe stem before we let the Election Bill through.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman says the estimates will go through in two minutes if we do something else, which indicates that the estimates are all right in themselves and so any questions that are asked wehther they are pertinent or impertinent are asked to cause obstruction and to waste the time of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. The opposition have a right to withhold Supply until their grievance is remedied. The opposition are not going to let this government inflict an unsecret ballot on the people so that they can buy up the whole country. They will not be allowed to put that nefarious Bill through parliament.

Mr. EMMERSON. What has that got to do with starving the civil servants?

Mr. TAYLOR. Tell us you will withdraw that Bill and the civil servants will get their pay immediately.

Mr. PATERSON. But you say these estimates are all right.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are all wrong. We will vote enough to pay the civil servants. We will give them a month's salary or two months' salary.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend probably knows that we made an application some days ago, not in a public way but in a way that was well understood, for a grant of money to pay the civil servants and an intimation was given to us that hon. gentleman opposite would not facilitate that grant. When my hon. friend now says that the opposition will pay a month's salary I say they had a chance to do it some few days ago and they refused.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not correct; you don't know what took place or you would not make that statement.

Mr. FIELDING I know very well.

Mr. TAYLOR. We were quite prepared to do that and we understood the bargain was practically closed.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Talk about the election Bill when you come to it.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have come to it several times. Bring on the Bill now and we will discuss it.

Mr. PATERSON. In the meantime we want to pay the civil servants.

Mr. TAYLOR. The opposition have rights and they will maintain them.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Have you a right to keep these people out of their money?

Mr. FOSTER. The government is doing that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Say you will drop clauses 1 and 17 and you will get your vote, or, dissolve the House and go to the country whichever you like. We are prepared to meet you any place.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has many times talked about dissolving the House and going to the country, and when we did go to the country and came back we found the hon. gentleman still doing business at the same old stand on the opposition side of the House. We have no reason to doubt that will be the result when the time comes again. Meantime let there be no misunderstanding. We are not discussing the election Bill; we are discussing the question of giving these customs officers their money. The hon. gentleman says the opposition have rights; yes, they have the right to obstruct and they are exercising that right but we want the country to know that. They are not content with criticising the government, they are not content with punishing the government if they like to call it that; they want to punish the men throughout the length and breadth of Canada who need this money and hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to give it to them. The opposition are not punishing the government; they are punishing the custom officers who want their money and cannot get it because of the opposition, and we would like the country to understand that.

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend were out in the country he would understand that the feeling is that clauses 1 and 17 of that Bill should not be allowed to pass. That is the feeling of both the Liberals and Conservatives in the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Vote against the Bill when the time comes.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Prime Minister said his only recourse would be dissolution and we welcome dissolution.

Mr. FIELDING. We may have to come to it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then we are ready for you.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend does not act as if he were ready.

Mr. TAYLOR. In what way?

Mr. FIELDING. Because for six months of this session hon. gentlemen opposite have been obstructing public business so that they might prevent an election during the current year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Don't you think we are right in not letting you go to the country with loaded dice?

Mr. FIELDING. Now you don't want us to go to the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. We won't let you go to the country with an unsecret ballot and power to enfranchise Doukhobors and Galicians.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That is good stuff in the Northwest.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, the Northwest was here a few days ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Mr. Bob Rogers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Ask the Prime Minister what he heard from the Northwest and the arrangement he made with the Northwest, and in view of that why are we here at 4 o'clock in the morning kept by the government with their large majority trying to force estimates through?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. We will just have as big a majority after the dissolution and a bigger majority.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is nothing so uncertain as a horse race and an election, and when the election is over my hon. friend will find he has come out second best.

Mr. EMMERSON. Don't boast.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not boasting. I said we are ready for dissolution and so we are. I want an explanation of what these individual men did for this money.

Mr. PATERSON. That you will not get, because I cannot give it to you.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have no right to give the minister the money he wants for next year unless we get an explanation of what he did last year.

Mr. PATERSON. You said the estimates were all right. Then pass them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Withdraw clauses 1 and 17 and we will give you a Supply immediately.

Mr. FIELDING. Still harping on my daughter. We are not discussing that.

Mr. PATERSON. The money is due now. These men have rendered the service and I am not going to be a party to keep them out of their money.

Mr. TAYLOR. If there is any one to blame it is the government who have not

provided the money for them two or three months ago. You have trotted out other estimates and held back the estimates of the Minister of Customs. If the hon. gentleman had asked for pay for his staff he could have got it. The government held back the estimates of the Minister of Customs and are now raising the cry that the opposition are to blame.

Mr. FIELDING. You can take that cry away from us by voting them right away.

Mr. LENNOX. I am a little surprised at the Minister of Finance announcing to the House a few minutes ago something not before stated in parliament, namely that there were some negotiations for a certain amount to be voted. I do not understand how he can justify that statement. I understood that any negotiations that took place between leaders were a matter of confidence.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no confidence in that.

Mr. LENNOX. We had better understand where we are in that matter. I understand that there have been negotiations. Is the Minister of Finance going to take the position that part of these negotiations are to be confidential and part of them not confidential ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Chairman, is the discussion of negotiations of this kind pertinent to the question?

Mr. LENNOX. Perfectly, because the Minister of Finance raised the question a few minutes ago.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I raise the point of order whether this discussion is pertinent to the subject-matter before the House.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Finance raised the question a few minutes ago and I propose to reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member knows what is before the Chair. It is the salaries of customs officers.

Mr. LENNOX. But the Minister of Finance said that negotiations were going on for the purpose of getting a portion of the supplies, and that that was refused, and I am saying that no negotiations of a confidential character could possibly be carried on between the leaders of the parties, or between the Minister of Finance and the leader of the opposition, if the Minister of Finance is to be the judge of how much of that is to be divulged and how much kept back. I know as a matter of fact that negotiations have taken place between the leaders, and when some hon. gentlemen called out a few minutes ago that Mr. Robert Rogers was down here, I happened to know that Mr. Roblin was also down here, and that—and there is no secret about that part of it—negotiations took place between the leader of the government and Mr. Roblin, and I know too——

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LENNOX. I know too that a week ago Mr. Roblin went home on the understanding, as was announced in the public press, and not denied——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is wandering away from the question of the salaries of customs officers.

Mr. LENNOX—that this objectionable Bill would be withdrawn. Now, if this objectionable Bill had been withdrawn——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the point of order is insisted on, I shall have to rule that the only question before the Chair is the salaries of customs officers.

Mr. LENNOX. Very good. I was dealing a moment ago with the question of Supply. I propose now to deal still further with that question. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was calling attention to this question of overtime. I have very great respect for the Minister of Customs, and I am very sorry that the circumstances do not permit us, without more explanation, to grant him this Supply. I notice that he stated very definitely, and I have great faith in him when he makes a statement—that as a matter of policy the department thought it advisable to employ men and give them extra time rather than employ an additional staff; and the point was raised on this side of the House whether or not that was detrimental to the service, because it entailed more work on these men than they could adequately perform, thus leaving them less efficient for the services they have to perform during the regular hours. The Minister of Customs, answering that, said yes, but we do not employ these people to that extent. We limit the extra service to two hours a day, so that that evil does not arise. What are we to understand if we go on the basis of the assurance of the minister that only two hours of extra service are permitted, and we find after hours of discussion that that statement is absolutely erroneous, that instead of the service being confined to two hours it is actually unlimited, and instead of their performing a total of twelve hours at the most in the heat of summer, in the most exhausting time, fifteen hours of service is exacted from these men? The minister says these men may have worked all Sunday and every Sunday in the year besides two hours extra on every working day of ten hours.

Mr. PATERSON. What does the Auditor General give as the largest amount paid any one man?

Mr. LENNOX. What I am concerned with is the minister just now. He allowed two hours per day and added ten hours per Sunday which would give twelve hours to each man.

Mr. PATERSON. That would come to $399. Have we paid any one that?

Mr. LENNOX. We will see that presently. I find a number of men in the Montreal item who were paid very close to that. A man named Cooney was paid $398. Other men are paid $300 and $385. T. J. Cooney was paid $389.75 or within 25 cents of the amount the minister gave as an impossible amount.

Mr. PATERSON. He must have worked more than the two hours. All these parties have vouchers. There is no man works every Sunday and holiday but in the summer when at the docks the men are allowed to exceed two hours at a time.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister shifts his ground. He started off with the proposition that these men were allowed to work two hours daily overtime. Then he said they were allowed to work as much as five hours extra time. Then when he found he could not sustain that view, he shifted again and said they worked two extra hours for every working day and all day Sunday. Am I right in saying that these are extra payments? But a large amount paid to these men for extra work is what is paid them for ordinary work. If the minister is right, the rule is that a man is allowed to work two hours extra but two only. Then, we should not expect, when we look at the items of pay for overwork to find that, as a rule, the payments are much more than one-fifth the ordinary wages. But, as a matter of fact, many of these men are earning in overtime one-half what they earn in ordinary wages. For instance, take Mr. Jackson, of Rainy River. Now, Rainy River is not a seaport, is it?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not heard that the Atlantic has got that far yet.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Jackson makes $244 overtime. If he were working the two hours extra every day, as explained by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) he would make $219. As a matter of fact he earns $224 for extra time, almost half as much for extra time as he earns for salary, his salary being $525. Then we have Mr. McGregor, at Rainy River, with a salary of $438.35 and overtime of $208.50. We have Mr. Clark, of Point Edward,—which is not a seaport—with a salary of $525 and overtime of $249. At Abercorn, there is Mr. O'Brien with a salary of $375 and overtime of $224. Does not the minister think it rather remarkable that a man will go idle on ordinary time and then work nights and Sundays to make up the extra $224.

Mr. FOWLER. At two hours a day overtime, and receive $224? That looks like a fraud.

Mr. LENNOX. If it were any department but that of the Minister of Customs, I would think it might be a fraud, but, as it is the department of the Minister of Customs, it looks like a blunder.

Mr. PATERSON. But you won't let me have the money to pay the men even their regular wages.

Mr. LENNOX. You shall have the money if you wait long enough. You should have begun sooner.

Mr. FIELDING. We did; we got money on account.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, but you did not acknowledge our reasonable rights. You did not ask us to give you more.

Mr. FIELDING. We ask you now.

Mr. LENNOX. But the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is not here.

Mr. FIELDING. He is well represented.

Mr. LENNOX. I really think we must go on with the discussion of this important matter until we finish it or reach some conclusion. I come to the case of Mr Sanders, of Athelstane. That is not a seaport?

Mr. PATERSON. No, but it is a manifesting port where an American railway comes in.

Mr. LENNOX. I hope the minister will not revise his argument. He said that this was confined to seaports.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. No.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood the minister to say, definitely, positively, absolutely and for the last time that only at the seaports did men work for more than two hours extra.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. No, no, tut, tut!

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Duncan Ross) may have been sleeping—

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. There are dozens of international ports where railways cross every Sunday and the customs officers have to work overtime. Everybody except the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) knows that.

Mr. LENNOX. But if there were one hundred thousand such points that would not affect the question. The minister said that this was confined to the seaports.

Mr. PATERSON. I said that at the seaports they were allowed to get five hours in the summer time.

Mr. LENNOX. I am ready to take the minister's explanation, if he will make it clear. I asked the minister as to this two hours overtime running into five hours. And he mentioned that that was confined to the seaports.

Mr. PATERSON. I understand that.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, the member for Yale-Cariboo being answered, I will proceed with the case of Mr. Sanders, of Athelstane. This gentleman has a salary of $525 and overtime of $360. There is no possibility at two hours a day, even if he worked every day in the year, of his earning $360.

Mr. PATERSON. Why not? This is an international border point where railroads are crossing that run on Sundays as well as other days and an officer has to be there.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister say that he believes that any man can work such hours as to give him $360 overtime out of a possible $399 ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Yes, lots of them.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not asking the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I do not know any rule of the House which prevents me giving the hon. gentleman much needed information.

Mr. LENNOX. The supporters of the government ought to have that confidence in the ministers of the Crown that they will asume they are capable of answering for themselves. I want to refer to another item. A landing waiter at Island Pond receives a salary of $450, and he is paid for overtime $269. That overtime seems to be suspiciously large item in proportion to the salary. Mr. Gendron receives a salary of $450, and $250 for overtime. Mr. Cauchon, preventive officer, receives a salary of $750 and $370 for overtime. These items appear to me to be very doubtful. I hope the minister will be able to give us more satisfactory explanations than he has done.

Mr. PATERSON. This overtime comes to us certified by our responsible officers, who send the vouchers to the Auditor General. They pass the Auditor General and appear in his books. To my mind the fact that they are in the Auditor General's books is proof positive that the services have been rendered. Whether the time may have exceeded two hours in some cases does not concern me much, because I know and am persuaded that the Auditor General and my officer would not pass accounts unless they were right. When you talk about these men not being able to work 12 hours or 14 hours a day, it is to be remembered that they are not engaged in manual labour. A man who is waiting for a train may be lying down on the bench, he may be dozing.

Mr. LENNOX. Surely the minister does not expect us to take it for granted that merely because an account appears in the Auditor General's Report it is therefore correct. If we adopted that system we might as well abandon our functions as an opposition.

Mr. BERGERON. I find that the department are employing a great many ladies as detectives.

Mr. PATERSON. We have two I think.

Mr. BERGERON. There are more than two.

Mr. FIELDING. At an early hour in the evening when the Minister of Customs was going into his estimates I said that I doubted if he would be able to get many through, but he thought he could convince the opposition of the error of their ways. I think he has had a fair opportunity to do so, and I would suggest that he consider whether it is worth while sitting any longer.

Mr. PATERSON. I did want to get this amount. We have been told by an hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Taylor) that there is nothing to criticise in them and that if we would drop the election Bill they would pass them in two minutes. I view the whole process to-night and this afternoon as an organized effort to stop our getting the money. To-day is the day on which we issue cheques for the outside service so that they may reach the distant ports in time. Over 2,000 men who have earned their salaries, many of them receiving small wages, scattered all over the Dominion, about 100 in this city, will not be paid and I am anxious to get them their pay. There is nothing to be gained by the opposition in refusing this amount because there are many items not yet passed if they are determined they should not pass them. I do not think they themselves will feel very well satisfied with what they have done. I would not feel satisfied with myself if I had not made every reasonable effort to pay these men. It is now after four o'clock in the morning and I do not believe in these tests of physical strength, but I did want to make an honest effort to get it, in order that the men might know it was not my fault if they are not paid. I think perhaps I have satisfied them and that they would be unreasonable to ask me to do more than I have. I would like, however, to get it at this afternoon's session.

Mr. BERGERON. I want my hon. friend to understand that this is not a personal attack on him or on his department. We are

not choosing our time, as he understands, and we all regret that it happens in this way.

Mr. PATERSON. You need not have attacked me.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sorry for my hon. friend and I think I am speaking for the whole opposition in saying that it is very unfortunate this should fall on him, but we are not choosing which one we will attack or delay.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What business will we take up when the session opens this afternoon ?

Mr. FIELDING. Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to give notice that when we go into Supply I will take up the matter of cold storage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been lying there for some time, it affects particularly the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend thinks that cold storage is more important than the payment of the public service, that is his right.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.25 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 27, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from Armand Lavergne, Esq., his resignation as member for the electoral district of Montmagny, and that I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

QUESTIONS.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. From what companies is the commission purchasing rails for the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway?

2. How many rails have been so far purchased, and at what rates?

3. What orders for the eastern division, if any, in addition to completed purchases, have been placed, and with whom?

4. What is the total quantity of rails estimated necessary for the main line?

5. What quantity of rails have been purchased by the Grand Trunk Pacific for use west of Winnipeg, and on the branch from the lakes to the main line, and from what companies or firms have these been bought?

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

1 and 2.

District 'A.'—Dominion Iron and Steel Company.

Delivery at	Tons.	Price.
Moncton..	7,794:4	$35 85
Edmundston..	8,548:4	37 60
	16,342:8	

District 'B.'—Dominion Iron and Steel Company.

Delivery at	Tons.	Price.
Quebec..	23,000	$34 00
Lévis..	19,485:7	35 00
Quebec..	8,171:7	35 00
	50,657:4	

District 'D.'—Algoma Steel Company.

Delivery at	Tons.	Price.
Our junction with T. & N. O. Railway	21,371	$40 00

District 'F.'—Algoma Steel Company.

Delivery at	Tons.	Price.
Port Arthur or Fort William..	32,000	$34 00

Dominion Iron and Steel Company.

Port Arthur or Fort William..	10,000	$34 50
	42,000	
Total (tons)..	130,371	

3. None.

4. Length of main line, 1,803·55 miles. 1,803·55 x 125,714, 226,731·48 tons. Estimated yards and sidings, 41,109. Total rails, 267,840 tons.

5. Western division—

	Tons.
From United States Steel Products Export Company, of New York, United States of America	50,000
From Algoma Steel Company, of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario.. ..	50,000
Total..	100,000
Fort William branch—	
From Grand Trunk Railway Company, used rails lifted from the Grand Trunk Railway	26,000

Note.—This 26,000 tons of rails lifted from the track of the Grand Trunk Railway were replaced by 26,000 tons of new rails purchased from the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, of Sydney, Cape Breton.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

Referring to the return, sessional paper No. 39f, touching the estimated cost of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, which shows the total length, less the Quebec bridge, to be 1,803.55 miles, the average cost per mile to be $63,427, and the total estimated cost, not including the Quebec bridge, to be $114,393,765.85, does this estimate include the cost of station houses, terminals, engine houses, round houses turn tables water tanks and all other buildings and structures necessary or usual for the effective operation of the road? If not, what will be the additional cost for all such purposes?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The estimate referred to in this question, of the average cost per mile of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, of $63,427, includes the cost of terminal yards, station houses, engine houses, turntables, water tanks and all buildings and structures, necessary or usual for the effective operation of the road ; but does not include terminals at Winnipeg (in regard to which, an agreement between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway and the commission was ratified, by Act of parliament during the session of 1907-8) or shops east of Winnipeg, or terminals at Quebec or connection therewith, plans of which have not yet been made and of which accordingly, no estimate of cost can yet be furnished.

Mr. BARKER asked :

1. Has the eastern limit of the Mountain section and the western limit of the Prairie section of the National Transcontinental Railway been established pursuant to section 4 of the agreement of 29th of July, 1903, scheduled in the Act 3 Edward VII., chapter 71?
2. When, and by whom, was such limit established, and at what point on the said railway?
3. At what distance along the line of the railway is such point easterly of the foot of the mountains?

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

1. Yes.
2. November 21, 1907. By Collingwood Schreiber, government chief engineer of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway, and B. B. Kelliher, chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The east bank of Wolfe creek.
3. One hundred and twenty-nine miles east of the summit of the Yellowhead Pass and 119 miles west of Edmonton. Wolfe creek has an elevation of 665 feet greater than Edmonton, while the summit of Yellowhead Pass is 840 feet higher than Wolfe creek.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. What portions of the line of the Transcontinental Railway between Grand Falls and Moncton are now under contract?
2. Who are the contractors, what is the mileage, estimated money value, and date of completion under each contract?

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

1. All.
2. Moncton to near Chipman, 50 miles, the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, $989,895.90. September 1, 1908.

Near Chipman easterly, 8·55 miles, J. W. McManus & Co., Ltd., 289,190.62. August 1, 1908.

Near Chipman westerly, to Intercolonial Railway crossing, 39·05 miles, Grand Trunk Pacific Company, $767,434.95. September 1, 1910.

Intercolonial Railway crossing to Mile 164, 66·40 miles, Grand Trunk Pacific Company, $1,898,124.21. September 1, 1910.

Mile 164 to near Grand Falls, 31·80 miles, Willard Kitchen Company, $1,646,253.65. September 1, 1910.

MESSRS. CHILVERS.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is one Alonzo Chilvers, Louis Chilvers and Charles L. Chilvers, recently from Essex county, in the employ of the government?
2. If so, in what capacity, what is the date of each appointment, and the amount of salary received by each?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Alonzo Chilvers last year had charge of a survey party. He is not now employed. Louis Chilvers was employed in the topographical survey. He is not now employed. Both are sons of Charles L. Chilvers, of Walkerville, in North Essex. The father never was employed by the government.

SIGNALLING APPARATUS AT BRIER ISLAND.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What method of marine signalling was used at Brier Island, Nova Scotia, previous to the installation of the new plant a year or so ago?
2. By what system was it replaced then, and at what total cost?
3. By whom was this plant supplied, and what portions thereof and at what cost, were made outside of Canada ?
4. Is it now proposed to replace this system by another? If so, by what, at what cost, and for what reasons ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Steam whistle.

2. Changed in 1905 to compressed air diaphone, cost of machinery $13,040. Changes in building and cost of installation, $3,800.

3. The Canadian Fog Signal Company plant was purchased as a whole and the department has no knowledge what portion (if any) was manufactured outside of Canada.

4. The diaphone was placed at this station to meet the requirements of large navigation which passes at a considerable distance from the island and for which the instrument is well adapted. Complaints have, however, been received from the smaller navigation passing close in and behind the island to the effect that the sound is thrown too much in one direction, and that local requirements were better served by the old whistle.

The department intends making a practical test in this direction, utilizing stock material, and the cost will only be that of the small amount of labour for connecting a whistle for this purpose.

No decision as to the best course to pursue can be arrived at until the test has been made.

WHARF AT POINTE AUX TREMBLES.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What was the date fixed, in 1904, by the Department of Public Works for the reception of tenders for the construction of a wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, county of Portneuf ?

2. What is the date of the contract of Dusseault & Pageau for the construction of that wharf ?

3. In virtue of their contract what length of time was given them to construct that wharf?

4. As Dusseault & Pageau were not able to construct the whart at Pointe-aux-Trembles on the date specified in the contract, what was the date fixed by the Department of Public Works for the completion of the construction of that wharf?

5. On what date was the notice to that effect given to Dusseault & Pageau ?

6. Were there any complaints against the contractors, Dusseault & Pageau, in regard to the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles? If so, by whom, what was the nature of such complaints, and were they written or verbal ?

7. At what date did Dusseault & Pageau suspend their work ?

8. What are the names, christian names and residences of the engineer and inspector who had the superintendence of the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles ?

9. Did the engineer make any report against the work done by Dusseault & Pageau?

10. What is the estimated amount of the material that Dusseault & Pageau had upon the ground when they suspended work ?

11. What is the amount estimated by the engineer for the work done by Dusseault & Pageau when they suspended work?

12. What amount was paid on account of their contract to Dusseault & Pageau, and what is the date of each such payment ?

13. Was anything paid to Dusseault & Pageau, or to any other persons, in connection with the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, since the suspending of the work? If so, to whom, at what dates and what amounts ?

14. Was anything done in connection with the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles since Dusseault & Pageau suspended work ?

15. Before receiving the contract for the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, had Dusseault & Pageau performed any other contracts for the Department of Public Works? If so, what were those contracts ?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. May 10, 1904.
2. June 28, 1904.
3. 12 months.
4. First extension, 25th November, 1905 ; second extension, August 1, 1906.
5. First, July 17, 1905 ; second, March 30, 1906.
6. The resident engineer reported that he had condemned several thousand feet of timber as undersized and defective and also that contractors were not making progress. Mr. Delisle, M.P., also wrote protesting against the delay on part of contractors in carrying on the work.
7. November 21, 1905
8. Resident engineer, Thomas Breen, Quebec. Inspector, Raymond Plamondon, Pointe aux Trembles.
9. Answered by No. 6.
10. $10,183.30.
11. 17,296.
12.

26th September, 1904..	$ 2,120 00
20th December, 1904..	6,180 00
17th October, 1905..	7,000 00
	$ 15,300 00

13. (a) Yes.

(b) October 12, 1906, F. X. Lefebvre, measuring timber.. ..	$ 12 75
October 12, 1906, L. Lame, measuring timber..	13 13
June to December, 1906, R. Plamondon, inspector..	442 50
February 15, 1907, T. Breen, disbursements taking soundings..	7 54
February 22, 1907, F. X. Saucier, translating specifications.. ..	25 23
May 8, 1907, King's Printer printing..	3 63
June 13, 1907, J. A. Picard, saving timber from flood..	155 75
August 1, 1907, F. R. Morneault & Company, timber	4,949 89
May 15, 1908, sundry newspapers, advertising..	620 42
May 15, 1908, King's Printer printing..	142 45
May 15, 1908, J. A. Chassé, travelling expenses..	34 70
	$6,390 09

14. Yes, tenders asked and contract awarded to O. Poliquin for $22,490.

15. Yes; Granby post office, 2nd November, 1901, $14,987; Quebec Iron Foundry, 24th June, 1902, $17,347.95; Thetford Mines post office, 8th August, 1903, $6,735.75.

PURCHASE OF RAILS FROM ALGOMA STEEL COMPANY.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Are there any contracts between the Intercolonial Railway company or the National Transcontinental Railway Commission with the Algoma Steel Company for the manufacture and delivery of steel rails, uncompleted? If so, what are they?

2. Is it the intention of the Minister of Railways and Canals, or of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, to place immediately any further orders for steel rails with the Algoma Steel Company, in order to insure the continuance of the operation of the steel rail plant at Sault Ste. Marie, which recently temporarily suspended its operations on account of reported want of orders for rails for immediate delivery?

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

1. The only uncompleted contract for steel rails, which the commissioners have with the Algoma Steel Company, is one, dated 25th November, 1907, for 21,371 tons of 80-pound steel rails, viz.: 10,686 gross tons to be delivered by November 1st, 1908, and 10,685 tons to be delivered April 1st, 1909.

2. Strong representations have been made to the government concerning additional orders for steel rails, but until money is placed at the disposal of the government, or the commission by parliamentary appropriations, it is impossible to practically consider the matter.

PURCHASES OF RAILS FROM RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. How many tons of rails have been purchased from the railway department by either the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company or the government of New Brunswick in the years 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907, respectively and what was the total amount of purchases in each of the several years?

2. What amount is still due the railway department on account of said purchase or purchases of rails, including interest, if interest will be charged?

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

1. For the years 1900-01—Nil.

1902	377 720-2240	$ 7,923.75
1903	1729 150-2240	36,310.36
1903	10 frogs.	150.00
		$44,384.11
1903—Dec. 31, by cash....		4,925.00
2. Balance due Intercolonial Railway at March 31, 1908, for rails		$39,459.11
Interest at 4 per cent, March, 1908		8,037.23
		$47,496.34

BALANCE OF SUBSIDY, NEW BRUNSWICK COAL AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Is there any balance due the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company on account of subsidy? If so, what amount is still due?

2. Has any claim been presented by the said company for extra subsidy? If so, at what date and for what amount?

3. Is it the intention of the government to grant any further subsidy than the first granted to that company? If so, what additional amount per mile?

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

1. It is so claimed on behalf of the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company, but no amount has been determined.

2. Yes. On January 20th, 1904. Subsequently on June 18th, 1904, on behalf of the province of New Brunswick, by Mr. James Barnes, and Mr. George W. Allen, secretary of the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company; and again, on the 26th June, 1906, by Hon. L. J. Tweedie, then premier.

3. The matter is receiving the consideration of the government.

SOUTH HURON BY-ELECTION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What was the amount of the returning officer's account rendered to the government for the expenses in connection with the by-election held in South Huron on the 22nd day of January, 1908?

2. What is the date or dates when these accounts were paid to said officer?

3. If there are still any unsettled accounts, what do they consist of?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. Amount of returning officer's accounts, $1,052.31.

2. Payments to returning officer: February 26, 1908, $842.05; March 28, 1908, $176.89 —$1,018.94. Amount disallowed on audit of accounts, $33.37.

3. There are no unsettled accounts.

TUBERCULIN TESTS.

Mr. R. N. WALSH asked:

1. How many cattle have been tested by the Department of Agriculture from March 31, 1906, up to the present date, with tuberculin?

2. What number have reacted?

3. How many have been tested by private practitioners?

4. What number have reacted?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. 2,509.
2. 89.
3. 2,964 ; that is with tuberculin supplied by this department.
4. 455.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of having reacted ?

Mr. FISHER. The reaction indicates the presence of the disease.

PORT SOUTH BAR, CAPE BRETON.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. How many vessels entered and cleared at the Port South Bar Sydney river, Cape Breton, during the years 1905-6-7?
2. Who is the officer in charge of this service of the department and what is his salary?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. South Bar Sydney river is only a customs preventive station (by the name of Victoria pier) under the port of Sydney. No vessels have been cleared there during 1905, 1906, 1907.
2. James Ratchford is the customs preventive officer on duty at that place. His salary is $300 a year.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

To what companies were land granted by way of railway subsidy during the year 1894, and what was the quantity of each such grant?

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

	Acres.
Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company..	384,000
Canadian Pacific Railway Company..	204,800
Brandon & South Western Railway Company..	108,800
Saskatchewan & Western Railway Company..	96,000

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Since July, 1896, what railway charters, carrying land grants, have been renewed or extended by the government?
2. In each such case what amount of land was affected?
3. What are the several statutes giving effect to these extensions?

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

The following charters have been extended by parliament :

1. The Red Deer Valley Railway & Coal Company ; The Manitoba & South Western Railway Company ; The Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company, now the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

2. The Red Deer Valley Railway & Coal Company, 384,000 acres ; The Manitoba South Eastern Railway Company, 680,320 acres ; The Winnipeg Great Northern Railday Company, now the Canadian Northern Railway Company, south of Saskatchewan river, 2,523,008 acres ; north of Saskatchewan river, 6,016,000 acres.

3. The Red Deer Valley Railway Company, 60 and 61 Victoria, chapter 60, assented to June 29, 1897. Act extending time for construction and for other purposes. 62 and 63 Victoria chapter 86, assented to July 10, 1899, Act again extending time for construction. 63 and 64 Victoria, chapter 77, assented to July 18, 1900, Act again extending time for construction and for other purposes. Charter expired through failure to construct within time limit. The Manitoba & South Eastern Railway Company, now the Canadian Northern Railway Company, 60 and 61 Victoria, chapter 53, assented to June 29, 1897, Act extending time for construction and for other purposes. The Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company, now The Canadian Northern Railway Company, 61 Victoria, chapter 10, assented to June 13, 1898, extending time for construction and for other purposes, 62 and 63 Victoria, chapter 57, assented to July 10, 1899, extending time for construction and for other purposes. 3 Edward VII, chapter 97 assented to June 25, 1903, extending time for construction and for other purposes.

NEW BRUNSWICK COLD STORAGE PLANTS.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government assisted by bonus, or in any form, any cold storage plants in the province of New Brunswick? If so, what plants, in what amounts, and to whom paid?
2. Were such plants, if any, built or established before or after the passing of the Act respecting the granting of assistance by this government?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Yes. The government has undertaken to grant a bonus of $37,500 to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, under the Cold Storage Act. $15,000 of this sum has been paid to the company.
2. After.

THE INSURANCE BILL.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked :

Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the Insurance Bill this session? If so, when? If not, why not?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). It is the expectation of the government to proceed with the Insurance Bill so soon as satisfactory progress shall have been made in the more urgent work of ob-

taining the appropriations for the carrying on of the public service.

EASTERN TOWNSHIPS CAVALRY BRIGADE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Will the Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade go to the Quebec celebration in July?
2. If not, will it go into camp for annual training?
3. At what point will this camp be held?
4. Will any regiments from the Eastern Townships attend the Quebec celebration? If so, which regiments?
5. Will a camp be held at Laprairie, Quebec, for the annual training of troops this summer?
6. Is there a rifle range at this point?
7. Has any rifle practice been held at Laprairie during the last two or three camps held there?

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

1. Under consideration.
2. Yes.
3. Laprairie.
4. Under consideration.
5. Yes.
6. The old range was washed away by a flood several years ago.
7. Yes, miniature practice one year since old range was destroyed by floods. A new rifle range will be constructed in time for this year's camp.

SHERBROOKE MILITIA CORPS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

Is it the intention of the Department of Militia and Defence to establish another regiment of infantry or other branch of the service in Sherbrooke? If so, what will be the branch of the service and strength?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). In General Orders of May 1, just issued, the transfer of the headquarters of No. 6 Cavalry Field Ambulance from Quebec to Sherbrooke is authorized. There is no present intention of establishing any additional unit at Sherbrooke.

MILITIA ALLOWANCES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Is the government in arrears for allowances to any militia regiments? If so, to what regiments, to what amounts, and for what periods?
2. What is the reason some regiments have not received allowances?
3. Is the government aware that officers of some regiments, including one Ottawa regiment, have been obliged to borrow money to meet requirements?
4. If so, will the government repay such officers the interest paid by them on such loans?

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

1. No, all such claims are paid or are being paid as fast as they are submitted.
2. Deficiencies of arms, clothing, &c., discovered on inspection.
3. The government is not aware of the fact.
4. No.

WHARFS AT PORT MULGRAVE, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Are the wharfs at Port Mulgrave, Nova Scotia, government property? If so, who is the officer in charge of said wharfs?
2. Has said officer ordered boats away from these wharfs, thereby preventing them from discharging their cargoes?

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

1. The railway owns wharfs at Mulgrave, the terminus of the railway on the Strait of Canso, but not at Port Mulgrave. Captain J. W. Reynolds is in charge of the railway wharfs at Mulgrave.
2. There have been no vessels, steamers or other crafts ordered away from these wharfs thereby preventing them from discharging their cargoes.

WESTPORT ALARM STATION, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. When was a steam whistle installed at Westport, Nova Scotia, for alarm station, and what was the total cost of same?
2. When was the new diaphones alarm installed at the same place, by whom, and what was the total cost of same?
3. Are the steam engines, foreign make? If so, who were the builders, and what was the cost of such engines?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. 1873. Cost $7,500.
2. In 1905 by department's erectors. $18,040.
3. The diaphone plant, including engines, was purchased complete from the Canadian Fog Signal Company. The department does not know the manufacturers of the component parts nor the cost.

MONTREAL POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. What action, if any, has the government taken to remedy the reported irregularities in the postal service of Montreal, as complained of by thirty members of the board of trade of the city of Montreal?
2. Is the government aware that many firms and citizens of the city of Montreal are said to be greatly inconvenienced, and business materially interfered with, owing to careless handling of mails, delay in delivery of letters,

irregular delivery, carelessness in delivering and handling of papers and packages, and general irregularities said to exist in the postal service of that city? If so, what means have been employed to remedy said grievances?

3 What action, if any, has been taken against the postmaster at Heaslip, Ontario, for reported irregularities and carelessness?

4. Has there been a new assistant appointed in the Shawville, Quebec, post office? If so, what is his name and salary?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. The complaints to which reference is made were not received from individual members of the board of trade, Montreal, but Mr. Geo. Hadrill, secretary of the board of trade, submitted in December, 1906, 28 cases of alleged delay in transmission of mail matter. In 19 of these cases the complaints were not substantiated by evidence or the sender was at fault or the delay was due to causes beyond the control of the department. In dealing with the balance the department pursued its well defined policy of following up the searching inquiry made in each case with prompt measures to make the Montreal postal service in every respect satisfactory. The complaints dealt entirely with the routine of work performed by postal employees and the usual steps were promptly taken to effect the desired improvements for which the machinery of the department was ample and sufficient.

2. No. Not only is the department not aware that such is the state of affairs, but is positively aware that no such condition exists. The department has had most gratifying evidence from the business men of Montreal in regard to the efficiency of the postal service of that city. It goes without saying that clerical errors will occur and mistakes will be made in a service as large as that of Montreal, but the department ventures to say that there is no city post office on the continent that is giving a better and more faithful service than the post office in the city of Montreal.

As a tribute to the present efficiency of the Montreal postal service the following letter addressed by Mr. Geo. Hadrill, secretary of the board of Trade, Montreal, to the assistant postmaster, Montreal, under date of the 23rd instant, may be quoted:

Montreal Board of Trade, Montreal, May 23, 1908, to L. J. Gaboury, Esq., assistant postmaster, Montreal.

Sir,—In reply to your inquiry as to whether any complaints have recently been made to this office by members of the board regarding the postal service, I beg to say that with the exception of a letter of recent date pointing out the need of an outside letter box in the post office, no complaints regarding the postal service have been addressed to this office since 1906.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) GEO. HADRILL,
Secretary.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

3. A complaint was made by Mr. J. H. Field that a registered letter addressed to him at Heaslip was unduly detained at that office. On investigation it was found that the letter in question had been accidentally mislaid by the postmaster of Heaslip, having fallen down behind some pigeon holes in the office, and the postmaster was admonished severely as to his carelessness in the matter. It being the only offence the postmaster was not fined. No other complaints concerning this office have reached the department.

4. The Post Office Department has nothing to do with the appointment of assistants in post offices like Shawville. The department holds the postmaster responsible for the office being properly carried on and all persons employed in the office are employees, not of the Post Office Department, but of the postmaster at Shawville, who is entirely responsible. When trouble arose a short time ago the postmaster at Shawville was written to that he must provide suitable assistance and he replied that he would employ a suitable assistant at once. Since then no complaints have been made by the public and the department is of the opinion that there is no further ground for complaint.

DREDGING IN ONTARIO AND QUEBEC.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Were tenders called for by the Public Works Department for dredging in Ontario and Quebec? If so, were tenders received?

2. What were the prices at the different places?

3. What were the names of the dredges mentioned in tenders?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). My hon. friend has not mentioned the year and I do not know to what year he refers. If he will state the year, I shall be happy to furnsh the information.

Mr. BERGERON. I mean this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad to furnish the information.

Question allowed to stand.

WHARFAGE DUES—SOULANGES COUNTY.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. Why are wharfage dues exacted at each of the wharfs of St. Zotique, Coteau Landing, Coteau du Lac and Les Cedres, in the county of Soulanges?

2. What amount has been received from that source from 1906 to the present time?

3. How much for each one of the wharfs?

4. Are the government wharfs constructed in other places subject to a like impost?

5. Is there a tariff in force?

6. Has anybody asked for the suppression of those dues?

7. Does the government purpose continuing that system in the county of Soulanges?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. These wharfs are under the provisions of chapter 112 of Revised Statutes of Canada, and the regulations made under this chapter and the dues are exacted because it is required by the law.

2. $67.17.

3. For the fiscal years 1906-7 and 1907-8, the receipts have been as follows:—St. Zotique, $21.78; Coteau Landing, $24.62; Coteau du Lac, $20.77; Les Cedres, nil.

4. Yes. All wharfs under the control of by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. are subject to the collection of wharfage dues.

5. Yes.

6. Occasional requests have been received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

7. Yes.

MAIL SERVICE—COTEAU LANDING.

Mr. Monk—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. Why do not the steamboats carrying the mails from Montreal to Kingston stop at Coteau Landing to land mails and passengers there?

2. Has anybody asked the government to re-establish the former service?

3. If so, who?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Mails are not carried by steamer between Montreal and Kingston and have not been for very many years.

2. No request has been made in so far as the Post Office Department is aware to establish or re-establish such a service.

3. Answered by No. 2.

COTEAU LANDING WHARF.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. Have repairs to the wharf at Côteau Landing and the construction of a shelter for the passengers been asked for? If so, by whom and when?

2. Will the government make them? If so, what amount will be appropriated?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. and 2. No. If such request should be made, it would have careful consideration.

MAIL SERVICE, SOULANGES COUNTY.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. Is there any reason why all the letters and mail packages between the different parishes of the county of Soulanges should pass through Montreal in order to reach their destination?

2. How long is it since the carrying of the mails in vehicles has been abolished?

3. Has the government received any complaints in that regard, either from the member for the county or otherwise?

4. Is it the government's intention to remedy that state of things? If so, when? If not, why not?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Letters and mail packages between the different post offices in the county of Soulanges have not to pass through Montreal in order to reach their destination. Out of 17 post offices in this county, 14 are served direct from the railways and the other three offices by stage.

2. Conveyance of mails by vehicles has not been abolished where such mode is necessary.

3. No complaints have been received in this regard either through the member for the county or otherwise.

4. Answered by previous question.

CHARGES AGAINST ALFRED SAUVE.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. Is the report of the investigation, held by Louis Boyer, advocate, into the accusations brought against Alfred Sauvé, the superintendent of the Soulanges canal, filed in the department?

2. Has the government come to any decision in regard thereto?

3. Was the man Alfred Sauvé suspended during the investigation, and is he still under suspension?

4. Does he still draw his salary?

5. How much has he received on that account, and for other reasons, during the three months last past?

6. How much has the Commissioner Boyer received up to date?

7. What amount per day was allowed or agreed to be allowed to Commissioner Boyer as salary and for expenses, respectively?

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

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Relieved of duty, pending investigation.

4. Yes.

5. $350.38.

6. Nothing paid to date.

7. $25 per day and reasonable travelling and living expenses.

COAL LANDS, ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What total area of coal lands have been sold in Alberta and in Saskatchewan, respectively, since July 1, 1896?

2. What total area has been leased?

3. In respect of what area has the government returns shown that coal has been or is being mined?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. In Alberta, 250,812·24 acres, of which area 56,640·49 acres include the surface as well as the coal mining rights.

In Saskatchewan, 5,636·83 acres, of which area 60 acres include the surface as well as the coal mining rights.

2. In Alberta 53,281·58 acres.
In Saskatchewan, 2,040·53 acres.
3. 9,640·96 acres.

COMMISSION ON POSTAL BUSINESS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What did the compensation on money order and postal note business, and commission on box and drawer rents amount to in the calendar year 1907?
2. Is the contract for the making and repairing of mail bags let by tender? If not, why not, and what firm has the contract at present?
3. What was the total expense for maintenance of postal service in the Yukon and Atlin districts for the calendar year 1907?
4. What was the total net revenue to the Post Office Department from the Yukon and Atlin districts for the calendar year 1907?
5. How many accounting officers are there in the Yukon and Atlin districts, and how many non-accounting post offices?
6. What is the total amount paid in salaries to postmasters in the Yukon and Atlin districts?
7. What is the total number of registered letters containing money or valuables reported to the Post Office Department, and the total alleged contents in the calendar year 1907?
8. What is the total number of unregistered letters containing money or valuables reported to the Post Office Department, and the total alleged contents in the calendar year 1907?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Commission on money orders, $109,166.32.
Commission on postal notes, $19,619.05.
Box and drawer rents, $29,135.
2. All ordinary letter bags for the domestic service are supplied under contract, the present contractors being Messrs. S. & H. Borbridge, Rideau Street, Ottawa.
The manufacture of registered sacks and British mail sacks is in the hands of S. S. Stratton, Sparks street, Ottawa, who formerly had a contract with this department, and the work was continued with him after the expiry of his contract (at a slight increase in the cost of the last mentioned sacks only) on account of the very favourable rates thus obtained.
Newspaper sacks are no longer manufactured under contract, experience having shown that no single contractor was in a position to manufacture these sacks with sufficient rapidity upon demand to meet the needs of the service at periods such as Christmas, etc., when there is an enormous increase in the amount of mail matter requiring to be handled. The department adopted the system of purchasing the material under contract and supplying it to different persons employed in the repairing of mail bags, who mannfactured new sacks for the department at a uniform price of eleven cents per sack.

Mr. OLIVER.

The repairing of mail bags and sacks has never been performed under contract, such method being considered impracticable owing to the varying nature of the repairs required, the different prices paid, and the uncertainty as to numbers.
3. $125,021.28.
4. $15,406.41.
5. Nine accounting offices; 13 non-accounting.
6. $30,145.84.
7 and 8. From the wording of the questions 7 and 8 it is not understood what information is desired. If the inquiry has reference to the returns of undelivered ordinary and registered mail matter regularly made by postmasters to the Dead Letter Branch, statistics for the calendar year of 1907 will be compiled and submitted at an early date.

HOG CHOLERA IN ESSEX

Mr. CLEMENT—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. How many hogs have been ordered destroyed in the county of Essex in the calendar years ending January, 1, 1906 and 1907, respectively?
2. Were these hogs destroyed owing to cholera, or what was the reason for such order?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. 1906.. .. .. 183 hogs
1907.. .. .. 37 "
2. They were all affected with, or had been in contact with animals affected with hog cholera.

SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY LAND COMPANY.

Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) for information on the subject which I mentioned yesterday—the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. He said he would look up 'Hansard' and give me an answer to-day. But perhaps the hon. gentleman has overlooked it.

Mr. OLIVER. I regret to say that I have overlooked it. I will promise faithfully to attend to it by Friday.

THE GOVERNMENT STEAMER 'CHAMPLAIN.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Would the Prime Minister be good enough to give an answer to the matter concerning which I asked him yesterday—the steamer 'Champlain'?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The 'Champlain' is running between Rivière Ouelle and Murray bay. On the north side she generally goes also to two other places, St. Irenée and Cap à l'Aigle. I was asked if she could be sent from Murray bay also to Baie St. Paul. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden)

knows, there is no railway connection between these two places. It is decided that the 'Champlain' could go there. We required that those who asked it should put up a deposit, as is generally required by the railway and steamship companies. Also, instructions were given to the agent that so much per mile should be charged those who took passage by the boat. I see it stated that some persons were refused admission to the boat. I telephoned to the agent at Quebec and the information we have is that the statement is not correct. The agent says he never heard of it, and that the boat has been open to the public.

PURCHASE OF FIRE EXTINGUISHERS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) if he has yet decided to lay on the table the file with reference to the celebrated fire extinguishers?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I certainly have no objection, as I have already done, to lay on the table the documents or the file bearing on the questions that I discussed here.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. gentleman have it here this afternoon? To-morrow is a holiday, and we could take advantage of it to get business ready for the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have a copy of it in my room.

Mr. FOSTER. That will do in the meantime.

REPORTED LOSS OF MAILS.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). I desire to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) if he has had information with regard to a reported loss of mail by accident on the Canadian Pacific Railway on this side of Kenora?

Mr. LEMIEUX. When was that?

Mr. LAKE. Within a few days—on Monday last, I think.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. member (Mr. Lake) will remember his question a little later, I may be able to give him information. There may be a report in the department. I will inquire about the matter.

SUPPLY—AMENDMENTS TO THE CRIMINAL CODE.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to again bring to the notice of the government some Bills which I have had before the House for some months and in reference to which I have been in consultation with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and to present reasons why these Bills should be taken over by the government and embodied in the measure which, I understand, the government is about to bring down in amendment to the Criminal Code. The first Bill has reference to the subject of immigration. It authorizes the officers of the Emigration Branch of the Department of the Interior to search immigrants and take from them knives, revolvers and other offensive weapons and directing them to inform such immigrants that weapons of this kind must not be carried in Canada. To show that there is great need for such a law, to show that this is a vital and pressing question, I wish to bring to your attention articles in the daily press written since this Bill was placed before the House. The first item is from the Toronto 'Globe.' It is headed 'Fool and Revolver form dangerous combination.'

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). I rise to a point of order. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lewis) a right to discuss on motion for Supply a matter already on the order paper?

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is that matter on the Order Paper cannot be anticipated by discussion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lewis) is suggesting to the House that the Bill should be placed upon government orders. It is perfectly proper to do that.

Mr. LEWIS. This is from the Toronto 'Globe'; and by arrangement with the Solicitor General——

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman—

Mr. LEWIS. This is by arrangement.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is discussing whether this matter should be taken up, that may be permitted, but discussion of the merits of a question upon the order paper would not be in order.

Mr. LEWIS. I do not desire to discuss the merits, but only to place before the House and the government, reasons, vital reasons which have arisen since this Bill was laid before the House, why the government should take action and should take over this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. That would be practically discussing the question, and I think would be out of order.

Mr. LEWIS. May I refer the government to the pages in which these articles are to be found?

Mr. SPEAKER. Any discussion which would anticipate the merits of the Bill would be out of order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that for the purpose of showing the necessity of placing the Bill upon government orders, it is necessary for the hon. gentleman to refer in some measure to the subject matter. To that extent—but to that extent only—I think the hon. gentleman would be within his rights.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Lewis) has not put it that way to the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would suggest to the hon. member (Mr. Lewis) that it would be useless to place these Bills on the Order Paper for action by the government, if the government cannot get Supply even.

Mr. LEWIS. I would suggest to make it a government measure and introduce it as an amendment to the Criminal Code, and an Immigration Act be prepared by the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the general principle of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. That would be out of order.

Mr. LEWIS. I merely wanted to read the title. Bill (No. 63) to amend the Immigration Act; Bill (No. 78) to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code respecting offensive weapons; Bill (No. 79) to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code respecting assaults on women and children; Bill (No. 93) to amend the Criminal Code to punish homicide while hunting; Bill (No. 140) to amend the Criminal Code respecting injuries to persons due to motor vehicles. I had no desire to infringe the rules of the House; I merely desired to say that since these Bills were brought before this House occurrences have taken place within Canada which would make it more necessary for such legislation to be passed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

COLD STORAGE FOR BAIT.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before you proceed to Supply, I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter of some interest. I do not propose at this time to found a motion upon the information at hand, but simply to place before the House, in as brief and comprehensive a way as possible, the information that has been brought down by return. The first remark I wish to make is that the Department of Marine and Fisheries developed some years ago two plans for the assistance of the fisheries, on the Atlantic coast particularly, with reference more especially to giving greater facilities for obtaining bait. The objects were sought to be accomplished by, in the case of the shore fishermen, having the fishermen form themselves into an association to which, if they erected a bait freezer under proper conditions, the government would pay one-half of the cost and would give a bonus I think of $5 per ton on bait frozen for a period of years, I think five years. This was for the shore fishermen. Then for the bank fishermen a more ambitious project was undertaken by the department, it was to have bait freezers and bait cold storage plants erected. A few of them, in fact two, were established, one at Canso and the other at Halifax, and the measure of aid given by the government to these was one-half of the cost of construction and equipment, and I think $2,000 a year for a period of three years. In the city of St. John a firm by the name of F. E. Williams, a practical-going firm of that city, knowing that these aids were held out, made an application to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for aid to a project for the city of St. John, that portion of the Bay of Fundy which opens out to the city of St. John, and preferred a request to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on that line. What he really proposed was to have a project a little more ambitious than merely a bait freezing establishment. He proposed an amalgamation of the bait business with a cold storage for commercial purposes for fish. This gentleman preferred his request in October, 1905, and proceeded in the orthodox way to back up his proposition by all the proper influences which he could find. He brought to his aid the party influence in the city of St. John. Amongst others who backed his project were the William Thomson Company, influential shippers and business men of that city; H. P. Robertson, who very strongly recommended Mr. Williams and endorsed his project; Mr. McKeown, I think at that time member of the local legislature, at any rate, a prominent politician in the city of St. John who also very strongly endorsed Mr. Williams as a business man, and endorsed the project which he was endeavouring to carry out; the O'Connors, operators in the Bay of Fundy, also lent their influence to the project. On March 2, 1906, Mr. Truman of the city of St. John, who seems to have been very strongly allied with Williams, whether as legal adviser and solicitor or otherwise, I do not know, visited Ottawa, and interviewed the minister with reference to the matter, having first obtained the hearty adhesion of the then Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Emmerson. Well, the reply of the then minister was that Mr. Williams' project hardly came within the purpose of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and they so informed Mr. Williams, and informed as well those who were backing Mr. Williams. I forgot to state that Mr. McAvity, of the city of St. John, who is a very strong party man, and makes copious and long continued drafts upon the party patronage, and has ever since these gentlemen got into power, also promised, that the party influence in the city of St.

John should be behind Mr. Williams' application and his project. As I stated, in the end the Minister of Marine and Fisheries rather set aside the project on the ground that he proposed to stick to the operations for the shore fishermen and the bank fishermen in the way of bait facilities and cold storage for bait, to the extent to which it had already been developed, and did not propose to go any further; and to the plea that the Bay of Fundy on this side, with the city of St. John as the centre, ought to have an establishment as good as that at Canso and at Halifax, he turned a deaf ear. In the end he cited Mr. Williams to the Minister of Agriculture, as did the Minister of Railways and Canals, telling Mr. Williams that there was legislation in prospect for the very purpose for which he was pushing his claim and that the minister to be applied to for help in that respect was the Minister of Agriculture. Just here then it is pertinent to say that in the fall of 1906 and the beginning of 1907 the Minister of Agriculture conceived, brought forth and ultimately enacted a law the purpose of which was to give government subsidies to commercial cold storage establishments under certain conditions. Then, at that period, that is late in December, 1906, or early in 1907, the application of Mr. Williams came to be made to the minister. I think it would be well probably to read the letter in reference to that. I find in the file an application dated 7th December, 1906, from F. E. Williams Company, Limited, to the Minister of Agriculture, as follows:

St. John, December 7, 1906.

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I beg to make application for assistance to a cold storage warehouse which I and associates desire to establish at the port of St. John. The application is made by me under the terms of the proposed Act in accordance with resolution of yourself before the House of Commons. I will make a more formal application when the matter can be dealt with in exact terms, but I desire to lodge the present application with you. I have already had correspondence with yourself on the subject of cold storage, and am very glad to find that you are disposed to place the government's assistance on a more liberal basis. St. John is well situated for a cold storage depot, and I feel that a pretty strong case can be made out for a grant of assistance by you for a warehouse here. If it is necessary to make for the present any more formal application will you kindly advise me of its necessity.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) F. E. WILLIAMS.

I read these letters because later, in the course of developments, it will appear that the Prime Minister and some others denied that any application was ever made, or if made, was properly made by F. E. Williams on behalf of himself or his company. Mr. Williams also asks the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), with whom he had been in correspondence for over a year and with whom he has had frequent conferences, to use his influence and do what he could for him in the advancement of his application when it came before the Minister of Agriculture. In response to a telegram from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) about that time, Mr. Williams comes to Ottawa with his solicitor and has various interviews. That is probably as well told as anywhere in a letetr writtten on the 1st April, 1907, by Mr. Williams as follows:

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—Some time ago I made an application to your department for a grant for a cold storage plant to be established in St. John. Previous to this I had put in an application to Hon. Mr. Brodeur for a grant from the Marine and Fisheries Department. The last time I was in Ottawa, Hon. Mr. Brodeur informed me that they were going to merge the whole grant for cold storage in the Government Cold Storage Act. I had the pleasure of meeting and talking the matter over with your good self in the presence of H. R. Emmerson, Sir Frederick Borden and Hon. Mr. Brodeur. At that time Sir Frederick Borden had a proposition which he was trying to carry out and wanted my friends and myself to go in with him, he and his son-in-law being the prime movers in this scheme. Mr. Emmerson all along assured me that my proposition was first in the hands of the government and he and Mr. Brodeur had promised to give me a bonus from the Fishery Department and now that is merged into your department I should have first consideration, and I would like to know by return mail if my application is to be granted for a cold storage warehouse in East St. John, or is the application of Sir Frederick Borden to be accepted instead. Hon. H. R. Emmerson now being out of the government I have to turn to you direct. Kindly give me a direct reply as soon as possible and you will very much oblige me, as I have other plans which I want to carry out if I am not to receive the government aid.

I am inclosing copies of some of my letters to Mr. Emmerson on this cold storage subject, which will convey to you my ideas and feelings regarding the matter. I trust it will not take too much of your valuable time to peruse the same and become a little acquainted with the cold storage proposition in St. John.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) F. E. WILLIAMS.

I read that letter because it gives in brief the substance of a good deal of the correspondence which passed and states Mr. Williams' position from his standpoint very succinctly. After numerous interviews, as stated in that letter, a letter is written on the 11th April, 1907, by the Minister of Agriculture, as follows:

Mr. F. E. Williams,
92 to 96 Princess street, St. John, New Brunswick.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 8th. I may say that we have not yet made any grant for a cold storage warehouse in St. John. Sir Frederick Borden has made application, on behalf of a company with which he is connected, and I have viewed his application very favourably. None of the applications, however, are in a position to be passed upon absolutely.

I cannot make any promises without definite plans and specifications and full information as to what the people applying for may be prepared to do.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) SYDNEY FISHER.

Then, the next correspondence that takes place is dated June 2, as detailed here. Mr. Williams writes from St. John on the 3rd of June as follows :

The Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—I received blanks for application for cold storage warehouses. In your letter of April 11 you gave me to understand that nothing could be done unless plans and specifications were submitted and you also stated that you looked favourably upon giving this grant in St. John to Sir Frederick Borden. I have already spent considerable of my money in going to Ottawa and endeavouring to obtain a grant for the cold storage warehouse in St. John and do not feel like spending any more money in getting up plans and specifiations if the preference is to be given to Sir Frederick Borden. I have written very strongly against your government giving a grant to a cabinet minister, and leaving out the business men who should be the proper parties to take up this proposition.

I would again kindly request that you inform me plainly if it would be worth while my proceeding to get plans and specifications ready to submit to you.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) F. E. WILLIAMS.

In answer to that, the minister being absent, the deputy minister says :

Dear Sir,—In the absence of the minister, I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant in reference to cold storage warehouses.

If you will submit your application it will receive due consideration.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) GEO. F. O'HALLORAN,
Deputy Minister.

F. E. Williams Company,
St. John, New Brunswick.

Now, it is incontestable that Mr. Williams made his application, backed by his friends in the city of St. John—and they were numerous—for government aid in the year 1905, and that as long as there was only that kind of legislation on the statute-book he directed his efforts to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries refused his application on that basis, and turned him over to the minister who was taking up the matter on a larger basis. Mr. Williams had gone to the only minister to whom he could apply, he spent a year and more of his time and effort trying to advance his scheme with the minister, and at the end of that time he was told that he would have to go to the Minister of Agriculture, who had a more ambitious form of legislation which he was just putting on the statute-book. He then transferred his claim for aid for his project to the Minister of Agriculture, and put in a formal application. He not only did that, but he came in person and with his friends, and through the Minister of Railways and Canals, and interviewed the ministers here; and in the course of that interview he found that there was another applicant besides himself, that applicant being Sir Frederick Borden, the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I never was an applicant.

Mr. FOSTER. I am simply giving the information which I have, and which will all come out in the letters before I get through with what I have to say. He found out that Sir Frederick Borden was an applicant on behalf of a company in which he was interested. He found it out, both from his interviews with the ministers and later from a letter written to him by the Minister of Agriculture. If I am wrong in that, surely it is not my fault, because I find in a letter of April 11, 1907, which was written by the Minister of Agriculture, and the colleague of the Minister of Militia and Defence, these words:

April 11, 1907.

Mr. F. E. Williams,
St. John, New Brunswick.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 8. I may say that we have not yet made any grant for a cold storage warehouse in St. John. Sir Frederick Borden has made application on behalf of a company with which he is connected, and I have viewed his application very favourably. None of the applications, however, are in a position to be passed upon absolutely.

If Mr. Williams needs any further reference or support in his contention that he had to meet the opposition of a cabinet minister making an application, and an interested application, for the very subsidy which he was after, he gets that support from the letter, positive and distinct, of the Minister of Agriculture himself. Having found out from his interviews and from the letter which he had received from the minister, in which he said explicitly that he had received an application from Sir Frederick Borden on behalf of a company with which he was connected, and that he viewed this application very favourably,

what was the conclusion to which Mr. Williams came ? After having for a year and a half spent his time and money and the energy and influence of his friends, he finds out that a cabinet minister is ahead of him and has forestalled him in the favourable opinion of the Minister of Agriculture in whose department the matter is ; and he comes naturally and properly to the conclusion that there is no use of his going to the further expenditure of preparing his plans and putting them in unless the minister tells him that he has a chance and that his claim will receive fair and just consideration. With this preference and this great influence against him, he did not file his plans, although he had put in his application at a very early period. On the 3rd of June he writes from St. John to the Hon. Sydney Fisher, Ottawa, Ont.:

Dear Sir, I received blanks for application for cold storage warehouse. In your letter of April 11 you gave me to understand that nothing could be done unless plans and specifications were submitted, and you also stated that you looked favourably upon giving this grant in St. John to Sir Frederick Borden. I have already spent considerable of my money going to Ottawa and endeavouring to obtain a grant for the cold storage warehouse in St. John, and I do not feel like spending any more money in getting up plans and specifications if the preference is to be given to Sir Frederick Borden. I have written very strongly on this matter. I would again kindly request that you inform me plainly if it would be worth while proceeding to get plans and specifications ready to submit to you.

The answer he got to that, which was his final appeal, was from the deputy minister, saying that if he would submit his application it would receive due consideration. Consequently, although his application was in, he did not file his plans and specifications, which would cost quite a large amount of money, and he had already spent, as he thought, sufficient in the matter.

Now, Sir, this correspondence has divulged the name of Sir Frederick Borden and the company with which he was connected as an applicant for the government subsidy. I propose to trace what had been going on. What had been going on ? Sir Frederick Borden was a member of the cabinet ; Hon. Sydney Fisher was a member of the cabinet. Hon. Sydney Fisher and Hon. Sir Frederick Borden and other members of the cabinet sat around the council board and hatched a scheme for government subsidies for cold storage. The very moment they were hatching and bringing out that scheme, Sir Frederick Borden, according to his own letters, was busy getting up a million dollar company in which he had an interest for the very purpose of applying for these government subsidies, which he as a member of the government around the council board was endeavouring to bring in and having intimate and first knowledge that they would be brought in. I think I shall be able to show that in the meantime the minister was working to get in his application. The first intimation we have of this matter comes from the following letter :

L. S. Macoun, General Broker
Ottawa, December 5, 1906.

To be fair and frank in the matter I think L. S. Macoun is a son-in-law of the Minister of Militia and Defence. If that is not denied I will take it for granted and go on with the reading of the letter. It reads:

The Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Understanding that it is the intention,

He knew, he had the knowledge,—

—of the Dominion government through the Department of Agriculture, to encourage by financial assistance, the establishment of cold storage warehouses for the preservation of perishable food products, I beg leave on behalf of the ' Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage, Limited,' to apply for, when available, the fullest information on the subject, and covering the conditions to be complied with to obtain what financial assistance or aid the government may decide to grant.

This company, which has received a charter from the Dominion government, was recently incorporated by letters patent, and has a capital stock of $1,000,000. It has secured under option, a suitable site on the deep water front at Halifax, Nova Scotia, which property is intersected by the tracks of the Intercolonial Railway. A site has been secured in St. John, New Brunswick, also on the harbour front and situated at the Canadian Pacific Railway's terminal, whose tracks also intersect the property. On each of the sites it is the intention of the company to erect next spring, a cold storage of adequate capacity and up to date in every particular. They have also in view the possibility of erecting one in Prince Edward Island and in several other locations not now equipped with cold storage.

Trusting that this application will receive your kind consideration.

I have the honour to be sir,
Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) L. S. MACOUN,
Secretary.

That is secretary of the same company I presume. That is all perfectly right. Let us go on to the reply. On December 13, 1906, the following letter is written :

L. S. Macoun, Esq., General Broker,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Macoun,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 5, with reference to the Bill I am introducing to provide better cold storage facilities for perishable products.

I note your application on behalf of 'Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage, Limited,' and shall be glad to furnish you with all the information available when our departmental arrangements are completed. In the meantime I have obtained and beg to send you herewith 'Hansard' report of the debates in the House on the subject up to the present time.

Yours very truly,
SYDNEY FISHER.

All of which is open and above board. Later we find a letter of April 11, which I have read, in which Mr. Fisher makes the announcement that Sir Frederick Borden has made an application on behalf of a company with which he is connected and that the minister viewed his application very favourably. I find no record of any application outside of Williams with the exceptions of Macoun's and Macoun's is on behalf of the Canadian Land Produce and Cold Storage, Limited, and I can find no other explanation of this than that the company in behalf of which Mr. Macoun, general broker, made application for information and the like, is the company to which the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture in an incautious moment referred.

Then another name comes in. I find the following letter:

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Sir Frederick Borden requested me to interview you in reference to aid for our cold storage propositions at St. John and Halifax. It is our intention to complete the one in St. John this season.

Taking up the very descriptions given by Mr. Macoun in a previous letter:

When I reached Ottawa Thursday night——

Mind you at the request of Sir Frederick Borden.

—when I reached Ottawa Thursday night I learned from Mr. Macoun that you had advised him that everything had been arranged in connection with this matter and therefore it would be unnecessary for me to bother you any further in reference to the matter in question. This will explain why I did not interview you in regard to the matter and if any further application or information is required please advise.

That letter is dated April 13. These dates you will remember are the very dates along which Mr. Williams is having his struggle to get an application in, and any chance for a fair consideration of that application:

When I reached Ottawa Thursday night, I learned from Mr. L. S. Macoun that you had advised him that everything had been arranged in connection with this matter and therefore it would be unnecessary for me to bother you any further in reference to the matter in question. This will explain why I did not interview you in regard to the matter and if any further application or information is required please advise

Yours truly,
R. J. GRAHAM.

We have three names thus far of men busying themselves about the very same proposition, Mr. Macoun, general broker, a son-in-law of the Hon. Sir Frederick Borden, Minister of Militia and Defence, Sir Frederick Borden who applied on behalf of the company with which he is connected and Mr. Graham who is requested by Sir Frederick Borden to go up to Ottawa and interview the minister of the department and make things right. He finds when he gets here after his hurried passage, that Mr. Macoun has been ahead of him and that everything is arranged so that he does not need to bother the minister. Then we have this letter of April 16, 1907:

Mr. R. J. Graham,
Belleville, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 13, and note what you state in regard to your visit to Ottawa last Thursday. This is quite satisfactory.

Yours very truly,
SYDNEY FISHER.

And there the matter rests for the present. The next occurrence is on June 11, 1907, when this letter is written:

Professor J. A. Ruddick,
Dairy Commissioner,
Department of Agriculture.

Dear Sir,—Herewith I inclose application for cold storage subsidy at St. John, New Brunswick. Attached are all the papers required by the Cold Storage Act, including schedule 'A' filled out as required by the Act, exhibit I showing the insulation contracted for with the Armstrong Cork Company, exhibit II showing plans and specifications for the foundation and superstructure, the former by F. W. Holt, C.E., the latter by Neil Brodie, architect, exhibit III, schedule of rates to be charged, exhibit IV, plan of site showing Intercolonial Railway siding, main building, annex and engine, boiler and machinery room.

Trusting you will find everything in order and awaiting your favourable consideration of my application, believe me,

Yours faithfully,
R. J GRAHAM.

With this are certain plans that are spoken of in the letter. On June 13, 1907, this is acknowledged by Mr. J. A. Ruddick. Then on August 7, 1907, the following letter is written:

L. S. Macoun, General Broker,
Central Chambers, Ottawa, August 7, 1907.
G. F. O'Halloran, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa.
Re cold storage warehouse, St. John, N.B.

Dear Sir,—I beg leave on behalf of Mr. R. J. Graham, of Belleville, Ont., to return herewith the original set you loaned me, and of

which I have made a duplicate set which is also inclosed.

A few days before Mr. O'Halloran had, in answer to a request from Mr. Macoun, lent him apparently three sets of papers which Mr. Macoun now restores to him :

Should everything not be entirely clear, you would please take up the matter with Mr. Graham, at Belleville, as I may be absent from Ottawa until August.

Believe me,
Yours faithfully,
L. S. MACOUN.

The connection is not at all broken between Mr. Graham and Mr. Macoun. If Mr. Macoun had remained in Ottawa, these communications would go to him, but while he is absent they are to go to Mr. Graham :

August 17, 1907.

Hon. Sydney Fisher, Ottawa,

Dear Sir,—As I have arranged with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company to amalgamate my interests with theirs, re cold storage at the city of St. John, you will be good enough to substitute the name of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company in the agreement instead of my own name, which I trust will be satisfactory to your department.

Yours truly,
R. J. GRAHAM.

The substitution was accepted at once, and so the said R. J. Graham and presumably the said two other gentlemen who are connected with him in these applications became amalgamated with the Cold Storage Company in the city of St. John.

I might state that R. J. Graham, under instructions, went to St. John and Halifax and procured the sites that were spoken of in the first letter by Mr. Macoun and afterwards referred to by Mr. Graham. The site he got in the city of St. John was on the west side of the harbour, but the Intercolonial Railway objected that that would not inure to its benefit. A certain amount of work took place and what happened ? The Intercolonial Railway, having acquired a piece of land in St. John for which it paid $8,415, leased that land for a period from 1907 to 1970 to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company—no, to Mr. Graham —for $250 per year with exemption from taxation during that time, and put an amount of extra work on it to the sum of some $4,000 or $5,000 in addition. That lease was given—carrying with it exemption from taxation from 1907 to 1970—at the small rental of $250 per year, giving the company possibly the most eligible site in the city of St. John for its establishment. In the end an amalgamation took place. The New Brunswick Cold Storage Company amalgamated its interests with these others, and that property went through various transformation until at last Mr. Graham, who first became possessed of the lease, assigned it to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, and that amalgamated company made it over to the government of New Brunswick. And then the government of New Brunswick leased it to the Cold Storage Company. There was some significance, I suppose, in that. Possibly it was to give the New Brunswick government some lien for the financial aid which they had given. And so, the assignment having been properly made, we go a little further :

New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, Ltd.,

Now full fledged.

Office of the secretary treasurer, Central Chambers, Ottawa, September 16, 1907.

G. F. O'Halloran, Esq.,
Deputy Minister Dept. of Agriculture,

Dear Sir, We beg to return herewith the rough copy of agreement which we have submitted to our directors, and which met with their acceptance, as you will note from copy of the resolution herewith inclosed.

Believe us yours faithfully,
The New Brunswick Cold Storage Coy., Ltd.,
L. S. MACOUN,
Secretary Treasurer.

On the next page we have the resolution of the directors in the city of St. John on the 12th September :

Moved by Mr. Geo. McAvity, seconded by Judge Trueman, that the president and secretary treasurer, shall execute on behalf of this company an agreement with His Majesty's Minister of Agriculture for Canada, whereby to the fulfilment thereof, this company shall receive the subsidy provided in the Cold Storage Act.

R. J. GRAHAM, President,
GEO. McAVITY, Vice. Pres.
L. S. MACOUN, Secy. Treas.
ARTHUR J, TRUEMAN, Director.
H. R. ROSS, Director.

So the matter stood, in its completed form, in that position. Now trouble began. Mr. Williams was not satisfied with the way he had been treated and he determined if possible to ascertain whether that sort of thing should go on. The order in council was passed on a memo. dated the 2nd August, 1907, from the Minister of Agriculture submitting :

That an application has been received from the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, Limited, of St. John, for a subsidy under the Cold Storage Act for having agreed to build a cold storage warehouse in the province of New Brunswick.

The minister goes on to state that the plans, specifications, &c., are all satisfactory, and the order in council authorizes a contract to be entered into between this company and the government, by which the government, when certain conditions are fulfilled, agree to give a subsidy of $30,000. Section 8 of the agreement provides :

That the minister shall be a director and a subsidy not exceeding in the whole 30 per cent of the amount expended and approved of in the construction and equipment of the

said warehouse, payable in installments as follows.

It is not necessary to follow out the installments. The main point I wish to bring out is this—that a contract is authorized by order in council and that by section 8, the minister is to pay a subsidy, not exceeding in the whole 30 per cent of the amount expended and approved of in the construction and equipment of the said warehouse.

Now, this was to cost a certain amount. But since that the plea has been put forward—and, I believe, substantiated—that it is to cost a great deal more. In that case, a subsidy of 30 per cent would mean a subsidy of a much larger amount. I have seen it stated that the cost will be at least $150,000. Of course, I am saying nothing against the plant; I believe it is a very complete and excellent one and starts with fine business prospects. But, if it cost $150,000, a subsidy of 30 per cent would represent $45,000. And, of course, that is only part of the aid given. The New Brunswick government, I understand, has had legislation passed to guarantee the principal and interest of a certain proportion of the bonds, running up, I understand, to $60,000. I am not sure that that is the exact figure. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will——

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is secured by first mortgage.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly. What I am pointing out is that, on the basis of cost I have given, the subsidy would be $45,000, and they have also the guarantee of the provincial government of both principal and interest to the amount of $60,000 more, making $105,000 in all. Of course the local government protects itself by a first lien upon the whole property.

Now, as I have said, Mr. Williams took the ground that he, a business man, ought not to have met with the competition of a cabinet minister in seeking a subsidy which was the benefaction, so to speak, of the government of which the cabinet minister was a member. He, therefore, commenced to make the pen warm. He wrote, as he had promised he would, to the Prime Minister. And I think I cannot do better than read that letter:

St. John, N.B., August 15, 1907.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—The writer, F. E. Williams, made application to your government early in 1906 for a bonus for a bait freezer in St. John, similar to those erected in Canso and Halifax. The bonus given to Canso and Halifax bait freezers was 50 per cent of the first cost, the game not to exceed $60,000, and $2,000 a year for three years, making a totaal bonus of $36,000 on a cost of $60,00. The proprietors of these freezers agreed to keep frozen bait on hand to supply the fishermen during the warm weather when fresh bait was not obtainable. All the conditions that apply to the Canso and Halifax would apply to St. John for the benefit of the fisheries in the Bay of Fundy, St. John being the headquarters for bait supply.

After discussing the matter with Hon. Mr. Emmerson and Hon. Mr. Brodeur both by personal interviews and letters during 1906, I received the inclosed letter (No. 1) from Hon. Mr. Emmerson. Mr. Trueman mentioned in this letter is my solicitor who accompanied me to Ottawa interviewing the ministers. The last of December, 1906, Hon. Mr. Emmerson, being in St. John assured me that there would be sufficient money in the estimate to cover the bait freezer in St. John, and that he would soon send me a telegram to go to Ottawa for the purpose of closing the contract with the government. I received the telegram about the 9th of January, 1907, and at once proceeded to Ottawa. I was met by Sir Frederick Borden and his son-in-law, Mr. Macoun. They informed me that they had a scheme of building a cold storage and that Hon. Mr. Fisher promised them a grant, which would be forthcoming when the Cold Storage Act was passed, and wanted me to abandon my scheme and come in with them. Sir Frederick Borden made a proposition to me, which I thought was very unfair coming from a minister of the Crown. He also said to me in the parliament buildings that he would have influence enough to have my proposition sidetracked and that Hon. Mr. Fisher would give him the grant for his cold storage scheme. While in Ottawa I urged Hon. Mr. Emmerson to endeavour to close a contract, but I could see that matters were being delayed, and he advised me to return to St. John, promising that he would not allow this scheme of Sir Frederick Borden to interfere with my proposition.

Sir Frederick Borden formed a company about October, 1906, called 'The Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Company.' It looks very much as if he formed this company about the time Hon. Mr. Fisher's Cold Storage Act was talked over in council and that this company was formed for the purpose of getting these grants, which the government would make.

Sir Frederick Borden visited St. John the last of December, 1906, and I inclose you a newspaper clipping——

Which, by the way, is not brought down.

—which shows that he was looking after cold storage business in St. John. He induced Mr. George McAvity to back him up in this city. Mr. McAvity was to use his influence with the local New Brunswick government to have the bonds of Sir Frederick Borden's company guaranteed to the extent of $60,000 and Sir Frederick Borden was to get a $30,000 grant through Hon. Mr. Fisher's department at Ottawa. Sir Frederick Borden told me while in Ottawa that he did not expect this cold storage to cost over $75,000 or $80,000 and they would get $90,000——

That is $60,000 and $30,000, you see.

—out of the government and make a construction profit besides owning the freezer. I wrote Hon. Mr. Emmerson and Hon. Mr. Fisher very strongly, and I inclose you copies of the letters I sent them. They are now erecting this cold storage warehouse in this city. I cannot think that you are aware of the facts in connection with this transaction, or that you can approve of a minister of the Crown deriving aid from the government for the furtherance of the interests of a company in which he is so largely interested. I appeal to you to frustrate the scheme and to put me in a position to make application for a grant for a frigerator that cannot be criticised in the way Sir Frederick Borden's can be.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) F. E. WILLIAMS.

And here is the letter he incloses.

Ottawa, November 19, 1906.

Dear Mr. Williams,—Your letter of October 17, was acknowledged merely. Since then I have been working on the matter. I gather from your present letter that you have doubts as to my giving you support in this matter. In this you do me an injustice. There are ways and ways of doing things and it is not desirable to have to secure concessions from my colleagues at the point of the bayonet. Failure is likely to accompany such procedure. My methods have been more successful than those you suggest. It does not do to be too impatient as to bringing about results. Let me say that there is likely to be placed in the estimates a provision for bait freezers to cover your proposals. Mr. Brodeur has given me great encouragement, and I hope before session closes to be able to invite you to Ottawa to enter into a contract which I trust will be mutually satisfactory. There is no present necessity for either you or Mr. Trueman coming to Ottawa.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) H. R. EMMERSON.

P. E. Williams, Esq.,
St. John, N.B.

Mr. LENNOX. Is that the Trueman who figured after as Judge Trueman?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether this is the judge or the solicitor. Judge Trueman has since died.

Mr. DANIEL. This is the judge, and a member of the firm of Pugsley & Trueman. He was in the cold storage company.

Mr. FOWLER. His name appears there for another man.

Mr. FOSTER. And here is another letter:

Ottawa, January 7, 1907.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 5th instant. I had received some information which is set forth in the clipping you inclose. I have been in communication, and am now, with Mr. Brodeur on the subject. I consider the two propositions quite distinct.

Yours faithfully
(Sgd.) H. R. EMMERSON.

F. E. Williams, Esq.,
St. John, N.B.

Now, when that letter to the premier came the fat was in the fire and there began to be some little stir. Two letters were written, which I think must be put on the pages of 'Hansard,' one of which I find at page 74 of this return.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there any answer to that letter of Mr. Williams to the Prime Minister?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and I will read it now. That letter was written to Sir Wilfrid on the 15th of August, 1907, when he was in the old country, and it was answered when he came back, on the 5th of October, 1907.

Dear Sir,—Adverting to your letter of the 15th of August last in reference to the grant of a subsidy to aid the establishment of a cold storage warehouse at St John, New Brunswick, I have gone fully into the matter, and find that on the 8th of April last you were advised to the Minister of Agriculture in reply to your inquiry as to whether your application for this purpose would be granted, that he could not make any promises without definite plans and specifications, and full information as to what the people applying were prepared to do, none of which had you furnished.

Yet at that very time the letter of Mr. Fisher, very pronounced with reference to Sir Frederick Borden's application, and his very favourable view of it, is on record.

Mr. FOWLER. And he refused to tell this man when he asked the question if the thing was still open?

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly.

On the 7th of June last, during the absence of the minister you were advised by his deputy in reply to your inquiry of the 3rd of the same month, that if you would submit your application it would receive due consideration.

That was the letter that contained the answer, the final request and appeal of Mr. Williams, who wanted to know, if he went to the expense of putting in plans and specifications, would his application get fair consideration.

It appears that in the meantime you had been supplied with forms for making the aplication in accordance with the regulations made under the Cold Storage Act.

Which was true.

It was the intention of the Minister of Agriculture, should your application be filed, to consider it in connection with that of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, the one on whose behalf Sir Frederick Borden had interested himself——

There again the Prime Minister declares that Sir Frederick Borden was interested in this company.

—and recommend the granting of the subsidy to the applicant whose scheme seemed the more in the public interest.

But the Minister of Agriculture had already indicated his preference, he was very favourably disposed to Sir Frederick Borden. The minister, Sir Frederick Borden, was here. In fact, if we are to believe the letter which was written and which I have read, when Mr. Graham came up from Brockville and interviewed the minister, he had been preceded by Mr. Macoun who had been told that everything had been made all right, that there was no need of bothering himself any more about it. The scant comfort which would come from this reply of the minister would be quite apparent.

In order that you might have ample opportunity to file your application no action was taken on that of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company until late in August, on the favourable report of the expert officer of the Department of Agriculture, made after careful consideration and examination of the plans, specifications and proposed operation of the establishment, and there being no other application before the department from St. John, it was decided to give a subsidy to that company.

Making it absolutely impossible for a man to compete, and therefore to put in his plans and the like of that, and then telling him that there was no other, and that therefore it was given to the one that was there.

I need hardly add that the application was dealt with by the Department of Agriculture without regard to the personal of the applicants or those associated with them, nor that your application would have received the same consideration as was given to that of the successful applicants if you had seen fit to file it.

Yours very sincerely,

WILFRID LAURIER.

Now on page 74 and following pages, I find two distinct apologies. 74 is the apology of Mr. Macoun. This matter had come before the minister, it was growing a little warm, it was known that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was on his way back and would soon be here; and so Mr. L. S. Macoun, general broker, Central Chambers, Ottawa, on September 16, 1907, wrote Mr. Fisher:

Dear Mr. Fisher,—I inclose herewith a clipping from the St. John 'Globe' of August 26, signed by 'An Onlooker.' I have no doubt in my mind, judging from the letter, that it was written or inspired by Mr. Frank Williams, of that city.

All I know about Mr. Williams is that he came to Ottawa to interview the Marine Department in the hopes of securing aid towards erecting a bait freezer along the lines of the aid granted the Halifax Cold Storage Company by the above department. Whether the fact leaked out that he was more interested in a pork packing establishment which he owns, than in bait for fishermen, I cannot say. All I know is that he was not successful in his quest. It was on this occasion that I met him for the first and last time. I must confess that I was not in any way prepossessed in his favour, in fact quite the reverse.

What a set back for Mr. Williams.

I told him on this occasion that I was interested in a company which had applied to your department for aid in erecting a cold storage warehouse which would be a public utility, and that to some extent our interests were the same. At first he was inclined to entirely ignore our right to intrude upon what he considered was his own territory. However, later on, he decided to make a proposition that he should be the president and managing director of our company and have full control of the building operations, and have full say in its future management. To this, of course, we could not agree, as Mr. Williams knows nothing whatever about the management of cold storage warehouses, and in addition we had already engaged the services of a very practical man, viz., Mr. R. J. Graham, of Belleville, Ontario.

So Mr. Macoun now reduced the active promoters down to two, himself and the Minister of Militia, and they hired Mr. Graham as a practical man to come in and do the business.

Since then I have had no further correspondence with Mr. Williams. I understand, however, that this man took serious umbrage on learing we could not entertain his proposition, and has done his best to thwart us on all occasions. Our first unpleasantness with him was when we applied to the city council of St. John, New Brunswick, for certain privileges which they had already granted others who once, some years ago, had like objects in view. He went to the council meeting and there used the most offensive and abusive language conceivable, stating that it was a most questionable and undesirable undertaking, and that those interested, including Sir Frederick Borden and others——

Admitting again that Sir Frederick Borden is one of those that were interested.

—were only interested in promoting the company and securing promotion expenses, government grants, and contractors' profits. In fact, he behaved in such an abominable manner as to warrant an action to libel. His statements, needless to say, are of course, without any foundation, but they had for the moment the effect of prejudicing the St. John city council against the undertaking. They, however, informed Mr. Williams that if he had any proposition to make they would be pleased to receive it in writing. He had stated at the meeting that he neither required or expected any exemption from taxation, or a free site, that he was prepared with his own money to build and operate a cold storage building, and did not seek civic, government or other aid. The council, however, waited in vain for any written proposition from Mr. Williams——

What written proposition could they get from Mr. Williams when he had no look in

for the government subsidy, and therefore could not be expected to carry it on at his own costs and charges. Bear in mind that the company had got the subsidy from this government, they had got also a guarantee from the New Brunswick government, and they had got also a valuable site upon which to establish cold storage plant. Therefore, they had everything; Mr. Williams was simply out in the cold.

The council, however, waited in vain for any written proposition from Mr. Williams, so granted us ten years exemption from taxation, and offered us a very valuable site at $250 a year. We heard nothing further of Mr. Williams until August 28th, when I received a letter from Mr. Geo. McAvity, who is the vice-president of our company, forwarding me the inclosed clipping with the remark that he was 'not aware that any cabinet minister or any ex-premier was financially interested in our undertaking.' The minister referred to is Sir Frederick Borden, and the ex-premier, the Hon. Dr. Pugsley, neither of whom have purchased or been given or even subscribed for stock in our company.

I can, to some extent, understand Mr. Williams' annoyance in the matter, knowing how he has failed to provide for his own private pork packing establishment, a cold storage plant largely at the expense of the Dominion government, but I cannot understand why he should seek by every unfair means in his power, to cast slurs upon our undertaking, and make the base insinuations he has in private and in public from time to time made.

I trust you will forgive the liberty I am taking in bringing this matter to your attention. I think in doing so, it is only fair to your department and to ourselves.

Believe me,
Yours faithfully,
L. S. MACOUN.

The Hon. Sydney A. Fisher, M.P.,
Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa.

Then follows, with reference to the cold storage episode, a clipping from the St. John 'Globe' which carries out the matter just about as I have stated it. On September 26, there is the following letter :

L. S. Macoun, Esq., General Broker,
Central Chambers, Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Macoun,—I have yours of September 16th, informing me about Mr. Williams. I have seen some letters of his, addressed to my department, and others through which he has been trying to balk your company's contract with the department. There is nothing in anything he has said which in any way justify refusing to enter into a contract with your company.

Mr. Williams was told by Mr. O'Halloran himself, that if he had any proposition to make it would be fairly and properly considered. He has made none. We, therefore, cannot recognize him at all. I think I understand the situation fully.

Your sincerely,
SYDNEY FISHER.

Now, the other letter I wish to read is displayed on page 105 of this return and we will see what confirmation is given by that letter.

Ottawa, January 22, 1908.

Dear Fisher,—My attention has just been called for the first time to certain letters of one F. E. Williams of St. John, N.B., addressed to the Prime Minister, yourself and Mr. Emmerson, respectively, with reference to cold storage construction at St. John, N.B. I am glad you have given me the opportunity of seeing these letters so that I may prepare a brief answer.

First let me say that the letters are full of untruths and misrepresentations. I saw Mr. Williams here some time last winter and he was introduced to me by Mr. Emmerson. I had then, as you know, been engaged for four or five months in endeavouring to establish a company with a million dollars capital, to take up cold storage and other important matters connected therewith.

It is the minister himself who says that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Why, certainly.

Mr. FOSTER (reading) :

I understood Mr. Williams was in pursuit of a grant for a bait freezer similar to the one already established at Halifax. In company with Mr. Brodeur, Mr. Emmerson and yourself, I heard Mr. Williams present his case in that behalf. I never understood that he intended to take up the question of cold storage in a general way.

Than which nothing could have been more patent from the letters of Mr. Williams himself which I have just read and which are on file.

His doing so must have been an afterthought.

The very first letter that he wrote, in October, 1905, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shows that his scheme was to do a commercial cold storage business and a bait freezing cold storage business and he never wavered in that plan from that time.

His doing so much have been an afterthought. I never made a proposal to him of any kind or description and never had the slightest intention of becoming associated with him in any respect whatever. In the summer of 1906, Mr. R. J. Graham, of Belleville, Ont., and others, including myself, procurred a Dominion charter with authorized capital of a million dollars for a company called the Canada Lands Produce and Cold Storage, Limited, above referred to.

There is a complete vindication of the statement made by Mr. Macoun, of the statement made by Mr. Graham, and of the statements made by Mr. Williams.

This charter was taken by some people in England who expected to be able to float it and advance certain sums of money to be paid over during the spring and summer of 1907.

On several occasions in 1906 I discussed the

question of cold storage establishments at Halifax and St. John with you as well as with the provincial authorities both at Halifax and St. John. Mr. R. J. Graham, with whom you are acquainted, was here on most of those occasions and discussed the question fully with you after having visited both Halifax and St. John during 1906. Mr. Graham, as you know, is an expert in cold storage and has been familiar with the business for the last ten or fifteen years. He was appointed manager of the Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Ltd., and the initial steps taken at St. John and Halifax in respect of cold storage were in the interest of that company.

Now, I think nothing could be plainer than that.

I left for England to attend the Colonial Conference about the 5th of April, and had nothing to do with the cold storage matter until after my return in June, when I found that Mr. Graham—

Who had been hired by this company, according to Mr. Macoun.

—had begun operations in St. John in the expectation that funds would be forthcoming from England in connection with the Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Ltd.

That, I may say, is a complete sustainment of the position which has been taken by Mr. Williams and which was disclosed in the first part of this correspondence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps you had better read the rest of the letter.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I will read the rest of the letter.

About this time Mr. Graham concluded an arrangement with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, a company which had been chartered many years before by the New Brunswick legislature. I need not trouble you with any further details as you are quite familiar with all that has taken place since that time. I am not a member of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company and have no connection with it whatever except that I have done all I could to assist the company in carrying on its work largely because I am greatly interested in the business of fruit growing in the Annapolis and Cornwallis valley and because I feel sure that a cold storage establishment at St. John will be of immense advantage in exporting fruit from that valley.

I will be glad to have this letter included in the return which you are bringing down.

F. W. BORDEN,

As far as reading from the documents is concerned that ends the presentation of it.

Mr. HAGGART. Whose letter is that?

Mr. FOSTER. That letter is signed by F. W. Borden and is addressed to the Hon. Sydney Fisher, Minister of Agriculture, and is acknowledged on the 24th January, 1908, by Mr. Sydney Fisher himself, Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was not present during the reading of the correspondence, but as I came in I heard my name mentioned in some way in connection with the company. Is there any statement to the effect that I was interested in the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, in any way?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not think there is any statement connecting the hon. gentleman's name in the whole correspondence, except the letter written by Mr. Macoun who refers both to Sir Frederick Borden and the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As being interested in the incorporation as it is stated?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He refers to Williams' letters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rather inferred from Mr. Macoun's letter that somebody had written to the effect that I was interested. that while I, as a member of the provincial government, for a great many years took a deep interest in endeavouring to have a cold storage warehouse erected at New Brunswick and also at other points in New Brunswick, I never had any interest, direct or indirect, in the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, or in any other.

Mr. FOSTER. In so far as the correspondence goes I do not think it says so. The strongest interpretation that could be put on Macoun's letter is that it had been stated that the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) was interested.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He was quoting a statement published in a paper in St. John, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. I set myself to find out when this company was incorporated and who incorporated it. As I had the statement of the Minister of Militia that he and Graham and others were interested in getting up this one million dollar company, I searched the files of the 'Canada Gazette' faithfully, but I could not find it. The only thing I did find was that on October 13, 1906, that is, in the fall of 1906, about the time that this legislation was being perfected ready for the House and about the time the minister says he was for four or five months trying to get up a company, a company called the Canada Lands and Farm Produce Company was incorporated, the incorporators being L. J. Miller, Hezekiah McKeown Mosher, John Hainy Hearn, Willard Hill Fulton, Joseph Burke Kenny. That is the nearest approach I could make to the facts and I do not find the name of one of these gentlemen. It may be that these were the names of clerks used for the purpose of getting incorporation and that when the incorporation had been secured the company was made over to the gentlemen themselves. I suppose that was probably it. Any way it shows about the

only modest step in the whole proceedings taken by the Minister of Militia and Defence, that he did not want to put his own name outright as being the incorporator of a company which was asking a subsidy for himself and a company of which he was a member.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not the reason. I cannot for the moment think of the name of lawyers in Halifax who procured the charter, but this firm, as usual, took the names of their own clerks in the office.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very often done, and then the company was organized.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Organized after that.

Mr. FOSTER. Now what seems to be the dominant features in this transaction? I shall summarize very briefly. We find that in 1906 a minister of the Crown interests himself in the formation of a million dollar company for the purpose of carrying on cold storage on a commercial basis, that he gets that company formed, that on October 13, a charter is taken out and it is incorporated. During the very same time he is sitting at the council board maturing a scheme for government subsidies to cold storage plants, and he himself states, and it is also stated with reference to him, that his company is an applicant from the very first time that an application could be put in for that subsidy. The minister at the end says: There is nothing left now but the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company and I own no stock in that. But what was the intention and purpose of the minister? That million dollar company was formed, it was proposed to float it in England. What circumstance would help to float it in England? Do you mean to tell me that anybody would attempt to float that in England unless he made all use possible of the elements that would secure confidence? And what would be the prime elements? The promoter would say the government of the Dominion have passed an Act or they have settled upon an Act and are going to pass it, by which they will give 30 per cent of the total cost of construction and equipment as a subsidy to a cold storage company. This is the cold storage company that I am promoting in London, and I want to tell you further that one of the prime persons interested in that company is Sir Frederick Borden, a member of this very government which is responsible for this subsidy and which will therefore carry out this legislation. Put those two elements together and you have the elements which, under favourable conditions, would have floated that company. Take this into account and Mr. Macoun for this company, Mr. Graham an employee of this company, Sir Frederick Borden himself as testified to by the Minister of Agriculture as one prominently interested in that company, have all made application to the government for a subsidy for their cold storage plant. Sir, it is a thing which would be unheard of in the annals of the British government for any cabinet minister to engage in anything like that. Why, Sir, I remember a few years ago when Mr. Mundella, a man against whose honour there was not a single stain of any kind, being indirectly connected with a company which had made some sales to the British government, felt that he could not excuse himself and he immediately resigned from the government rather than place the government in a wrong position by that indirect connection. But here is a minister who openly, in the light of day, works to bring about a scheme, helps to carry the scheme in parliament and all the time that he is doing that is working up a million dollar company in order that he may get a subsidy from the government of which he is a member, and under whose auspices this is brought forth, and it was only by the accident that the money was not raised in Great Britain to float that company that when he came back and found Mr. Graham busily at work all summer buying lots, getting ready to build, getting material under the assumption that the money would be got in Great Britain that he joined with Mr. McAvity and they amalgamated their interests in the cold storage company. But the animus, if I may so speak, the intent certainly is shown in the open, full, unqualified way in which the minister went to work first to make legislation and secondly to incorporate a company in which he himself was largely interested in order to get a subsidy and therefore to partake of the benefit. I say that is not the thing for a cabinet minister to do. I care not whether the cabinet minister is as innocent as the babe unborn, or whether there are other charges against him with reference to other transactions in the public domain which are debatable to say the least. But that is the state of things with reference to this minister, and I think it would be a graceful act in the minister himself, even at this late day, to cease to compromise his colleagues any longer, and to resign from the government on account of that transaction.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, so the hon. gentleman demands my resignation.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I suggest it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is himself qualified to pose or act as censor of public morals in this House or in this country. The hon. gentleman has spent three hours, or two hours and a half, this afternoon, in endeavouring to bring

forward correspondence, to draw inferences, and to make statements prejudical to my character and reputation. The hon. gentleman is very fertile in seeing wrong-doing in others. The hon. gentleman seems to live in a sort of hallucination that there is nothing but evil in the people surrounding him. He has doubts even about some of the people in his own party. He certainly had a few years ago, when his former leader designated him as the chief of a nest of traitors.

Mr. BENNETT. But they resigned.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman seems to be very suspicious. But, Mr. Speaker, assuming that every word that he has said to-day is true—and scarcely a word of it is true in its application—I would like this House to consider whether at its worst it is to be compared for one moment with the position of a man who succeeds in placing himself in a position of trust in a company and then succeeds in placing himself in another position connected with another company, and then engages in the delightful occupation of buying for the company of which he is manager, and taking a commission which comes out of the hard savings and earnings of the people of this country, in connection with one of the large insurance companies, and putting that commission into his own pocket.

Mr. FOSTER. All of which is——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. All of which is absolutely true.

Mr. FOSTER—is absolutely untrue.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And was proved by the record of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. It was never proved and never can be proved from any record.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Now, Mr. Speaker,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Prove it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The book is open. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the Minister of Justice in his place in this House proved it absolutely, and he knows that he failed to answer it.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me, he says what I know. I think I know what I know myself. I know nothing of the kind that he says I do. The Minister of Justice never proved the assertion the Minister of Militia and Defence has now made, and what is more, he cannot prove it. I challenged him to meet me before my own people in the city of Toronto and assert what he asserted in this House. I make the same challenge to my hon. friend now, if he will take it up.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He does not need to take it up, because it is done. It is an accomplished fact, and everybody in this House and out of it knows that it is an accomplished fact. The hon. gentleman is very bold. The hon. gentleman has two peculiarities at least. One is that he cannot see any good in anybody but himself, and he is incapable of seeing any harm in himself. He is mentally crooked, as well as morally crooked.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. Not that I care, Mr. Speaker,——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I withdraw that word.

Mr. FOSTER—what this gentleman says of me, but I am bound to respect my position as a member, and I ask that that be retracted.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I say that the hon. gentleman is neither mentally nor morally crooked, in a parliamentary sense—how is that? But possibly in a Pickwickian sense he might be.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there is not a great deal of point in that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Now, Mr. Speaker, however true the statement made by the Minister of Justice in this House a year ago may be—and I believe it is absolutely true—that the hon. gentleman abused his position—or utilized his position, perhaps would be more parliamentary—in order to act in two or three different capacities to his own pecuniary advantage, it has nothing to do with the case before the House. I grant that, and the fact that he may not be all that he professes to be, and all that we would wish he might be, the case having been brought here, it is necessary for me to make a few observations with reference to it, and I propose to do so.

Now, I think the hon. gentleman has gone very much out of his way to endeavour to bring a charge against a fellow member of this House. I would think that he ought rather to assume that the thing which he professes to believe here to-day is not true rather than to have rushed——

Mr. FOSTER. As the hon. gentleman did in the case of Colonel Worthington.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What is that? I do not remember.

Mr. FOSTER. If you had taken that advice, you would not have made the vitrolic personal attack that you made.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. That is what I might expect from an eighteenth century knight.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I suppose the hon. gentleman makes some reference to the Nineteenth Century, does he? If he does, I do not suppose he can take any par-

ticular credit for that. The Nineteenth Century saw fit to make a charge against me and has withdrawn it and apologized. If that is what the hon. gentleman refers to, if he sees fit to do the same, I will endeavour to treat him in the same way. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says in effect that I have, in my position as a minister of the Crown and a member of the cabinet, procured the passing of a law by which a special grant or subsidy was to be given for cold storage to the extent of 30 per cent of the cost of the cold storage building, to be spread over a considerable number of years. Well, the hon. gentleman does me an injustice on the one hand, and does me altogether too great credit on the other hand. I am not so all-powerful even from selffish motives, as the hon. gentleman would think.

Mr. FOSTER. I take it back.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not believe that in his heart, badly as he may think of me, he believes that I would set myself at work in the cabinet to do a thing of that kind. But if he did have that opinion of me, I can assure him with absolute truth that I do not possess over my honourable and honoured leader and over my colleagues of the cabinet any such extraordinary power. The cabinet of this country, as far as I have had experience—and I have been in it for twelve years—conducts its business from broad public motives, and in this particular matter of cold storage, everybody knows that in this House for years and years, hon. gentlemen on the opposition side of the House and hon. gentlemen sitting on this side have advocated a greater encouragement to cold storage in Canada. Everybody knows how important it is to the best interests of Canada—to the butter, the cheese, the fish, the meat and the fruit industries—that cold storage should be developed as rapidly as possible. And so my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), having been besieged and argued with in this House and out of it to do more than was being done in order to aid cold storage generally, felt that it was time some stand should be taken, and altogether independent of me, except in so far as I may be a humble member of that cabinet, this policy was brought down after most careful consideration. But I had no more to do with it than any other member of the cabinet, and the cabinet acted solely in deference to public opinion throughout the country. So much for that.

As to this particular cold storage establishment, we have been told a great deal about a man named Williams who applied some years ago for a subsidy for a bait freezer. He said he was engaged in the fish business in St. John, though it turned out he was engaged in the pork business. He wished to get from the Department of Marine and Fisheries a grant—not of thirty—but of fifty per cent in order to enable him to freeze bait and carry on his own line of business. In other words, he wished to be given a system of cold storage which would subsidize directly his own line of business and not a cold storage on a large scale which would be a great advantage to the foreign export as well as the local business, but be of far less importance to the local than to the export trade. Mr. Williams wanted something which would particularly benefit his own line of business and he made certain applications and had certain negotiations with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). But owing to a change of policy in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Williams failed to get what he wanted; and not being pleased, he endeavoured to solace himself by abusing me. Seeing that even he could not get something for nothing, he published in the newspapers some very abusive articles against me, and he sent to the First Minister the letter which was read by the hon. gentleman and in which I am abused very severely. Let me say, as I have said in a letter which I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture and which the hon. gentleman read, that Mr. Williams' statements, from beginning to end, are absolutely and utterly without foundation, and I shall not waste further time upon him beyond saying that he is an unworthy disappointed man, and being unworthy and disappointed, indulged in these letters and articles against me, which have so delighted the hon. gentleman.

The hon. gentleman was in Nova Scotia last summer. He did me the honour, in the beginning of this session, to point out that he saw my family riding somewhere in an official car. That was about the time this man Williams was concocting his letters. Mr. Williams puts forth the same idea in his letters that the hon. gentleman has expressed to-day, namely, that I had procured from this government the adoption of this policy of aiding cold storage simply and solely to benefit myself and put this 30 per cent subsidy in my own pocket. Well, the hon. gentleman is welcome to all the satisfaction he can get out of those letters. I can easily understand that that kind of man and that kind of letter will delight the hon. gentleman, but I doubt if he will find many others who will be particularly pleased with the unfair, dishonest and dishonourable statements this man has made. I dismiss his statements with an absolute denial, and I shall be prepared, if it should be thought worth while by the hon. gentleman to submit this case to any other tribunal, to go on oath and make my answer to any charges brought by Williams or anybody else in his behalf. So much for the first charge, that I procured the passing of this legislation for my own benefit. Where is the proof? Where are the benefits? Has the hon. gen-

tleman been able to show that I have in any way participated in anything that could by any possibility be a benefit to me? The hon. gentleman has rung the changes upon the fact that my son-in-law, Mr. L. S. Macoun, happens to be connected with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company and with another company which was incorporated and in which I had an interest, although I had no interest, and never expect to have any, in the Cold Storage Company. Is my son-in-law to be prevented from engaging in legitimate business because he happens to be my son-in-law? He was in similar business before he came to my house, and I know of no reason why he should be punished and deprived of the means of getting a livelihood because he happens to be connected with my family. I have observed questions on the paper and notices in the Public Accounts Committee this session which would indicate that certain gentlemen think that because Mr. Macoun is my son-in-law and happens to get an occasional contract from the public service —if he has got one—there must be something improper in it. I am quite willing that the fullest investigation should be made. But surely I am not to be asked to deprive my son-in-law of the means of earning an honest livelihood because he happens to have married into my family. So much for the son-in-law argument.

I observe that the hon. gentleman made some reference to a company for which, he says, I procured a charter in 1906, and with great diligence he has hunted up the names. And he saw something very mysterious and terrible in the fact that the names were not very well known. I tell him that the names were those of the clerks in the law firm which procured this incorporation. The firm was that of Drysdale and McGinnis. Mr. McGinnis is one of the most prominent Conservatives in Nova Scotia, a man of the highest honour and one to whose business capacity and business methods the hon. member (Mr. Foster) will not take exception. While I was in England in 1906 application was made under instructions given by me and Mr. Graham jointly for the incorporation of a company. It was intended, I may say at once and frankly, that my properties in Kings county, orchards and farms should be made a part of this company, and Mr. Graham, of Belleville, I believe, a prominent Conservative, a great fruit dealer and well up in cold storage and all matters pertaining to agriculture, was to have taken an interest and to put his properties into the company in the same way as mine were to be put in, and we were to accept bonds and a certain amount of stock for these properties. It was expected that money would be raised in England to carry on the business, and it was expected also that a portion of the money would undoubtedly be invested in the establishment of cold storage plants in different parts of Canada. Was there anything wrong in that? Was there anything highly improper in that? This was all arranged before it was expected that any policy such as that afterwards decided upon would be brought down by the government. When the Minister of Agriculture saw fit to adopt the policy of aiding, somewhat largely, cold storage. I felt that, so far as I was concerned, it would be undesirable for me to own stock in any company which was receiving from the government a subsidy, although, under the law, I do not know that it would have been. I would not have been going beyond my right in doing so. Then it was that I told Mr. Graham that some other means must be taken to carry on the cold storage project in the city of St. John and elsewhere. Mr. Graham made arrangements with a company already established, or, if not established, at least incorporated, known as the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. He made arrangements with the government to secure for that company the necessary bonus which any cold storage company complying with the requirements of the law would be entitled to. Mr. Williams thinks he did not receive fair treatment. Mr. Williams never made a serious application. He never filed plans in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Agriculture. My own opinion—without wishing to reflect upon Mr. Williams—is that he never intended seriously to construct anything like the kind of cold storage establishment which is now in existence to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) himself is not able to take exception, and with which he finds no fault. My own opinion is that Mr. Williams never intended seriously to do more than provide something which he could put up under his own roof and control in connection with his business. What is this cold storage plant established at St. John? I am told that it is one of the most creditable, if not absolutely the most up-to-date establishment of its kind on this continent; that it has cost $160,000 or $170,000; that it is already doing a considerable business, and that it is being utilized for the business of transatlantic export. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says that I am interested. Well, Sir, I am interested; and I want to appeal to you and to this House as to whether there was anything underhand in the matter. The hon. gentleman says that this is done openly. Certainly, it is done openly; there has been no desire or intention to conceal anything—there has been nothing to conceal. I have said I am interested. What was my interest? My interest was to endeavour to provide the means at St. John—as I hope may be provided also at Halifax later on—by which the fruit that is yearly grown in the valley of which I am a citizen the great Annapolis and Cornwallis valleys,

can be cared for and held in cold storage safely, so that the people who grow that fruit may get the benefit of the best prices in the English market. Consider what happened last year. Thousands and tens of thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands—of barrels of the best fruit were sacrificed because of arrival in England at a moment when the market was unfavourable. The fruit had to be shipped early; it could not be held, there being no means of keeping it. I have reason to know now that scores of people who were compelled last year to ship their fruit in this way—not only from my own province but from the west—will take advantage of this means of keeping the fruit and so tempering the market and shipping as the demand may exist for the goods in England. Mr. Speaker, the shipment of fruit from Ontario is a most important industry. In the winter months. the great port of Montreal, to which a great deal of the fruit is shipped up to December is closed. The fruit must go to the United States in order to be shipped, and, in transit from Ontario to Portland or Boston the fruit is frequently frozen. Two years ago this involved an enormous loss to the growers and dealers of Ontario. Under the present arrangement, I am told, tens of thousands of barrels will be taken to St. John in November or the early part of December, before the frosts become serious, and there stored to be shipped during the winter months. This is the interest and the only interest that I have in this cold storage establishment. I do not own one dollar of stock; I have never received one dollar of benefit. I never expect or intend to hold one dollar of stock; I never expect to receive one single dollar of benefit. I have done this in my position as a public man and a minister because I thought I was doing right, and I do not fear the closest examination into what I have done. It remained for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) with his suspicious mind trained—trained, Mr. Speaker—as there has been ample proof, in directions not always the most open and frank; it remained for this gentleman to see this spectre of malfeasance and of failure to perform my duty in connection with my position. I can do no more, I suppose, than contradict the statement and deny it. I do not expect to satisfy the hon. member—he is not built upon those lines. I do expect, however, to be able to satisfy a large part of those who sit with him, and I do not doubt that my statement here in this House will be accepted with far more credence than any statement the hon. gentleman could make.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I am sure we have all listened with a great deal of interest to the speech which has just been delivered by the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden). I congratulate him at all events on the plucky manner in which he made his defence. Not satisfied with assuming a defensive attitude he, as becomes the soldier, and head of the war department that he is, carried the war into the enemy's country, and made an attack on the opposition party. Unfortunately the line of defence which he seems to have adopted reminds us of the rule which seems to prevail among the legal fraternity, that when you have a bad case you are expected to abuse your opponent. That I think is the great weakness of the defence which the Minister of Militia has made this afternoon. He started out to abuse the hon. member for North Toronto who had brought this subject before the House. In my opinion if there is any subject which, more than another, ought to be ventilated before this House and this country, it is acts which reflect on the character of our public men, acts which contradict the high ideals which we all desire, I hope, to see set before the young men of this country and carried out by them. The people of this country naturally look up to their public men for examples, and especially do they look to members of the cabinet for examples of high character which can be safely followed by the public at large. The hon. minister made some personal reference to the hon. member for North Toronto, and rather accused him of taking commissions and things of that kind when he was manager of the Union Trust Company. These statements were absolutely denied by the hon. member for North Toronto himself, and I challenge the Minister of Militia to place his finger on anything in the printed evidence which will bear out any statement or insinuation of that kind, namely, that, the hon. member for North Toronto, while he was being paid as manager of the Union Trust Company, accepted commissions for business which he obtained for that company and out of which that company made a profit. If the Minister of Militia is able to do that, he has an opportunity. The minister even went further, and he pointed, so to speak, the finger of scorn at the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. JOHNSON. The hon. member referred to the evidence relating to the action of the hon. member for North Toronto. If he wants information——

Mr. DANIEL. I have the floor. If the Minister of Militia has anything to say, I will permit him to say it.

Mr. JOHNSON. I merely wish to direct the hon. gentleman's attention to page 6334 of the 'Hansard' of 1906-7.

Mr. DANIEL. Having directed my attention to that, I hope the hon. member is satisfied. But the Minister of Militia, not content with making these references to my hon. friend for North Toronto, also passed a sneer on the morality of that gentleman,

and the futility of a gentleman like my hon. friend preaching morality and high ideals. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you and I would ask any member of this House if the Minister of Militia and Defence is a gentleman whom we could look to as a preacher of morality. I will say nothing more in regard to that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. You had better not.

Mr. DANIEL. I would ask the hon. members of this House if they think the Minister of Militia is a gentleman whom we would call upon to preach morality in this country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps you are not either.

Mr. DANIEL. Well it is one of those cases where you pay your money and you take your choice. Now to come down to the matter which is before the House it was initiated by an application from a Mr. Williams, a merchant in the city of St. John N.B., for aid to a bait freezer. When the Minister of Militia referred to this, he said that Mr. Williams not only made application for a cold storage plant on which he would get a subsidy of thirty per cent, but he also asked for such a bait freezer as would carry with it a subsidy of fifty per cent. Now the application he made was for a bait freezer on exactly the same terms as had been granted to the bait freezers at Canso and Halifax. His letter to Mr. Emmerson reads as follows:

We have been giving a cold storage plant some attention of late, and having been in communication with the Marine and Fisheries Department, who will grant a bonus for a cold storage plant for freezing fish in order that fishermen will be supplied with bait at the time they require it. We are prepared to go ahead and build one such as they are building in Canso and Halifax, providing we get the assistance of the government, such as has been given in the above places.

Just the same subsidy and the same assistance as were given to these other places.

In the meantime we thought it would be better to let you know that we are in the field, and just as soon as we get a little further along with our negotiations and plans, we will send our representative to Ottawa and interview you and the Marine and Fisheries Department personally.

Another statement that the minister made was that this application was for a cold storage plant for fish alone, and not for any other purpose, or any commercial purpose. Here is a letter signed by the F. E. Williams Company, Limited, and addressed to the Hon. Mr. Préfontaine, and although it has been read once this afternoon, I will take the trouble to read it again on account of the minister's statement that the application of the Williams Company was only for a storage plant, and none other.

Mr. DANIEL.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not say that it was for no other purpose. I said that it was to carry on his own private business in addition to the freezing of bait.

Mr. DANIEL. I understood the minister to say that it was not for commercial purposes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. DANIEL. I will read it and it will speak for itself:

St. John, New Brunswick, October 4, 1905.
Hon. R. Préfontaine, Ottawa.

We take the liberty of addressing you with reference to a cold storage plant for the purpose of freezing fish for bait, also other kinds of fish at St John, New Brunswick. We understand the government is willing to give a bonus for a plant put up for this purpose, with space or rooms to hire to dealers or farmers who may require cold storage space. We would also agree to freeze and keep in stock sufficient quantity of bait for the needs of fishermen. We are anxious to put up a large plant that will give service to both the fish and farming industries and would be pleased to hear from you giving us some particulars of what you require and what bonus the government are willing to give. The Hon. Mr. McKeown will probably write you on this same subject.

An early reply is particularly requested.

Yours truly,
F. E WILLIAMS COMPANY,
Limited,
F. E. Williams, President.

That was the original application and there is no doubt that in his mind he had largely the idea of dealing with the bait freezing question. Mr. Williams is a man who is in the provision business. He has a very large business. He is an able, experienced and successful merchant, and he is in a position to carry on any undertaking, such as he proposed to carry on, to the extent of $100,000 or more. The minister rather insinuated that Mr. Williams, in writing these letters to Mr. Emmerson, to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was seeking to convey the impression that the Minister of Militia only supported the cold storage scheme of the government for the purpose of obtaining the cold storage subsidy for this plant down in the maritime provinces. The minister had no reason for making any such statement because there is nothing in the whole correspondence that has been given to us this afternoon which justifies it. What I understood Mr. Williams did say was that the minister, naturally being in the secrets of the government and knowing what was going on, aware of the legislation that was proposed, was willing to take advantage of that knowledge and put himself in a position, through the influence which he would naturally have as a minister of the Crown,

to obtain for himself, or any company in which he was interested, the subsidies which would be offered by the government. There is only one important point to bring before this House and that is as to whether the Minister of Militia, in his position as a cabinet minister, did take advantage of his position to obtain for himself a subsidy, which, perhaps, might otherwise have gone elsewhere. Then again there is the question as to the propriety of a member of the cabinet putting himself in competition with the ordinary business men of the country. Mr. Williams had put in his application as far back as October, 1905. He put in the application which I have just read and he had quite a correspondence with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. After a good deal of correspondence, and with the assistance of Hon. Mr. Emmerson, he had obtained a certain promise that a sum of money would be placed in the estimates by the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the assistance of a cold storage company. But, after awhile, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries went back on that largely and told Mr. Williams that the Minister of Agriculture was bringing in a cold storage Bill and that this Bill would include fish cold storage as well as other kinds of cold storage. On the 7th December, 1906, Mr. F. E. Williams makes a formal application to the Minister of Agriculture for a subsidy under the proposed Act. On the 5th of that month, two days before, Mr. L. S. Macoun had applied, not in a formal way for a subsidy, but for the fullest information that the minister or the department could give him, and in the correspondence that has been brought down I can find no record of any actual formal application put in by Mr. L. S. Macoun at any time for a cold storage subsidy. After a good deal of correspondence between the then Minister of Railways and Canals and Mr. Williams, also, on behalf of Mr. Williams, by Mr. W. H. Trueman, his solicitor, and also, I believe, after a letter from the Hon. Mr. McKeown in connection with the matter, about the 20th February, Mr. George McAvity appears on the scene. This is his first connection with the matter. The fact of Mr. George McAvity appearing on the scene brings in the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, for at that time Mr. George McAvity was the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. What did that mean? That meant the bringing in of a company with a $60,000 guarantee with interest at 3 or 3½ per cent which was afterwards raised to 4 per cent. It was a great advantage to have Mr. McAvity taken into this company. There is then still further correspondence and Mr. Williams writes to Mr. Emmerson a letter in which he says that he is afraid he is out of it, and he complains in that letter of members of the cabinet getting contracts in competition with business men. That letter is dated the 9th March, 1907, and addressed to the Hon. H. R. Emmerson, Ottawa:

Dear Sir,—You will see from the inclosed clipping from the 'Globe' newspaper that Sir Frederick Borden is getting along very nicely It certainly looks, unless you can assure me to the contrary, as though I was out of it and that my application to Hon. Mr. Fisher has been turned down. I cannot understand Hon. Mr. Fisher making a grant to a company in which Sir Frederick Borden has been the promoting and is the moving spirit, and which he puts forward merely as a blind to screen his own name. It is most unfair to the public to have to compete with ministers in matters of this kind. In the present case it was hopeless to do so. It seems to me it is contrary to law, and I do not feel like standing for it. I believe if the matter were called to the attention of Sir Wilfrid Laurier he would see that Sir Frederick was overruled in this matter, and that the matter was put upon a defensible basis. Where Sir Frederick Borden is acting with such a supreme disregard of my rights and the rights of my Liberal friends in St. John I am inclined to strike back, and I will be justified in doing so. I am willing to deal fairly with the government, but I expect a like treatment in return. If I am to be turned down, please let me know it, when I will at once place Sir Frederick Borden's conduct before Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DANIEL. That was afterwards done in the letter which was read this afternoon. Similar correspondence went on which has been read. Now we come to what, in my opinion, is certainly a most important letter, one of the most important in the whole correspondence. I refer to the letter from the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, in which he states that:

Sir Frederick Borden has made application on behalf of a company with which he is connected and I have viewed his application very favourably.

There is absolutely a statement of fact made by the Minister of Agriculture, that the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) had applied on behalf of a company with which he is connected and that his colleague viewed the application very favourably. As I understood the Minister of Militia this afternoon, he said he made no application to this government for a subsidy. But there is the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, and I set the one against the other.

Then there is another statement, the statement made by Mr. R. J. Graham when he wrote to the Minister of Agriculture on the 13th April:

Belleville, Ontario, April 13, 1907.

The Hon. Sydney Fisher, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Sir Frederick Borden requested me to interview you in reference to aid for our cold storage propositions at St. John and Halifax.

To whom does the expression 'our,' refer to? Does it refer to any one else than Sir Frederick Borden and Mr. Graham who have already been connected together in advancing schemes of this kind.

It is our intention to complete the one in St. John this season. When I reached Ottawa Thursday night I learned from Mr. L. S. Macoun that you had advised him that everything had been arranged in connection with this matter and therefore it would be unnecessary for me to bother you any further in reference to the matter in question. This will explain why I did not interview you in regard to the matter, and if any further application of information is required, please advise.

Yours truly,

R. J. GRAHAM.

There are the two statements. One from the Minister of Agriculture and the other from Mr. Graham. The one is a positive statement and the other is a statement by implication. The latter is one which might fairly be taken to convey the idea that the Minister of Militia was interested in this application made by Mr. Graham to the Minister of Agriculture.

Without going into all the details, for they have been pretty thoroughly gone into already, I may say that the scheme, as it eventually turned out, certainly was very favourable indeed for the contractors. They have, in the first place, a mortgage of $60,000 from the New Brunswick government, and only a week before the prorogation of the New Brunswick legislature, there was an order in council passed providing that an additional guarantee of $30,000 should be given to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company when the House reassembles. In other words, the New Brunswick government of that day pledged itself to introduce and carry such legislation. That means an amount of $90,000 which was guaranteed, principal and interest, in favour of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. In addition there was an application to the Minister of Agriculture for a Dominion subsidy of 30 per cent on the proved cost. The application in that case was for 30 per cent on an expenditure of $125,000, making an amount equal to $37,500. So that if this plant cost, as stated in the application to the Minister of Agriculture, $125,000, this company actually obtained in guarantees of principal and interest on its bonds and in subsidy an amount equal to $127,500, or $2,500 more than was spent in obtaining the plant and putting it where it is. There is a letter in connection with that matter. That agreement between the government and the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company was made on the 30th October, 1907, and the amount of subsidy granted was $37,500, being 30 per cent on the stated expenditure of $125,000. But on the 13th November, or barely a fortnight afterwards, Mr. Macoun writes the secretary of the Minister of Agriculture saying that their plant would cost more than the $125,000 and that it would cost completed $150,000. In that case I presume there was another application for an additional subsidy; and perhaps the Minister of Agriculture will say whether there was another application for an additional subsidy based on a cost of $150,000 or $160,000.

Mr. FISHER. I shall speak of that in a few minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. You have not the information handy just now?

Mr. FOWLER. He is keeping it in cold storage.

Mr. DANIEL. We have to take the figures as they are put in the official correspondence, and the claim for the 30 per cent subsidy was on an expenditure of $125,000. If that statement is correct this fortunate company obtains in guarantees and subsidies from the Nova Scotia and Dominion governments $127,500 for building a plant which cost $125,000 or $2,500 more than it cost. Now, Sir, as I have said, the important thing in this matter is not so much the subsidies that are granted to a company for providing cold storage facilities, even if the assistance was considered to be more generous than it ought to have been. I put that on one side entirely, and I say that the point here is simply and almost wholly the fact of a cabinet minister acting in competition with an ordinary private citizen, and in that sense using his influence to obtain assistance of that kind more easily than an ordinary citizen would be able to do; and I think the connection with these cold storage plants, which has been acknowledged to some extent by Sir Frederick Borden himself, in the letter which was read by the hon. member for North Toronto, the letter of the Minister of Agriculture, and the letter of Mr. R. J. Graham to the Minister of Agriculture, leave it very difficult for any one to form any other conclusion than that the minister had made use of his position, or at all events while a cabinet minister had acquired subsidies for an enterprise with which he was closely connected. The people generally are disposed to look to public men in prominent positions to set a good example in matters of that kind, and I think it would be a great misfortune for the people of this country if any laxity which is found to arise in that connection were not brought before the public in order that it should be frowned down upon and not encouraged in any way. The Independ-

ence of Parliament Act has been referred to, and if the minister has been guilty of what the ordinary reader going over this correspondence would naturally think he was guilty of, section 10 of that Act reads as follows:

No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons or shall sit or vote in the said House.

So that this is a matter of very serious moment, and I think no apology need be offered for bringing it up in this House, and I would certainly be very glad indeed if the Minister of Agriculture could explain away the letter which he wrote, in which he stated that the Minister of Militia had made personal application for a subsidy for a concern in which he was interested. If he can put any other face on that letter than the words would naturally bear, I for one will be very glad indeed. I think it is a misfortune for a minister of the Crown to be even suspected of making use of his cabinet position to assist any enterprise in which he may be interested. It is just the same as if a member of the cabinet, on an occasion when the government were contemplating changes in the tariff, should make use of the knowledge which his position in the cabinet would give him of such proposed changes for his own advantage in a commercial sense in the open market. What sort of opinion would the people of this country have of such a minister? I am sure that the mere mention of such a thing shows how impossible it is for this country for a moment to allow anything of that kind to be done, or to be suspected of being done, without its being frowned down upon, so that a certain and immediate stop shall be put to it for all time to come.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture.) Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend who has just sat down has expressed the hope that I can explain matters a little in connection with this transaction. I think, Sir, if my hon. friend and those who seem to agree with him would exercise a little common sense in their interpretation of things, and not allow themselves to be carried away by the desire to cause political injury to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, they would be able to find an explanation for themselves. My hon. friend has spoken of the honour and integrity of members of the government and of members of parliament. He must be well aware that even supposing the Minister of Militia were a shareholder in a company doing business with the government of Canada, he would be legally entitled to be so. My hon. friend does not remember, perhaps, but I do well, when the Hon. Thos. White, who was a minister of the Crown in Sir John Macdonald's government, was a shareholder of the Gazette Printing Company in Montreal for years and years while he sat in this House, and yet he did not violate the Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is dead: let him alone.

Mr. FISHER. He is dead, and he was an honourable man who would not have done anything contrary to the Independence of Parliament Act; and yet he was a shareholder in the Gazette Company at the time he was Minister of the Interior, and when the Gazette Company had a contract with the government.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let his ashes rest in peace.

Mr. FISHER. Let his ashes rest in peace. He did perfectly right, and my hon. friend from Leeds and the hon. gentlemen around him are the men who are casting aspersions on the memory of Mr. Thos. White. Hon. gentlemen opposite think a great deal of the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, who was a member of the imperial government; and yet it is well known that at the time he was a member of the government he was a shareholder in a company in Birmingham which constantly had contracts with the government of which he was a member. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) has just alluded to the position of a member advocating changes in the tariff. The Hon. Joseph Chamberlain was a member of a company which was interested in the manufacture of screws and other things at the very time he was carrying on a propaganda for the purpose of giving protection to the industries in which he was engaged.

Mr. LENNOX. He was not a member of the cabinet.

Mr. FISHER. I am making no accusation against Mr. Chamberlain, or questioning the perfect integrity of what he was doing; but I am pointing out that it does not lie on the lips of hon. gentlemen opposite, who approve of the actions of the gentlemen to whom I have referred, to come here and endeavour to cast aspersions on the Minister of Militia, who was not and has never been a member of a company carrying on business with or receiving subventions from the government of which he is a member.

Sir, a great deal of stress has been laid by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on a letter which I wrote to Mr. Williams. I did that perhaps in rather loose language, since my hon. friend's ingenuity has been able to draw from it prac-

tically the basis of his whole accusation against the Minister of Militia. The Minister of Militia had been talking with me and probably a great many other people, of the importance of developing the fruit industry and other agricultural operations in the province of Nova Scotia. The Minister of Militia is a land owner in the province of Nova Scotia and has properties there which he thought were not giving that great return which they ought to be giving and might be made to give if properly managed from an agricultural point of view. He discussed these things with me on many an occasion. He talked to me about the proposition he has here described of establishing a company which I think was called the 'Canada Lands Produce and Cold Storage Company, Limited,' a large undertaking intended to be capitalized at a million dollars with which to develop large fruit growing and other agricultural industries in the county he has the honour to represent. I cannot see for a moment that in this my hon. friend was doing anything improper. On the contrary, he was doing what was in the very best interests of the people whom he represented, the people of the province of Nova Scotia at large and the people of the Dominion of Canada at large. When that question of cold storage came up my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, like myself and the other members of the government, believe that the Act which was being placed upon the statute-book for the encouragement of cold storage would be a good one. Supposing even for a moment that he was interested in a company which might get a bonus under that Act, supposing even for a moment that that was the case—he has denied that this is the case and as far as I am personally aware of the matters, I know that it is not the case and that he was not interested in any company that got the bonus or was expecting to get it—but supposing that he was, would it be proper and right for him as a minister of the Crown to block a proposition of the government to be laid before parliament which was in the interests of the people of Canada at large? If a cold storage proposition——

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, oh.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend smiles.

Mr. FOSTER. I am smiling at the trend of the argument.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I suppose my hon. friend can hardly realize it.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I suppose not.

Mr. FISHER. I hardly expected he would. I would like to know whether he would go so far as to say——

Mr. FOSTER. Dear knows whether he would or not.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know how far he would go because it would be far beyond my ken.

Mr. FISHER

Mr. FOSTER. I dare say; your ken does not go very far.

Mr. FISHER. We will let that drop.

Mr. FOSTER. Now go on with your argument.

Mr. FISHER. It would not be proper that my hon. friend who is a member of the government should block either in council or in parliament a proposition to enact a law which is in the interest of the people of Canada. The law in regard to cold storage companies was discussed in this House, it was adopted without opposition and with perfect unanimity in this House. I supposed therefore that hon. gentlemen opposite were in full concurrence with the spirit and scope of that fact. That Act was to encourage people of Canada to enter into the enterprise of establishing cold storage, a thing which my hon. friend the Minister of Militia was desirous to encourage just like the rest of us. He was himself advocating that a company should be formed for that purpose. I contend that he was perfectly justified and called upon as the representative of the county which he represents in Nova Scotia, as a representative of the province of Nova Scotia, to aid and help on any such scheme which would be in the interests of the fruit growers and other agriculturists of Nova Scotia as well as the rest of Canada.

Now to come down more particularly to the details of this transaction. As far as Mr. Williams' application to the Department of Marine and Fisheries are concerned, I know nothing, I knew nothing at the time. I am reminded that Mr. Williams came to me and spoke about the cold storage question and that he was told that the cold storage question was going to assume a new phase because the government were preparing a new law in regard to bonuses for cold storage. I remember meeting Mr. Williams and having a talk of that kind. Mr. Williams thereafter made no personal or straight application to me whatever until the letter which has been quoted by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I received that letter asking for information. I gave him the information and I wrote identically the same letter to Mr. Williams and to Mr. Macoun on the very same date, each of them having written to me asking for information. I sent each of them exactly the same information, being copies of the 'Hansard' containing the debates in this House on the Cold Storage Bill. They were therefore in exactly the same position as far as I was concerned, treated exactly as I would treat anybody else who would make application to me for information in regard to a matter in my department or with which I was concerned. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) read the letter addressed to Mr. Williams but did not read identically the same letter written

the same day by my secretary and signed by me and addressed to Mr. Macoun. I treated them both in exactly the same way. Mr. Williams some time afterwards wrote me a letter on the 8th of April. The first letter was on the 13th December, 1906. On April 8, 1907, Mr. Williams wrote me a letter in which he gave me a lot of information which I confess I did not value very much because it seemed to me to be tinged with the imputation that he was being badly treated and I confess that I did not know of anything to justify any such implication and I did not feel prepared to treat him any way differently from anybody else. That letter was replied to on April 11. In my reply I acknowledged his letter and said :

We have not yet made any grant for cold storage warehouses in St. John. Sir Frederick has made application on behalf of a company with which he is connected, and I have viewed his application very favourably. None of the applications, however, are in a position to be passed upon absolutely. I cannot make any promises without definite plans and specifications, and full information as to what the people applying for may be prepared to do.

In other words, I gave Mr. Williams the full statement and information on that occasion that no consideration could be given to him unless he gave full plans and specifications. He got just the same information as anybody else. In the meantime I referred to the conversations I had had with Sir Frederick Borden, my colleague, in which he had been talking about the larger scheme and had said that he hoped a company would be formed for the purpose of taking up his cold storage scheme in St. John, Halifax and other places. I confess I used the words rather loosely in saying that he was connected with the company. I meant by that a company in which he was interested as a public man and ought to be interested. I say it without hesitation and I say it absolutely sincerely and with truth. At the same time I was prepared to treat Williams fairly and squarely just like anybody else.

As the correspondence has been quoted I need not go over it completely. Mr. Graham wrote and spoke about an interview with Williams on the 3rd of June. Mr. Williams wrote me a letter complaining of his treatment and casting aspersions and imputations on me and the government for our treatment of him in comparison with our treatment of Sir Frederick Borden. In that letter he wanted to know whether it would be worth his while to get plans and specifications ready to submit to me. I was away in England when that letter was received and my deputy answered him :

In the absence of the minister, I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant in reference to cold storage warehouses. If you will submit your application it will receive due consideration.

That letter was dated 7th June, 1907. An application was received with full specifications and in full and proper form from Mr. Graham, dated 11th June, 1907. That application was held in my department until September. The contract with him was not signed until November and when I came back from England I asked my deputy minister whether he had received any further communication from Mr. Williams. I waited from June until November—five months —for Mr. Williams to take further steps in accordance with the information I had given him of what would be necessary for him to do exactly the same information that I had given to Mr. Macoun and Mr. Graham as to what was necessary for them to do. It was not until after five months, when, having no further communication of any kind from Mr. Williams, I eventually signed a contract with Mr. Graham for a cold storage warehouse in St. John. I knew Mr. Graham as a man thoroughly well informed on cold storage questions and as one likely to make a cold storage plant and building and business a success. I learned that he had transferred his interest to a company called the New Brunswick Cold Storage Limited, and that he was president of that company. I also learned that Mr. George McAvity, of St. John, the well known and enterprising merchant, was vice-president, that Mr. Macoun was secretary-treasurer, that Mr. Richard Trueman was a director and so was Mr. H. R. Ross, a gentleman well known in business circles in St. John, men upon whom I could depend, if I made a contract with them, to carry out that contract. The directors sent forward a resolution stating that they took over and accepted the responsibilities Mr. Graham had assumed in making his application. When the Bill was passed in this House to encourage cold storage equipment. it was well understood that a cold storage plant was dependent on business to be obtained from those producing what we call perishable food products, and that it was very important that these plants should be placed so as to get the business in fruit, meat, eggs, butter, cheese or fish, and that there would be no use in a cold storage equipment unless it had connections or surroundings that would give it business. That is one great reason why St. John was looked upon as a place particularly suitable for a cold storage plant, and it was one reason why I had no hesitation in giving the bonus to a company undertaking to put a cold storage plant there. St. John is situated very favourably not only for the business of the Nova Scotia fruit exporters but also for the business of the Ontario and Quebec fruit exporters who send a large quantity of their fruit down to the seaboard in the fall so as to allow

it to be exported in the winter when the prices are better and they can gain greater profits than they would if they were compelled to place their fruit on the market in the fall of the year. The people who undertook to provide the cold storage equipment at St. John were in a position to carry on the work, having the necessary connections and being men of substantial means and the highest character. Therefore, I had no hesitation in granting them the subsidy.

The contract was signed and the building was put up. My cold storage commissioner examined the plant carefully and reported to me favourably on the construction and equipment. Over and above his official report, he stated to me that those who own the building got good value for their money and that he was surprised that they were able to put up such a building and equip it so well for the amount of the contract on which they were getting the bonus. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) asked if the company got an additional bonus or made an additional contract. They did not; the original contract was the only one. I have been told by Mr. Macoun that they were going to make application for an additional amount because the building and equipment had cost more than the sum on which the bonus was given, but I received no official communication concerning it and no additional contract has been made. If an application comes in, it will be dealt with in the ordinary way of business; if the company shows cause for the additional demand I shall feel justified in conceding it; if they cannot show cause, if they cannot show that they have expended the money and that the expenditure was necessary for the equipment and the building in order to carry on the business in St. John, there will not be an additional contract or additional subvention. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that a greater contract was given than had been usual in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I do not know in what sense he meant that. Under the old system of the Department of Marine and Fisheries the contractors get half the cost of their building and a bonus of $2,000 a year for three years. Under the present contract and under the present Act, the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company receive only thirty per cent of the cost of their building and no yearly bonus. I think it is a very much better contract for the country therefore, and I am glad of it and proud of it. I want to add just one word. I do not know, nor does it matter from my point of view as administrator of the Cold Storage Act, whether this company is getting a bonus from the city of St. John or the provincial government of New Brunswick or not. The Act does not say who shall supply the money or contemplate any investigation into how the people who build and equip these cold storage buildings and make the contract with this government get their capital. It only contemplates the provision, in the interest of the commerce of Canada in perishable food products, that a cold storage building shall be supplied, properly equipped and that properly revised rates of charges shall be made and proper chambers at proper temperatures provided. These arranged for, it is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture to sign a contract where he considers that the company is providing a building that is in the interest of the trade; and, if the company can get anybody to make it a gift of all the money put into the plant, that matters not a whit to me as Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion. I do not care where the money comes from or who supplies it, so long as the trade of Canada gets the accommodation under the terms of the Cold Storage Act.

I think, perhaps, Sir, if others are going to speak on this question as it is near six o'clock, it is better that I should move the adjournment of this debate to allow further discussion if desired. Therefore, I move the adjournment of this debate to allow a motion for Supply to be presented, that we may get into Supply before six o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it necessary to move the adjournment of the debate ? He could simply talk on until six o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING. It is only a question under the new rule for the proper standing of the motion at six o'clock. I think it would serve all purposes better if a motion to adjourn the debate were carried, and then it will stand in its proper order for the next sitting of the House.

Mr. FOWLER. I propose to address a few remarks to the House.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman could talk until six o'clock, and then move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objection to that.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood the Minister of Agriculture to say that the only way in which the Minister of Militia and Defence was interested in this matter was from his public position, he was interested as a public man in anything that would make for the general welfare of the trade of the country. Is that correct ?

Mr. FISHER. I said that so far as the Minister of Militia had undertaken to start a large company, the name of which I mentioned, in Nova Scotia, a company that was in the public interest, and that would incidentally require cold storage accommodation, the Minister of Militia was in that way interested in the cold storage accommodation.

Mr. FOWLER. I propose to call the attention of the minister to the particular letter which he wrote, the contents of which he must have forgotten, or he would not have said what he did with respect to the interest of the Minister of Militia. This letter of his is dated the 11th of April, 1907, and is addressed to Mr. Williams, who was a rival applicant with the Minister of Militia for the subsidy to the cold storage plant in St. John. He says :

I may say that we have not yet made any grant for a cold storage warehouse in St. John. Sir Frederick Borden has made an application on behalf of a company which he is connected——

Mr. FISHER. I read that—not in which he is interested.

Mr. FOWLER. 'With which he is connected.' Surely that would imply something more than a mere interest which a public man takes in anything that is going to advance the trade of the country. If the construction of the Minister of Agriculture be correct, that it was merely the interest which he as a public man was taking in all matters relating to trade, then it would apply to every member of this House, because we are all supposed to take an interest, I think most of us do take an interest in anything which pertains to the welfare of the country.

—and I have viewed his application very favourably.

So I think that even on the correspondence and on the statement of the Minister of Militia himself, we must conclude that the interest which he had in this particular transaction was much more intimate and much more individual than the interest which he took as a public man in that which pertained to the well being of the country. Now it may be said that there was no particular objection to that, it may be said that no particular advantage was obtained by the Minister of Militia on account of his position in relation to the Minister of Agriculture as a colleague, the Minister of Agriculture having the granting of this subsidy. We had two rival applicants. We had an application by a man named Williams, of St. John, a man who was in the meat and produce business, a man of high standing in St. John, doing a large business, an influential Liberal, too, a man of the same political stripe as the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Agriculture. He had therefore, from a business standpoint, quite as good a standing as had the Minister of Militia and the friends by whom he was surrounded. From a party standpoint, one would think that he would have pretty nearly as good standing. He would have not quite so good opportunities of getting the ear of the Minister of Agriculture, perhaps, as the Minister of Militia would have. Naturally there would be things that the Minister of Agriculture would want in the Department of Militia, and the Minister of Militia could very well say to the Minister of Agriculture, If you want certain things done—we will say with reference to that regiment down in the eastern townships for which the Minister of Agriculture stands as godfather, the 13th Dragoons, I think it is, the Dundonald regiment—it might very well be that certain privileges, certain advantages that this particular regiment belonging to the Minister of Agriculture would require, might be more easily got provided the Minister of Agriculture was willing to make concessions to the Minister of Militia for things which he required. So from the necessities of the Minister of Agriculture, and remembering the opportunity that the Minister of Militia had for taking advantage of these necessities, poor Mr. Williams, of St. John, deserving Liberal though he might be, is naturally turned down, and the concession is granted to the company in which the Minister of Militia, and a very close relative of his, are the moving spirits.

I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 29, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 179) to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin.—Mr. Johnston.

Bill (No. 180) respecting the Crown Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Northrup—by Mr. W. J. Roche.

Bill (No. 178) relating to the water carriage of goods.—Mr. Johnston.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I find in the 'Hansard' of Tuesday, May 26, the following :

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. BERGERON.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I beg to rise to a question of privilege. I was away on Friday last, but on reading 'Hansard' I find a statement referring to myself in a speech made by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) which is not correct. That hon. member is reported as saying:

I am just coming to that. It was strange that a gentleman, a member of the great Conservative party, following the same noble

leader, would not have come to me and said something to me about it. Now I come to what I have got to do about it. Soon after the notice was put on the paper last year, the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) notified me that Dr. Worthington had something terrible against me. He is going to expose you, said Mr. Bergeron, and your grafting in connection with the Ross rifle. And he asked: Is it not possible for you to pay back the money?

Mr. Bergeron then said :

This is the first time I have heard anything of the matter. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) has never spoken of it to me and I have never spoken to the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) in the way he has here indicated. The whole thing is entirely a dream, as far as I know.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair to the hon. member for Beauharnois—at the time he spoke to me we were sitting as we are today. He spoke, as I felt, as a friend, a gentleman talking over the motion on the Order Paper standing in the name of the hon. member for Sherbrooke Mr. Worthington. He stated to me that he (Mr. Worthington) had any amount of data, I think the expression was any God's amount of data against me, and the Minister of Militia ; and he went on further—I do not remember the exact words—but he begged me for God's sake to try and get out of it, and pay the money back, was there any way to pay the money back that had been grafted in order that I might get out of it ? These were the statements. Not only that but it was referred to on other occasions. I assured him there was nothing in it. He said 'everybody believes it.' Not only that but I spoke to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) about it. He said it is a common rumour, current opinion in Montreal that 'you are in it up to the neck.' I spoke to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) about it and to twenty other members of the Conservative party and this is the first time I ever heard it contradicted. More than that, I happened to receive——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman does not suggest that I said I had heard anything about it ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, what I mean is I had informed my fellow members of the statement made by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and I mentioned his name last session and told it to a dozen members last session that my friend Bergeron had spoken to me and I said it was a slander, I gave that to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) as the reason why I would not drop the agitation before the Public Accounts Committee at the time the First Minister wanted to go to England ; I was going to fight it to a finish, they were going to either prove their case or be exposed before the country to be as they have been shown to be. Mind you, I have other data upon it. I can show you just how these gentlemen would go around —not the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), because as I say he spoke in all kindness, and wanted me to try and save the party, and save my own reputation by getting out of it—but the agitation was engineered by other gentlemen who went around with that pained expression on their countenances and would say : It is too bad that Hughes and the Minister of Militia are tied up in these things, it is a terrible thing that they should be tied up in this way. And oh, my the agony of soul these gentlemen would display in passing around the town and the country, circulating this slander on fellow members and some others who were not fellow members. The data is all available. Here is a letter from another gentleman to show how they are working it, how even within the last two weeks some of them have been trying to work it. The letter is from Colonel Greville Harston, of the city of Toronto, and in it he says :

Some of your good friends have industriously sent it about among some of our best men like John T. Small and Colonel J. I. Davidson and others that you have large pecuniary interests in the Ross Rifle company and that you are a director of that company. I of course denied it flatly.

Then follow other matters to show that the insidious falsehood started by this organization has been passing around. I do not know what the hon. member for Beauharnois means, if the words have not a double meaning, by saying: 'In the way he has heard indicated; the whole thing is entirely a dream.' The regrettable thing is that the gentlemen who started the agitation did not find out that it was a dream before they started it. It would have been much more to their credit and to the advantage of the country. I have nothing further to say than to repeat, in words as strong as the English or the French language will allow, that the words the hon. member for Beauharnois used expressed the sentiment I have stated in this House on a former occasion and on the present occasion.

Mr. BERGERON. As my name has been mentioned, I suppose I may be allowed to answer in one word. I have nothing to take back of what I said the other day, and so far as I am concerned, my hon. friend is entirely mistaken. I never heard that he had any interest in any shape or form in these so-called scandals, and nobody ever said anything to me about it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I again insist that the words were uttered not once only, but two or three times.

Mr. BERGERON. I call on the Chair. When the hon. gentleman puts words into

my mouth, and I deny having used them, he is bound, according to the rules of the House, to withdraw what he said.

Mr. SPEAKER. In a matter of personal dispute it is very difficult for the Chair to decide. It will have to be left to the judgment of the House.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. As my name has also been drawn into this discussion, I wish to add my absolute denial to that of the hon. member for Beauharnois. I never at any time nor in any place made such a statement to him or to any other member of the House. I also think, as the hon. member for Beauharnois does, that it is nothing but a silly dream.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It has turned out to be quite silly.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 181) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion.

Mr. LENNOX. In reference to this matter I have just a word to say before the hon. member introduces his Bill. I wish to call the attention of the House to the time this measure is introduced. We have now been sitting six months. This is an important Bill. The minister and the government gave consideration to this matter last year. This is I suppose to a great extent the same measure that was introduced last year, and I think the introduction of such an important Bill at this stage, when I suppose the session is pretty nearly drawing to a close, is very much to be deplored and to be condemned. I think the hon. gentleman ought to give some satisfactory explanation to the House as to how it is that an important measure of this kind has been delayed until this stage of the proceedings. If it were an isolated case it would be somewhat different; but more and more, not only during this session, but during preceding sessions, the practice is prevailing with the government of leaving the introduction of important measures to the late days of the session. This is not fair either to the members of the House or to the country. It leads to injudicious legislation and results in the measures not being properly considered, and it is a practice that I think ought to be condemned and discontinued.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill is in very much the same terms as the Bill of last year. The consideration given by the House to the Bill of last year resulted in the acceptance of certain amendments which have been adopted in the re-drafting of the Bill. The opportunity has been taken to make a very thorough revision of the Bill in the light of the subsequent operations of the Lands Act. In regard to the provision which was particularly contentious, while the principle of pre-emption and of purchased homesteads remains in the Bill, the area to which this principle applies has been restricted to the territory, speaking roughly, between Moosejaw and Calgary on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and between the international boundary and the latitude of Battleford. It is hoped that, with this restriction, the Bill will be acceptable to all parties in the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS — HALIFAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to say to the Minister of the Interior that I have had a letter from the commissioner of immigration, Mr. Scott, asking for particulars with respect to one of the officials in Halifax to whom I referred in the House not long ago. The information which I have is in the form of a statutory declaration having the force of an affidavit. As it is from a man who has been dismissed in consequence of an investigation recently held, and as it contains charges against one of the officials of the government, I think for the present it is not best for me to read it in the House until the government shall have an opportunity of making an investigation. Instead of doing so, I shall hand the original to the Minister of the Interior, in order that he may make a copy of it, and return the original to me. I have also a declaration respecting another official, but as to that, I think I shall speak privately to the minister, as there are some circumstances which seem to make that the wiser course.

THE EXERCISE OF CLEMENCY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the government whether or not their attention has been called to a resolution of the town council of Sydney, which is in the following words :

Whereas one Agnes Ballum Kun was on the 28th day of December, A.D. 1907, convicted by D. A. Cameron, Esq., stipendiary magistrate in and for the city of Sydney, for that she at Sydney did, on or about the 15th day of December, A.D., 1907, conduct a disorderly house to wit a house of prostitution and was sentenced for said offence to six months in the common jail.

And whereas the said Agnes Ballum Kun was on or about the 3rd day of May, A.D., 1908, released from said common jail at Sydney by order of the Department of Justice at Ottawa.

And whereas the crime for which said Agnes Ballum Kun was convicted is in the opinion of this honourable council, one that deserved the severest punishment, as it affects the moral welfare of the community;

And whereas the police department of Sydney, has within the last few years put forth every effort to rid Sydney of such disreputable houses.

Therefore be it resolved that this council view with regret the release of said Agnes Ballum Kun and hereby voices its protest against any persons sentenced for such offences being released on tickets of leave or otherwise, until their full sentence is served.

And further be it resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Minister of Justice at Ottawa.

I would like to inquire whether the attention of the government has been directed to this resolution and also to ask what were the considerations which led the government to release this offender before the full term of her imprisonment had expired?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). So far as I know, no member of the government has received communication of this resolution unless it be the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). The resolution. I apprehend, should have been sent to the Minister of Justice, and I do not think he has communicated with any of his colleagues about it.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). The resolution referred to as having been passed by the city council some time ago was forwarded to the Minister of Justice, and I noticed in the press a reply published, as coming from the Minister of Justice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The resolution came to me in a letter dated 21st May. Obviously the writer of it was not aware of any reply having been given up to that time, so far as I can gather from the context of the letter.

Mr. JOHNSTON. All I know is that the Minister of Justice replied.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the reply ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have not the papers before me, but a reference to newspapers published some considerable time ago will show what the reply was.

THE BANQUE DE ST. JEAN.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to a statement which appeared in one of the Montreal newspapers in sequence of other statements of a similar character which have appeared from time to time with reference to the failure of the Banque De St. Jean, Quebec. According to this statement——

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose this is for the purpose of founding a question ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. Probably the better way would be to read what is stated.

After calling attention to the fact that in the case of the Banque Ville Marie an investigation was held by the Finance Department and punishment meted out to the guilty parties, it goes on :

In the case of the Banque de St. Jean there are the same kind of harrowing experiences attending the depositors as beset the depositors of the Banque Ville Marie and the Banque du Peuple. Among the depositors of the ill-fated Banque de St. Jean are to be numbered priests, nuns, guardians, widows, orphans, farmers, merchants, artisans, peddlers of farm and other produce and the usual clientele of the modest country bank. The deposits as a rule run from ten and fifteen dollars to a hundred and five hundred, and temporary deposits have sometimes run into the thousands.

Many special cases are detailed, and then it goes on :

We have shown that in January in the report furnished to the government, the Banque de St. Jean credited itself with $751,859 of current discounts and $17,574 of overdue debts. But in the statement just issued by Mr. Tancrede Bienvenu, these current discounts or promissory notes are reduced to $191,396 or by $560,463 or nearly three-quarters. How has this huge proportion of the bank's loans been wiped out with, as it were, a stroke of the pen?

Several questions follow, and then the query is put whether the Finance Department has as yet undertaken to do its duty in the matter as it did in the case of the Banque Ville Marie ? And that is the question I ask.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I think that the machinery of the Bank Act is not the same to-day as at the time when the case of the Banque Ville Marie arose. The present Bank Act provides that the moment a bank gets into trouble, an officer shall be appointed by the Bankers' Association to take possession temporarily until a liquidator is appointed. These two steps have just been taken, as I see by the press of the last day or two that a liquidator has been appointed. What further proceedings shall be taken is a matter for consideration. The machinery of the Bank Act is in motion. If there is a difference of procedure as between the time of the Banque Ville Marie case and the present day, it is because, under the amended Act the Bankers' Association have a duty to perform. That duty they have performed and we have now reached the next stage. I am afraid the situation is a very grave one for all concerned, but the moment has not arrived for the government to take further action. I expect that we shall receive further communication on the subject at an early day.

Mr. FOSTER. No change has been made with reference to penalties for misconduct?

Mr. FIELDING. No ; but we have no information that will enable us to proceed as respects penalties. Of course, the hon. gentleman will agree that in such a matter newspaper reports are not sufficient. I have no doubt that there will be a fuller investigation. The machinery provided by the law remains the same, and action will have to be taken on the facts coming before us.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—HON. MR. FOSTER.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On Wednesday last, a statement was made in this House by the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) in the course of debate. It is always difficult to tell exactly what a man says across the floor of the House. Still, I ventured to characterize the statement at that time as absolutely untrue. It now appears in cold print as reported on page 9585 of 'Hansard' :

> The hon. gentleman seems to be very suspicious. But, Mr. Speaker, assuming that every word that he has said to-day is true—and scarcely a word of it is true in its application—I would like this House to consider whether at its worst it is to be compared for one moment with the position of a man who succeeds in placing himself in a position of trust in a company and then succeeds in placing himself in another position connected with another company, and then engages in the delightful occupation of selling out the company of which he is a director to himself in another company, and taking a commission which comes out of the hard savings and earnings of the people of this country, in connection with one of the large insurance companies, and putting that commission into his own pocket——
>
> Mr. FOSTER. All of which is——
>
> Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. All of which is absolutely true.

He then goes on to say he does not need to take it up because it has been taken up and proved : 'it is an accomplished fact and everybody in this House and out of it knows it is an accomplished fact.'

Mr. Speaker, I desire again to-day to say that, so far as the language of that declaration and its charges are concerned, and the meaning that seems to be intended by them, they are absolutely and wholly untrue. I give the Minister of Militia and Defence—as this is the first time these insinuations have come to be put in direct language by a responsible member of this House—the opportunity to prove that statement ; or, if he cannot prove it, to retract it, again stating that it is absolutely and wholly untrue.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The language reported as just quoted by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is not precisely the language I used, or, at any rate, is not what I intended to use, for there is very little meaning in the words as reported. The following is what is reported :

> I would like this House to consider whether at its worst it is to be compared for one moment with the position of a man who succeeds in placing himself in a position of trust in a company and then succeeds in placing himself in another position connected with another company, and then engages in the delightful occupation of selling out the company of which he is a director to himself in another company, and taking a commission——

And so on. I did not say that, or I certainly did not intend to say it. What I intended to say was :

> A man who succeeds in placing himself in a position of trust in a company and then succeeds in placing himself in another position connected with another company, and then engages in the delightful occupation of buying lands for the company of which he was manager, and accepting a commission and putting it in his pocket in that connection——

And so on. That is what I intended to say, and the revised 'Hansard' will show the words so corrected. And my authority, if the hon. gentleman wants it, are the proceedings of the Royal Commission which investigated this particular case which was discussed thoroughly in this House during the last session, and I quoted particularly, and I mentioned it, from the speech of the Minister of Justice which I happen to have before me at this moment. I had not the pleasure of hearing the speech which was delivered by the Minister of Justice, as I was away, but I read it after my return from England, and in that speech I find the following :

> The other transaction of a similar character perhaps deserves one word of additional notice, and for the simple reason that in regard to the $5,000 transaction, the verbal evidence which witnesses gave before the commission is contradictory. One witness gives in his testimony—which I need not say is equally sworn evidence—a statement of the transaction directly at variance upon this crucial point with the statement of the hon gentleman. It is not for me to judge between the two, it has not been the part of the commission to judge between the two. They have stated simply and frankly upon the face of the report what was the evidence of one and what was the evidence of the other, and leaving that evidence for comparison and for perusal, and leaving those who read to form their own judgment upon it. The commission left it at that and discussed the transaction from either of the different points of view, according to the different evidence which any reader may choose to accept.
>
> But with regard to the subsequent transaction——
>
> The one to which I referred.
>
> —in respect to which a commission of small amount was paid, there is not, because there cannot be, variation in the testimony of witnesses, it resting upon written documents. This is a transaction, in essence of precisely

the same character. The syndicate is purchasing lands with the money of either the Foresters or of the Trust Company, with money which is furnished to it, borrowed by it, if you please, upon the security of the lands that are being bought, and the syndicate so making its purchase and so making its payment, we are again treated to the proposition that there is to be paid a commission out of it. And in this instance, it is upon the letters which are in evidence. Exhibit No. 665 is a letter dated December 23, 1903, from Mr. George E. Foster to Mr. Pritchard, at Winnipeg. He says:

I have talked the matter of these lands over with some parties. The price is too high as it was asked, and I can get no one to take any interest at any such price. My clients are filled with lands, and the offerings of men who have got lots and have to make payments and have not the money, are numerous. This flattens the price. Now, if the following is of any use to you I will, on receipt of answer, go into it further, and give you an early decision, to wit, $5.25 per acre for the land with twenty-five cents per acre as commission, thus netting you $5 per acre. This will depend upon the amount of cash down required—$1.25 certainly, and $1 say in four months, and the remainder in four yearly instalments with note, and option to pay the whole amount at any time without bonus. One trouble is the inability to inspect lands at this time. This, I am aware, is not as good as you expect, but you have no idea of the amount of land offered here and parties here are filled up. Kindly let me know if this will be acceptable. I see no way of doing anything better at present, but I think I can get the above through.

The answer on December 28, in Winnipeg, from Mr. Pritchard, is as follows:

Dear Mr. Foster,—I am in receipt of yours of the 23rd, and have read your offer with some little regret, as I had hoped that you would be able to handle these lands at a better price in view of their choice location. As I pointed out when I saw you in Toronto, the Canadian Northern are putting their branch through from at or near Swan river to the Thunder Hills, which will make these lands convenient to railway facilities. However, as you cannot do any better, I accept your proposition with the following slight modifications. There is $2.48 due the Canadian Northern on these lands which runs for eight years at thirty-one cents an acre per year, with interest at six per cent. The whole of it can be paid off at any time without bonus, which I expect you to assume. As regards the cash payment, $1.25 down, seventy-five cents in three months and seventy-five cents in six months. The cash payment in that way will secure the equity, all being met within six months. I trust you will be able to meet me in this slight change.

Yours very sincerely,

The answer is a telegram of December 31, 1903, to A. W. Pritchard, Winnipeg, Manitoba:

Send contract terms your letter for part due Canadian Northern and amounts due vendors. The Union Trust Company, Limited, in trust is purchaser. Cash payment will be made on signing contracts.

On January 2, 1904, Messrs, Macdonald, Haggart and Whitla, of Winnipeg, solicitors for the vendors, wrote to the Hon. George E. Foster, as manager of the Union Trust Company, as follows:

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Mr. A. W. Pritchard, who has been carrying on correspondence with you regarding the lands in the Swan river district, has handed us all the correspondence therein, together with your telegram of the 31st ultimo, accepting the offer of sale of these lands The lands in question stand in the name of our Mr. Whitla, under contracts from the Canadian Northern Railway Company. We are preparing agreements of sale in accordance with the terms of the agreement already arrived at, and will forward the same to you as soon as completed. There are 9,920 acres all told. If you have any suggestions to make as to the methods of closing the sale we will be glad to hear from you. We presume that since we act as solicitors for your company we can have Mr. Whitla sign the agreements and forward them to you for the signature by the company, and you can forward the cash payment and return one copy of agreement duly signed. We can at the same time forward you for inspection the contracts covering the various parcels which our Mr. Whitla holds. We trust this will be satisfactory.

The answer was as follows:

Toronto, January 5, 1904.

Yours of January 2, duly received re Pritchard's sale of Swan river district lands. The contracts will be with the Union Trust Company in trust and cash. Cash payment will be made to credit of vendors in Standard Bank of Toronto on receipt and signing of satisfactory documents of agreement. Twenty-five cents per acre is to be paid as commission on sale. This can either be deducted from the cash payment or better. You can send a cheque therefore signed by the vendors in favour of myself. I will then deposit to credit of vendors the whole cash payment and present cheque which will be paid therefrom. Kindly see that purchasers are allowed to pay up whole amount due on lands at any time without notice or bonus.

Yours truly,

GEORGE E. FOSTER.

And accordingly, as is asked by that letter, a cheque to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) issues for that amount of commission at the rate of 25 cents per acre on the 9,920 acres, or $2,480. That is asked for in the letter I have read in distinct and unmistakable terms as a commission on the sale of these lands to the company of which the writer was then the paid manager. That is asked for as a deduction from the cash payment his company was to make, or better, a cheque for the amount signed by the vendors in favour of 'myself,' the manager. And that amount so received has not been shared with anybody.

That is the ground upon which I made the statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House will allow me for a moment, I have not altogether caught the exact statement made by the Minister of Militia and Defence. This much is certain that he does not stand by the statement he made the day before yesterday. Do I understand that he retracts it?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not stand by the report; I stand by the statement I made.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the minister declares that this is not the statement that he did make ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have already said what took place. 'Hansard' will show that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the statement that he did make ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister does not say that ? What does the Minister say ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I gave the hon. gentleman the statement I made.

Mr. FOSTER. I see no difference between the minister's statement now and that which appears in the unrevised 'Hansard.' We find it very difficult to go upon anything else than that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If there is no difference it is quite satisfactory.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, the Minister of Militia and Defence substitutes another statement for this one and I do not altogether understand his statement. We will see what it is in 'Hansard' to-morrow, but if his statement is intended to convey the meaning that his statement of the day before yesterday was intended to convey, all I have to say, Mr. Speaker, is that in the verbiage and in the intent it is absolutely untrue and unfounded. I do not care how many speeches the Minister of Militia and Defence may read to buttress it up ; even if he has to take the campaign literature of the Liberal party and read it as he does at this moment, Mr. Speaker, although I have nothing to say against the extract as not being a fair extract.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman deny the authenticity of the letters I have read ?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all ; I never did. I absolutely deny the charge that the Minister of Militia and Defence bases upon these letters and that evidence, and I challenge the Minister of Militia and Defence to prove his statements to be true. He can take his own means, his own method and I state, as a member of this House, that the charge that he has made is an absolutely unfounded charge, and if that is his charge I think he ought to retract it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply read a statement made in this House over a year ago. I based the statement I made the day before yesterday on that. That statement, made by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), has never been contradicted or disproved. That is all I have to say.

Mr. FOSTER. There is every difference between a statement and an inference. I am dealing with the statements of the Minister of Militia and Defence. I brand them as absolutely untrue. He may draw any inference he likes, but I will not be bound by them. All I have to say is that they are not true and the minister as a member of this House is bound to take my statement and withdraw his statements.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes ; hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Then if he will not withdraw them I challenge him to prove them and I shall repeat that statement as long as he and I are members of this House.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot see very well how I can withdraw a statement made by a member of this government a year ago based upon the evidence which he gave at that time. I have simply quoted that statement and repeated it. I cannot withdraw a statement made by the Minister of Justice. It is impossible.

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody asks the minister to withdraw a statement made by the Minister of Justice. All I ask the minister to do was to withdraw his own statement which is absolutely unfounded.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The statement is taken from your letter.

USE OF THE GOVERNMENT STEAMER 'CHAMPLAIN.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to refer again to the question as to the use which is being made of the government steamer 'Champlain.' On Tuesday I brought to the attention of the government the statement that the government steamer 'Champlain' was being used by Mr. Taschereau, Minister of Public Works in the province of Quebec, candidate in Charlevoix, for political purposes. I stated to the House that I had been credibly informed that persons supposed to be Conservatives were turned off that steamer although they offered to pay their passage. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) stated in reply that the route of the steamer had been somewhat extended. He did not say for what purpose, or at whose instance, although my question involved that. I have now another telegram from Mr. Rodolphe Forget, a member of this House, bearing date the 27th day of May, which says that :

> Steamer 'Champlain' refused to call at St. Irene for me and Conservative friends this morning although scheduled for this place.

On looking at the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries I observe that the place named is one of the points at which that steamer is supposed to call. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether the government has any information upon this and whether it is true or not that this steamer is being used as a political transport in the

interests of the Liberal party in the provincial election now going on in the province of Quebec ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) called this matter to the attention of the House the other day my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was not in his seat. I wired at once to Mr. Beland, the agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, as to this matter and he sent me a telegram which, I think, was communicated to the House by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I also received this morning from Mr. Beland a letter on the same subject. If I had known that the matter would again be brought up I would have brought it to the attention of the House and read it. I shall do so on Monday. With regard to the later charge that the steamer 'Champlain' did not call at St. Irene, although scheduled to do so, that is a new charge of which I have not heard, but as to which I will make inquiry. The steamer 'Champlain' is doing ferry work between River Ouelle and Murray Bay.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And St. Irene.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. St. Irene is one of the points. Of course, I cannot give any information to my hon. friend on this matter, but I shall inquire of Mr. Beland. Mr. Beland is stationed at Quebec and gets his information by wiring River Ouelle or Murray Bay.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—HON. MR. PUGSLEY.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I desire to rise to a question of privilege also. In the discussion on the subject of cold storage, as I find the report on page 9575 of 'Hansard,' Mr. Trueman was referred to and I see that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is reported to have asked this question:

Mr. LENNOX. Is that the Trueman who figured after as Judge Trueman?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether this is the judge or the solicitor. Judge Trueman has since died.

Mr. DANIEL. This is the judge, and a member of the firm of Pugsley & Trueman. He was in the cold storage company.

My hon. friend who represents the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) must know that Judge Trueman, who, in his lifetime was a practising barrister in St. John and afterwards became a judge, was a partner of mine some fifteen or twenty years ago ; that at least fifteen years ago he ceased to be my partner and afterwards practised upon his own account. So far from Judge Trueman being the gentleman referred to as 'Mr. Trueman' that gentleman was Mr. Walter H. Trueman, an entirely different person.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he a judge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; Walter H. Trueman was not a judge. He was the solicitor and he is the gentleman who is referred to in this correspondence and who is mentioned by Mr. Williams. My hon. friend from St. John is therefore wrong, first, in his statement that the Mr. Trueman referred to was Judge Trueman, and secondly he was in error in informing the House that Judge Trueman was a partner of mine.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John). The Minister of Public Works is quite correct in his statement. When the member for North Toronto was speaking I was under the impression he was referring to those who were the charter members of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. The charter member by the name of Trueman of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company is A. I. Trueman, Judge Trueman, and when alive the partner of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But, at what period?

Mr. DANIEL. I was mistaken in understanding the member for North Toronto as referring to the charter members of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, and so I spoke of the Mr. Trueman that was mentioned in that case as, he was, Judge Trueman, partner of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, I do not understand that. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that Judge Trueman was my partner. I have already informed the House that some fifteen years ago Judge Trueman and I dissolved partnership and were never afterwards in partnership.

Mr. DANIEL. All I can say is that the firm name down in St. John has always been Pugsley and Trueman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. DANIEL. I have never seen any notice of the dissolution of partnership.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It occurred at least fifteen years ago.

Mr. DANIEL. I know the two gentlemen had their office in the same room all along.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we rented an office in the same building.

SUPPLY—COLD STORAGE FOR BAIT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Fielding that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GEORGE W. FOWLER (Kings, N.B.) When the House adjourned at six o'clock on Wednesday I was referring to the reciprocal compliments that had passed between the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Militia, and to the fact that the

Minister of Agriculture desiring to take a part in military affairs, the Minister of Militia was desirous to join to his more warlike accomplishments something of the arts of peace, and so took an interest in agricultural matters. Unfortunately, as I pointed out, between the warlike desires of the peaceful minister and the peaceful desires of the warlike minister, poor Mr. Williams got into serious difficulty and was unable to handle a scheme he had devised for establishing cold storage facilities in St. John, N.B. It is to be regretted that the Minister of Militia in discussing this matter should have lost his temper. There was nothing in the well-reasoned speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) which ought to have aroused to such a degree the ire and the wrath of the minister of war. There were no insinuations made in that speech.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend did not hear the concluding part of that speech. If it were said of him he would not have stood it half so well as I did.

Mr. FOSTER. The concluding part was a suggestion.

Mr. FOWLER. Sometimes the sting is in the tail, and perhaps the minister thought so in this case. Anyway it is just as well not to be too thin skinned. This is a matter of great public interest and my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) had a perfect right to bring it to the attention of parliament, and because he did so was no reason why the Minister of Militia should have fallen upon him in such a savage, fierce and vindictive manner. Well, I do not intend to follow that line of debate ; I dont believe in it. I dont think we should make these personal attacks on members of the House, and I shall therefore discuss this question from the information before us, and from the knowledge we have of the circumstances of the case leaving personalities aside as they should be left aside in discussing public matters. The facts of this case are: Some time in the latter part of the year 1905 Mr. F. E. Williams of St. John, who is a merchant of considerable prominence and not the kind of person the Minister of Militia would lead us to believe, took an interest in cold storage matters in his city. By the way I was surprised to hear the Minister of Militia speak of Mr. Williams as he did; I was more surprised at that than I was at his references to the member for North Toronto. The member for North Toronto was in the House able and willing to defend himself, but Mr. Williams was absent, and so it is the more regrettable that the minister should have made disparaging statements about him. I quote from the speech of the Minister of Militia:

As to this particular cold storage establishment, we have been told a great deal about a man named Williams.

Now, Mr. Williams is a prominent merchant of the city of St. John and a prominent Liberal as well, and it was quite unnecessary for the Minister of Militia to refer to him as 'a man named Williams.' True, he is a man, and true he is named Williams, but we all understand the idea the minister wished to convey; we all know he wished to underrate Mr. Williams and to minimize his importance, and so he spoke of him not as Mr. F. E. Williams, a prominent merchant of St. John, but he designated him in a curt and disparaging way as 'a man named Williams.' I quote further from the Minister of Militia in referring to Mr. Williams:

He says he was engaged in the fish business though it turned out he was engaged in the pork business.

I defy the minister to point, in the letters of Mr. Williams to the department, to any statement of his that he was in the fish business. The Minister of Militia has gone out of his way to attack the veracity of Mr. Williams, and that attack was unwarranted and unsupported by facts. The minister further says:

He wished to get from the Department of Marine and Fisheries a grant not of 30 per cent but of 50 per cent in order to enable him to freeze bait and carry on his own line of business.

Now, if he was not in the fish business he would not be carrying on his own line of business in freezing bait. The minister seems to have attributed some evil motive to Mr. Williams in trying to get 50 per cent, but Mr. Williams in his letters points out that in every case the bait freezing establishments in Nova Scotia receive 50 per cent of the cost of their plant, and so when Mr. Williams was asking 50 per cent for a bait freezing plant to serve the fishermen of the Bay of Fundy, he was asking exactly for the same terms they were getting in Nova Scotia. Is there anything unfair or improper in that. Is there any reason in it why the Minister of Militia should sneer at this gentleman and insinuate that he was grasping enough to try and get something he was not entitled to ? I think this is very unfair on the part of the Minister of Militia. It says in other words, he wished to be given a system of cold storage which would subsidize directly his own line of business and not a system of cold storage on a large scale which would be of great advantage to the foreign export as well as the local business. As a matter of fact Mr. Williams was not engaged in the fish business. He wished to establish a bait freezing plant in the city of St. John, and asked for assistance to that freezing plant

on exactly the same terms as had been given by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to similar establishments in Nova Scotia. Supposing that he had advanced his own business by getting cold storage in St. John. The Minister of Militia states that he started into this because he was largely interested in fruit culture in his own district, therefore he would be equally blamable in desiring to get some special benefit for himself on account of the business in which he was engaged. The minister said:

Mr. Williams wanted something which would particularly benefit his own line of business and he made certain applications and had certain negotiations with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). But owing to a change of policy in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Williams failed to get what he wanted; and not being pleased, he endeavoured to solace himself by abusing me. Seeing that even he could not get something for nothing.

He could not get something for nothing. Did he ask for something for nothing? Did the industry with which the Minister of Militia was connected get something for nothing? Is that the inference we are to draw? It seems to me that is the only inference we can draw if we are to take for granted the statement of the Minister of Militia that Mr. Williams, in asking for this subsidy which the Department of Agriculture had already been authorized to give, was trying to get something for nothing and therefore guilty of reprehensible conduct. What are we to say of a cabinet minister who is asking for exactly the same thing? Is his conduct to be all right while that of Williams, who does not have the advantage of a seat in this House, is to be all wrong? Yet that is the only fault the minister can find with Williams, that he was trying to get something for nothing, and because he could not get it was abusing the minister. Surely the minister, having been successful in obtaining what he was after and Mr. Williams having been turned down in trying to get what he was after, should have just a little of the milk of human kindness in him and should have said that Williams was a little sore and so should not be blamed so much. I think that Mr. Williams' conduct has been reasonable and proper. I do not think he can be blamed much for having lost his temper under the circumstances. He had all his life been an active Liberal worker in St. John, he was prominent in the councils of the Liberal party there, he was only asking what every one had the right to receive if they came within the conditions laid down in the grant and be found himself up against an influence he did not expect to have to butt against, he found, even although he had engaged the services of the Minister of Railways and Canals and supposed that minister was going to be powerful enough to gain what he wanted, that that minister was powerless in the fact of another minister who had greater influence over the Minister of Agriculture, and it was perhaps natural that Mr. Williams should feel a little sore on the subject. It would not be necessary to speak of the history of this case had not the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) denied that the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) has any direct or indirect interest in this business. It does seem to me that the Minister of Militia stated in so many words in his speech that he was interested in this business.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Did I misunderstand?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not intend to. I stated that I had an interest and then I introduced two or three sentences between that statement and the discussion of what that interest was. Then I resumed and said: I said I had an interest—and then I explained what the interest was.

Mr. FOWLER. Then I take it that the hon. gentleman denies that he has any interest in this business except his interest as a public man——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Precisely.

Mr. FOWLER—in something that he believes to be for the benefit of the country. All I can say to that for the moment before I analyse the evidence is that the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence has manifested a greater and deeper personal interest in this particular line of business for the improvement of the country than he has in any other line in which only his general interest as a public man is concerned.

I was speaking of the history of this case. It began, as I say, with the application that was made to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries by F. E. Williams. The negotiations between Mr. Williams and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries continued for some time. Finally the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shunted Mr. Williams and his application off on the Minister of Agriculture. We find that on October 13, 1906. about a year after the Williams application was first made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries—and it seems to me that that application having been made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and passed on by that department to the Department of Agriculture it should date from the time it was made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries which beyond all question would make Mr. Williams the first applicant for the subsidy for the city of St. John—a company was incorporated called the Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Company, Limited.

As I understand it, the moving spirit in the incorporation and formation of that company was the Minister of Militia and Defence. I understand that the Minister of Militia and Defence will not deny that and in fact although the minister is not included among the incorporators, nor is Mr. Macoun his son-in-law and another of the active spirits in the promotion of this company, although the names of the incorporators are simply men of straw used for the purpose of the incorporation of the company, clerks and the like of that——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Clerks in the law firm that got out the charter.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, that is the common way of incorporating these companies; afterwards the true people come in and take up the stock.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As a matter of fact the company was never organized.

Mr. FOWLER. It was incorporated but not organized.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. It is only fair to say that Mr. R. J. Graham, the other gentleman to whom my hon. friend referred as having been interested——

Mr. FOWLER. Will refer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN—agreed, in case the company were finally organized, to become the managing director of the company but that point was never reached.

Mr. FOWLER. We find then that the Minister of Militia and Defence and his son-in-law, Mr. Macoun, and Mr. Graham were the moving spirits in connection with the incorporation of this particular company. That was on October 13, and on December 4 the Minister of Agriculture announced in the House his intention to give a subsidy of 30 per cent on the cost of cold storage plants. That 30 per cent was to include not only the cost of the building, but the cost of the site as well. That is a matter of some importance and I remember that when this matter was introduced by the Minister of Agriculture in the House I opposed the inclusion of the cost of the site in reckoning the amount of subsidy to which the builders were entitled, because in many instances free sites would be given —and just that same case arose here.

I have no doubt that when the cost of this building was made up, for which the amount of subsidy was asked, the value of the site was included.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think so.

Mr. FOWLER. I think it was, and in addition to the value of the site being included, I think there was included the amount of stock given to the gentlemen promoting the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company; because any one who has seen those buildings must come to the conclusion that no amount of $150,000 could possibly have been expended upon them, not even on a government contract. On the 4th of December, 1906, as I have stated, the Minister of Agriculture announced his policy of paying 30 per cent to those who established cold storage plants throughout Canada. On the 5th of December, 1906, the very next day, an application was made by L. S. Macoun for aid for a cold storage plant in the city of St. John. He did not lose much time in getting in the application. It would almost look as if the application were waiting to be put in—waiting for the announcement to be made, with the knowledge that it was to be made. That may not have been the case; I am only saying what it looks like. Mr. Williams did not lose much time, although he had no means of knowing beforehand the policy of the Minister of Agriculture; for we find that on the 7th of December, 1906, three days after the announcement to the House, in which there was time for the announcement to be telegraphed to St. John, Mr. Williams put in his application to the Minister of Agriculture. Negotiations then proceeded between the parties. There was a considerable volume of correspondence between them, but nothing of very great moment until we come to the 11th of June, 1907, when Mr. R. J. Graham applies for the bonus, the same gentleman who was interested with the Minister of Militia in the Canadian Lands and Produce Company, the abortive company that died stillborn Up to this time Mr. Graham, Mr. McAvity, Mr. A. I. Trueman and others, who were interested in what was known as the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, were at arms-length with each other. One party had the ear of the provincial government, through a former partner of Mr. Trueman, who was at that time at the head of the provincial government of New Brunswick. There are people who are suspicious enough to say that the name of A. I. Trueman, though it appears there, was really only used for the name of somebody else.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Who?

Mr. FOWLER. Ask him and you will find out. I am not referring to anybody; I am simply saying that there are those who say that the name of Mr. Trueman was used for somebody else, they do not say for whom. They leave that to the imagination of other people, and my hon. friend has a very vivid imagination when it suits him, and he can perhaps supply the name of the other person. I say that at that time the two parties, the one having the ear of the provincial government, and the other, composed of the Minister of Militia, Mr. Macoun and Mr. Graham, having the ear of

the federal government. They were not working in harmony. That was on the 11th of June, 1907. But between the 11th of June, 1907, and the 17th of August, 1907, a change took place. They felt that it would not be well to fight, because if they united together, they could better divide the spoil among them. They were getting 30 per cent from the federal government and those who took the provincial subsidy were to get $60,000 towards their plant.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, no; a guarantee of bonds.

Mr. FOWLER. Bonds and interest guaranteed—practically the same thing. If they made money, all right; if they lost, the promoters would not lose anything. Well, they thought it best to join forces and put up a plant. With the $60,000 that they were to get from the provincial government by way of guarantee of bonds and guarantee of interest, and with the $30,000 of subsidy from the Dominion, supposing the plant would cost $100,000, they would get $90,000. This would mean that they would only have to put up $10,000. But we know how these things are worked. They are worked in a variety of ways. By the padding of accounts, by the putting in that for which no money has been paid, such as good will, and that sort of thing, it would be possible to bring the cost of the property up so much that the $60,000 and the 30 per cent would more than cover the cost of the building, leaving a decent margin to the gentlemen who were engaged in the promotion of the company. That something like this did occur we have evidence in the letter of Mr. F. E. Williams to the Prime Minister. Opposed to that we have the absolute denial of the Minister of Militia as to any conversation having taken place between them. Now, I do not propose to judge between these two men—the one a prominent Liberal and merchant of good standing and character in the city of St. John, the other the Minister of Militia, a gentleman enjoying the confidence of his constituents in the province of Nova Scotia, enjoying the confidence of his colleagues in the government, and it is presumed enjoying the confidence of a majority of the members of this House. We have the two statements diametrically opposed, Mr. Williams asserting that the Minister of Militia said to him that by the uniting of forces, by getting an amalgamation of the St. John party, who had the ear of the provincial government, with the Ottawa party, who had the ear of the federal government, they would be able not only to build this plant with the subsidies and subventions, but divide a decent profit as well.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Is that statement attributed to me?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, it is absolutely false.

Mr. FOWLER. I have already stated that the minister absolutely denies this, and I say that I do not propose to judge between him and Mr. Williams. I merely say this. Let us look at the question of interest. On the one hand, Mr. Williams' evidence perhaps should be taken with a grain of salt, from the fact that he is a disappointed applicant for these very subventions and subsidies, while on the other hand should not a certain amount of doubt gather about the statement of the Minister of Militia from the fact that he is as intensely interested in denying that any such conversation ever took place? So that when we come to take the statements of these two gentlemen, equally worthy of credence from the positions they occupy, they are equally clouded with suspicion, and it is difficult to judge between them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) does not wish to take an unfair advantage. I think his statement is altogether out of order. Mr. Williams is not a member of this House. But, whether my hon. friend believes me or not, or whether he believes Mr. Williams or not, I think he is bound to accept my statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is the rule of the House.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). It was not the rule in the other case.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin) should not say that. The other was the case of a dispute between two members of the House about a matter of common knowledge, which was an entirely different proposition.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Militia has entirely misunderstood me, and I was trying hard to make myself plain. I do not refuse to accept the word of the Minister of Militia, but I was pointing out how difficult it was to decide between these two gentlemen, they being equally respectable and each having an interest.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am afraid my hon. friend wanted an inference to be drawn.

Mr. FOWLER. I did not draw any inference. But the Minister of Militia is so accustomed to drawing inferences in order to make charges against the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that he cannot cease even in his own case. Now, the peace-pipe was smoked, and on August 17 there had been an amalgamation of the interests of these conflicting parties. On that date Mr. R. J. Graham notified the department of the amalgamation of interests of the Canada Lands Produce and Cold Storage Company and the New Brunswick Cold

Storage Company and asked that all the interests should be transferred—that is correct, I think—to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As I understand it, Mr. Graham had applied in his own name and had actually made a contract with the Department of Agriculture, but later he asked to have his own contract transferred to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the Minister of Militia is misinformed with respect to that. He must admit that up to the time of the amalgamation, Mr. Graham was acting for himself and the other promoters of the Canada Lands Produce and Cold Storage Company, and that when he made his application on June 11, it was not for himself, although it might be in his own name. Surely the minister will not say that it was for himself solely, absolutely and independent of the other gentlemen, Mr. Macoun and the minister himself? There never was an intimation that Mr. Graham was acting for himself, although the application was made by him. Mr. Graham himself does not claim that he was acting for himself.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The contract with the government will show.

Mr. FOWLER. It does not show anything. It might be made in Mr. Graham's name, and yet he might be acting as trustee for other parties.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If he were trustee, it would be so stated, would it not?

Mr. FOWLER. Not necessarily. Why should it be stated?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I should think it would be.

Mr. FOWLER. Take the case of a man who holds timber licenses, for instances. Why, I myself hold timber licenses that do not belong to me individually; I hold them for others. My name does not appear as trustee, but appears as if I were the individual owner. But I am not the owner. That is the way it is always done.

Now, on August 17 Mr. Graham gives notice that the interests are amalgamated. On September 1 the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company is organized, with R. J. Graham as president, L. S. Macoun as secretary-treasurer. What stronger evidence could you require that the Canada Lands Produce and Cold Storage Company had been absorbed? Because it was not a case of amalgamation, but of absorption. This company had absorbed the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company which is the fact—

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have told my hon. friend that the company was never organized. How could it absorb anything if it was never organized?

Mr. FOWLER. It was incorporated.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But it was never organized.

Mr. FOWLER. What had that to do with it?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman said the Canada Lands Produce and Cold Storage Company absorbed the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. How could it if it was never even organized?

Mr. FOWLER. The minister is something like the man who sent for a lawyer to get him out of jail. When the lawyer heard the man's case he said: 'They could not put you in jail for that; it would be impossible.' But the man's answer was: 'It may be impossible, but I am in jail just the same.' The minister may say that this absorption could not take place; all I say is that it did. In this Canada Lands Produce Company how many people have we been able to trace? (I do not refer to the names of the incorporators, because, as the minister himself admits, they were simply clerks). We find that the men connected with it were the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), L. S. Macoun and Mr. R. J. Graham. I care not whether the company was organized or not—it consisted of these individuals—just as the Ross Rifle Company, the Minister of Militia tells us, consists of Sir Charles Ross solely, so this company consisted of the three individuals. Now, we find two of these individuals in the amalgamated concern, one as president and the other as secretary-treasurer, occupying the important positions in connection with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. So when I say that it was not a case of amalgamation, but of absorption, I think I was not far from the mark. On 1st September, 1907, we find this company incorporated, Mr. R. J. Graham president, Mr. L. S. Macoun secretary-treasurer, Mr. A. J. McAvity, Mr. A. I. Trueman and Mr. Henry R. Ross. Now, Mr. McAvity was a man very close to the government then holding power in the province of New Brunswick, a very close friend of the then premier of the province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who was the premier at that time?

Mr. FOWLER. I think that September 1, was just after the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) had been translated; I think he had not changed his form on August 17, certainly not on June 11. But although the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) may have retired as the nominal premier of the province of New Brunswick, he continued as the actual premier up to March 3, 1908, when the people took a hand in the matter and made a change themselves. While not the nominal, he was the

actual leader during that time, the actual premier, and the other gentlemen were simply puppets to be moved as he pulled the strings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You flatter me too much.

Mr. FOWLER. Though I am bound to say that his pulling of the strings was not done in a very masterly manner. Perhaps the string broke. Mr. A. I. Trueman was a very worthy gentleman. He has since died. He was at one time a partner of the present Minister of Public Works and ex-premier of the province of New Brunswick. While nominally he had for some time ceased to be a partner, in fact the offices were the same, and were never changed. They occupied the same offices, particularly about the time I think that the hon. minister came up here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me to correct him? He is entirely in error. When Mr. Trueman and I dissolved partnership, we actually dissolved, and never from the time we dissolved was I interested in his business, nor was he interested in my business. It is true, he had his own office and I had my office; but there was a general office which was occupied by the respective clerks for both of us. But so far as our business was concerned, it was absoluetly separate; and as I say, neither one of us had the slightest interest of any kind or description, direct or indirect, in the business of the other.

Mr. FOWLER. Now my hon. friend has proved just what I said. What different position would the minister have us think was occupied by these two gentlemen than any other parties. Is there not in every case, where they are able to afford it, a general office, and a private office for each member of the firm? That is the way it was here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman, notwithstanding my statement that we were not in partnership, and had not been in partnership for fifteen years, persists in saying we were. The hon. gentleman made the statement that we only nominally ceased to be partners. Now I think my hon. friend will accept my statement, and I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, whether he should not do so.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I never made any such statement. Let me repeat what I did say. I said that at one time these gentlemen were in partnership, and that at a certain time they, nominally, so far as I knew, ceased to be partners. At the time, and up to the time of the removal of the hon. gentleman to this scene, they occuped the same offices. That is what I said, and I say that any inference can be drawn from that state of facts. I never made any statement different from what the hon. gentleman has made. When he got up and said that they occupied each their own private office and had a general office in common, I said that the same practice existed among other partners. I did not say that proved a partnership between these two gentlemen, I did not say anything of the kind. Therefore it is not necessary for me to accept the statement of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood that is what he said, that while we nominally ceased to be partners—the fair inference I drew from his remarks was that, while we nominally ceased to be partners, we were still real partners. If my hon. friend did not mean that, I cheerfully accept his denial.

Mr. FOWLER. There my hon. friend goes again, just like the Minister of Militia and Defence drawing inferences. I am not responsible to this House for any inferences he may entertain, nor any meaning he may take. I am responsible to this House for what I state. I stated the matter as it was, and I am going to restate it. I am going to state that at one time the hon. gentleman and Mr. A. I. Trueman were partners; at a certain other time they nominally ceased to be partners. Perhaps they actually ceased; I do not know, but I do know that they nominally ceased to be partners. I am going to state further than that, that from the time——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. gentleman should not accept my statement, that for fifteen years or thereabouts we had not been in partnership, and had no interest directly or indirectly in each other's business.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not understand that the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) refused to accept the statement of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. FOWLER. I certainly did not refuse to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman. It would be almost high treason for any one of us to refuse to accept any statement of the Minister of Public Works. I would be looked upon as a man almost crazy if I refused to accept his statement. Now that is with respect to Mr. A. I. Trueman. The other director is Henry R. Ross, a young man whom I know thoroughly, a very bright young man, who has no financial interest in this company, but who is its manager at St. John—because this company extends its operations beyond St. John, it has another plant in the province of Nova Scotia, I think two.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. None, so far I know.

Mr. FOWLER. No, the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. They run it under

another name over there. What is it there ? the Nova Scotia Cold Storage Company? It is run under another name over there.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, does not wish to misrepresent me. There is no cold storage company in Halifax, so far as I know, except the bait freezing establishment to which his friend Mr. Williams refers in his letter. That is the only one I know of.

Mr. FOWLER. Is not Mr. Graham connected with another cold storage company in Nova Scotia ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is none whatever.

Mr. FOWLER. I thought there was one in Nova Scotia. I accept the statement of the Minister of Militia, because I know that the Minister of Militia knows.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I certainly do.

Mr. FOSTER. He knows all about it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I know several things, more than you wish I did.

Mr. FOWLER. Now I want to refer to an editorial which appears in the St. John 'Telegraph.' It shows that the suspicion that the Minister of Militia is interested in this company, is not confined to the wicked opposition members of this House, but it is a suspicion that is widespread, as widespread as the knowledge that a cold storage company exists in the city of St. John. This editorial appears in the 'Daily Telegraph' of Thursday, May 28, which arrived here to-day. It is a very clever, bright, readable editorial, and I am sure all the members on both sides of the House will enjoy hearing it. It is headed 'Very cold storage':

In an evil moment the Hon. Sydney Fisher ——

I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not here.

—wrote a letter. He says a careless phrase slipped into it. Unfortunately the phrase he now describes as 'loose' referred to his friend and colleague, Sir Frederick Borden, and the latter's interest in a cold storage promotion, or company, of which New Brunswick has heard much, and to which it has contributed more money than it likes to think about. Mr. F. E. Williams, of this city, wrote to Hon. Mr. Fisher to make application for a cold storage subsidy, and the Minister of Agriculture replied, intimating that the subsidy would go to a company in which the Minister of Militia was interested.

That certainly is borne out by the facts as disclosed in the correspondence.

The virtuous rage of Sir Frederick at being thus officially associated with a subsidy hunt must be imagined.

There, of course, the editor is drawing upon his imagination.

Hon. Mr. Fisher, in discussing the matter yesterday, when Mr. Foster brought up the chill but seasonable subject of cold storage, explained that when he said Sir Frederick was 'interested' he did not employ the word in the narrow and commercial sense, but meant to convey the intelligence that Sir Frederick's benign interest in all matters of public welfare and progress embraced cold storage also.

That, I think, is a fair inference from the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture.

It is a pretty story, and no doubt Mr. Fisher told it with becoming gravity. Sir Frederick, too, may be disposed to applaud his colleague's interpretation of a phrase which the public might be inclined to view as, let us say, awkward.

But one cold storage chapter leads inevitably to another. Keeping Hon. Mr. Fisher's loosely worded, or carelessly phrased, letter in mind, let us come down to the time of the recent change of government in New Brunswick.

The Robinson government, by an order in council of which the mere taxpayers heard no whisper, agreed to give the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company an additional mark of esteem by guaranteeing an additional $30,000 worth of its bonds.

In addition to the $60,000 to which they were already entitled, in its dying moments, the Robinson government, under the tutelage of its preceptor, I have no doubt, passed an order in council giving an additional $30,000, making $90,000 altogether towards this cold storage construction in the city of St. John. The fact of the passing of that order in council was most carefully concealed from the people of New Brunswick during the elections that were held there. Although the financial condition of the country was gone into, although there was a joint meeting held at St. John at which the leaders of both parties spoke, although they discussed the financial affairs of the country, although the premier—I was just going to say the acting premier—himself spoke on that occasion, and although he professed to disclose all the financial obligations of the country, he carefully concealed from his audience on that occasion and from the general public the knowledge that he had passed an order in council granting $30,000 more of a subsidy in this cold storage construction :

At that time the Robinson government designed to succeed itself in the esteem of the people whose credit it was pledging. The people had other plans, and these matured on March 3, when the government was routed at the polls. The cold storage company's relations with the old government had been cordial in the extreme, but a new king had arisen, and it was quite possible that he might not know Joseph. Also, he might be inquisitive as to orders in council and have constitutional scruples.

While things were at this pass——

Here is where the connection of the Minister of Militia and Defence comes in :

While things were at this pass Sir Frederick Borden came to St. John and called upon Hon. Mr. Hazen. He casually referred to the $30,000 guarantee, of which Mr. Hazen up to that time had never heard, and it is reported that he suggested the desirability of the government's 'seeing' the old government's thirty and 'raising it' ten thousand.

I am afraid that the editor has been in the habit of playing poker judging by the terms he uses :

Sir Frederick's son-in-law is one of the officers of the company. How is Sir Frederick's presence here on that occasion to be interpreted? Does it square with Hon. Mr. Fisher's theory that the Minister of Militia's interest in cold storage was general and patriotic and not confined to a particular project whose success was personally desired by him for the ordinary reasons?

The theory of subventions is that all applicants shall have equal opportunity to share the public money thus given to promote enterprises of public benefit. How does that theory work out in this case? Was the opportunity of Mr. F. E. Williams equal to that of the men who had the energetic support of a cabinet minister? Possibly so, but the average citizen would as soon fire off a Ross rifle as believe it.

That, Sir, is how this matter is viewed by one of the leading newspapers of the maritime provinces, the leading paper in New Brunswick, published in the very city where the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company has its building and offices. It seems to me that we must come to the conclusion that the parties who were interested in the Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Company, Limited, that company which was incorporated but never organized, are, with the exception of the Minister of Militia, who claims that he is not interested, the same parties who are interested in the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, because the same idea obtains all the way through. There was a time when the Minister of Militia admits that he was interested, but the Minister of Militia has not yet told us when his interest ceased. If he were interested in the first instance and if he is not interested now, there must have been a period when his interest ceased. I fail to see it. I have not found it. The minister has not told us when that was, but we have the facts before us that the minister has maintained the same apparent interest in this matter up to the present moment and that he has worked for the welfare of this enterprise as he did at the outset when he admits himself that he had more than an apparent interest in the matter, that he had more than the ordinary interest of a public man. Of course, in this House, when a minister states that he has no actual interest in the matter we are bound, by the rules of parliamentary practice, to accept his statement, although the minister himself is more ready to ask for the application of that rule than he is to submit to it when asked by others. I think it is unfortunate that the minister should have imparted into this discussion a degree of bitterness that was unnecessary and which I, at any rate, have sought most strenuously to avoid.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) made some statements with respect to the conduct of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain which were absolutely incorrect in so far as the facts are concerned. If the minister had taken the trouble to look up the authorities he certainly never would have made the statements he did make. He stated that Mr. Chamberlain, while still a member of the government, was largely concerned in companies which were doing business with the government. What are the facts ? I have the authority here. You will find it stated in the Parliamentary Debates, fourth series, from 5th December to 15th December, 1900, page 442. This matter came up in the House of Commons and it was discussed in a motion brought in by Mr. Lloyd George, one of the Welsh members, at present, I think, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and it really amounted to a motion of censure upon the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain. This is what Mr. Chamberlain says :

When I went into public life I gave up private business altogether. I have done what I could, I defy anyone to do more to keep out of investments that seemed likely to bring me into relationship with the government or public works. I will take one case. I was a considerable shareholder in the Small Arms company and in another company, Kynochs.

That is the company which the Minister of Agriculture referred to.

Now, what did I do? I sold out of both companies, and I sold out of them at a loss.

That is what the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain said and when my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture cites the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain's case as a justification for a minister of the Crown being mixed up in a matter of this kind he certainly cites a case that is against him rather than for him. Then, there is another case which the hon. gentleman might have cited and that is a discussion in this House. The motion upon which it was based appears in the Journals of August 13, 1891. The discussion will be found in Volume II. of 'Hansard,' 1891, page 3827. This amendment to the motion to go into supply was moved by Sir Richard Cartwright, and seconded by Mr. Laurier, now the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister of Canada. This is the amendment :

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved: That the acceptance of gifts or testimonials of any kind on the part of ministers of the Crown or of

any member of their families from contractors, government officials or other persons having pecuniary relations with the government, is entirely opposed to sound principles of administration, and is calculated to bring parliamentary government into contempt, and that the example thus given tends to corrupt and demoralize the officials serving under ministers who have accepted or permitted the acceptance of gifts or testimonials as aforesaid.

I would ask the Minister of Public Works to pay particular attention to this because he has accepted a banquet gotten up for him by a contractor in the city of Montreal and presided over by that contractor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A very good banquet it was.

Mr. FOWLER. I should judge so from some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman when that banquet was pretty well along. I should judge there was something at that banquet which loosens the tongue, gives rein to fancy, takes away from judgment and reason, and sometimes from veracity. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it was a good banquet and I should think he enjoyed to the full every thing that was at the banquet. Now, this resolution was seconded by the leader of the Minister of Public Works. We all know that the opinion which the Minister of Public Works entertains for his present leader has greatly changed in the past few years, and for that matter the opinion his leader held of him away back in 1896 appears to have changed also. However the opinion which the Minister of Public Works had of the present Prime Minister has changed very much for the better so far as the Prime Minister is concerned. This amendment to Supply was accepted by the government and the House was unanimous on it, and Sir Richard Cartwright made a speech and he was very vehement as he often was, and he said :

But I lay down, with all the emphasis in my power, I call upon this House and I call upon every honest man in this House and out of it, to stand by me in declaring that ministers of the Crown have no right whatever under any conceivable circumstances, to accept gifts from contractors or public servants. or persons having direct relations with the government. I have always held that ministers of the Crown were in a two-fold sense trustees. They are trustees of the people by right of the fact that they are the representatives of the people, but they are more than that. They are the sworn and paid servants of the public; they are, therefore, doubly bound to see to it, that no act of theirs should bring their high office into contempt or should be likely in any way to interfere with the proper administration of constitutional government as we have it and understand it.

It does seem to me that this is very apposite to the present case. Here is the Minister of Militia making application for a subsidy for his own private purpose as it was in the first instance—I am not speaking of the latter part now, but as it was up to the time the Minister of Agriculture wrote this letter—and it does seem to me in that respect the Minister of Militia was blamable.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I never make an application for my own private purpose and the Minister of Agriculture has said so.

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, no.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Agriculture does not say so; the Minister of Agriculture says exactly the opposite. I will read his letter again:

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Read his speech.

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, his speech; that is a different thing entirely.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is more recent.

Mr. FOWLER. Here is the letter written by the Minister of Agriculture when he had no idea this matter was to be discussed in parliament. Here is the letter not couched in language for the purpose of concealing facts but for the purpose of disclosing facts. Of course the Minister of Agriculture says he used a loose expression and now he comes to parliament and tries to fix it. I do not say that he wilfully prevaricates. I would not say that for two reasons: One is that it would be unparliamentary, the other is that I am frank enough to say I don't think it would be in accordance with the facts. But here is the letter written to Mr. Williams in which the Minister of Agriculture says :

Mr. F. E. Williams,
92 and 96 Princess street, St. John, New Brunswick.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 8th. I may say that we have not yet made any grant for a cold storage warehouse in St. John. Sir Frederick Borden has made application, on behalf of a company with which he is connected, and I have viewed his application very favourably.

There is what the Minister of Agriculture writes in plain English. He says the Minister of Militia made application on behalf of a company with which he was connected and in that statement the Minister of Agriculture was disclosing the absolute fact as it was up to that time. Either the Minister of Militia had made that application for a company with which he was connected and the Minister of Agriculture was stating the fact, or else the Minister of Militia had made no application and the Minister of Agriculture was not stating

a fact. I do not see how the Minister of Agriculture could have misunderstood the Minister of Militia in respect to his connection with the company. It would be impossible for such a misunderstanding to arise between two ministers who fight like blazes, as Mr. Tarte told us, I could understand it; but here are two ministers who don't fight at all, and the one of whom is always trying to help the other. When the Minister of Agriculture got into difficulty with Lord Dundonald the Minister of Militia out of the friendship he had for the Minister of Agriculture was willing to sacrifice the officer that he knew to be eminently qualified for his position. The Minister of Militia out of the great friendship he entertained for the Minister of Agriculture was willing to accept the odium for dismissing the hero Dundonald, and the Minister of Militia and the ministry as well did incur a great deal of odium for that act. So I say if this letter had been written by a minister concerning another minister between whom and himself there were no feelings of accord, I could quite understand how there might be a misunderstanding, but in this case it was utterly impossible, and the Minister of Militia must have given the Minister of Agriculture to understand that he was connected with this company. So, Sir, I think, in view of all these circumstances to which I have alluded, in view of the evidence disclosed in the letters, that the Minister of Militia is not without blame in this matter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). Mr. Speaker, I desire to occupy the attention of the House for just a few moments. After listening to the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on Wednesday last, which occupied more than two hours and consisted of numerous quotations from papers, upon the public records, from which he read at unnecessary length, the fact came back to me that the motion before this House was that you do leave the chair so that the House might resolve itself into Committee of Supply, and I was impressed during the time the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was addressing the House and after reading his speech subsequently, that the time of this House might be better occupied in proposing or carrying out some amendment to the rules of this House which would prevent such unreasonable consumption of time as has occurred during the last few weeks in this House and the great delay in the transaction of public business which is much to the detriment of the public service. I presume that of all countries in the world in which there is any form of parliamentary government, Canada is the sole country which would permit such an abuse of privilege as prevails in this parliament; no other parliament would tolerate for one moment such unwarranted consumption of time and neglect of public business. And, Mr. Speaker, I submit that where the political head of an organized political party, under a statute of the parliament of this country, is in the receipt of an indemnity almost equal to that of the Prime Minister, he is in honour and all morals bound to exercise some control over the party which follows him. It is not fair, it is not intelligent or reasonable that the leader of a political party who is in the receipt of an indemnity, or whatever you may call it, can free himself from the obligation to pay some little respect to what is the real business of parliament.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is what hurts you.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I am not one of those who would object to reasonable opposition even if it was opposed to my own opinion; I have sufficient knowledge of what political warfare is to recognize that. But surely there is some limit. We have members of parliament standing up here openly announcing that if the provisions of a certain Bill were eliminated the estimates would go through at once, intimating that they have no objection to the estimates.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) ended his long speech the other day by suggesting that the Minister of Militia and Defence should resign his seat in the cabinet and not further compromise the government. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is too free, as he was reminded the other night by his own friend and political ally the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes), to suggest wrong-doing by his political opponents. During his whole speech the hon. member for North Toronto was unfair to the Minister of Militia and Defence. His whole speech was but a repetition of innuendoes which could not be supported by the evidence which was before the House, or by the papers which were upon the table of the House, and yet my hon. friend took great umbrage when he received a slight reprimand from the Minister of Militia and Defence. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) should remember that anybody who has skated on such thin ice as he has and who has sometimes fallen through that his provoking style of discussion of public affairs must provoke recrimination.

I could not but smile this afternoon when I heard the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) deprecating any excesses in parliamentary speech, particularly of a personal nature, and then saying that he would not condescend to such a mean manner of speech and never had done so. I am in the judgment of the House when I say I am telling the simple truth in stating

that the hon. gentleman's speech from beginning to end was unfair and unwarranted. He would accept no statement of correction from any hon. gentleman opposite. He did not, I think, candidly accept the explanation of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) that a certain gentleman was not his partner, and he made the statement that in St. John it was generally understood that Mr. Trueman was but nominally interested in this company and that his name stood for the name of somebody else.

In this discussion two ideas have been developed by hon. gentlemen opposite. One is that the Minister of Militia and Defence was interested in this corporation which received a subsidy under the Cold Storage Act passed some two or three years ago by this parliament. The second is that this corporation was assisted too largely by the government of Canada. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the other day repeatedly made the insinuation that the Minister of Militia and Defence was a shareholder, was financially interested in this corporation, and he quoted from many letters to sustain this contention of his. Now there were upon the record two letters, one addressed to the Minister of Agriculture by Mr. Macoun stating that the Minister of Militia was not financially interested in this corporation and that he was not then a shareholder or the owner of a share of stock therein, and the other from the Minister of Militia and Defence stating that he never was interested in that corporation and did not now hold stock in it. Then later we had in the address of the Minister of Militia and Defence his own explanation of what interest he did have in the corporation and this I desire to place before the House. I think it was a fair and reasonable statement for him to make and it furnishes to the House very clear information as to the interest of the minister in this promotion. He said in part:

> While I was in England in 1906 application was made under instructions given by me and Mr. Graham jointly for the incorporation of a company. It was intended, I may say at once and frankly, that my properties in Kings county, orchards and farms should be made a part of this company, and Mr. Graham, of Belleville, I believe, a prominent Conservative, a great fruit dealer and well up in cold storage and all matters pertaining to agriculture, was to have taken an interest and to put his properties into the company in the same way as mine were to be put in, and we were to accept bonds and a certain amount of stock for these properties. It was expected that money would be raised in England to carry on the business, and it was expected also that a portion of the money would undoubtedly be invested in the establishment of cold storage plants in different parts of Canada

That was a clear, clean, business proposition, in which Mr. Graham and the Minister of Militia agreed to pool their interests and place them in the hands of one corporation, and they were to receive, as part of the consideration for the sale, bonds and stock of the company. The establishment of cold storage was to be an incident in that promotion. If after that organization was completed, it became entitled under an Act of the parliament of Canada to a subsidy for cold storage purposes, I submit that there could be no objection to that, even if the Minister of Militia was in it. But the Minister of Militia saw that it might be open to criticism, so far as he was concerned, and he decided to withdraw. He says:

> This was all arranged before it was expected that any policy such as that afterwards decided upon would be brought down by the government.

At the time the organization was proposed, the Cold Storage Act had not been placed on the statute-book.

The minister goes on to say:

> When the Minister of Agriculture saw fit to adopt the policy of aiding, somewhat largely, cold storage, I felt that, so far as I was concerned, it would be undesirable for me to own stock in any company which was receiving from the government a subsidy, although, under the law, I do not know that it would have been. I would have been going beyond my right in doing so. Then it was that I told Mr. Graham that some other means must be taken to carry on the cold storage project in the city of St. John and elsewhere.

Now, I submit that the course pursued by the Minister of Militia and Defence was highly commendable, and that he did everything to destroy the criticism that might have been made had he remained interested in the original project. That project was abandoned. Then the Minister of Militia admits frankly that he was interested in the conclusion of the project which he and Mr. Graham had in mind, and I suppose he lent his sympathy to it. Why should he not do so? Was it not his duty, as a member of parliament, as a minister of the Crown, as one interested in the export of agricultural produce and its preservation prior thereto, to lend to that project his active sympathy and support? The question is this: Was that support of a nature which might possibly be construed as a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act? There were apparently two applicants for this subsidy, Mr. Williams and the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. I might preface that by saying that the Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Company was never organized; it never became a live organization, and it was eventually abandoned. Mr. Graham and Mr Macoun became identified in interest with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, and there the connection of the Minister of Militia with the project positively ceased. Now, I deny that there was more than one applicant for cold storage aid after

the Cold Storage Act passed. The hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) denied the statement made by the Minister of Militia that Mr. Williams had stated that he was in the fish business. Well, I have in my hand a letter of March 1, 1906, addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries by Mr. Williams, in which he says :

The undersigned is engaged in the city of St. John, N.B., in carrying on a fish business, and is about to enter more largely in the business.

That statement the hon. member for Kings and Albert denied most vehemently. He denied that Mr. Williams was engaged in the fish business, or that he ever said he was.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As a matter of fact, he said he was when he was not.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister said he was not engaged in the fish business, and that is what the hon. member for Kings and Albert said.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The hon. member for Kings and Albert had before him the records before parliament. That is all I have, and in those records Mr. Williams states, in a letter to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that he is engaged in the fish business and that he proposed to enlarge it.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman seems more interested in correcting the statement of the hon. member for Kings and Albert than he does in getting at the fact.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I am interested in correcting a statement made by the hon. member for Kings and Albert ; I am not very much interested in whether that statement is correct or not. Mr. Williams goes on to say:

The object of establishing a refrigerator plant at St. John will be to ensure a regular supply of bait to our fishermen when fresh bait cannot be had. This will prove a great boom to the fishing industry.

He enlarges on that idea ; and on the files will be found a great many letters from Mr. Williams, all indicating fully and conclusively that the only cold storage plant he had in mind was a bait refrigerator plant ; he never suggested anything else. Even in his last letter, addressed to the Prime Minister, he makes mention of that fact again. This letter of March 1, 1906, was replied to by Mr. Gourdeau, the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as follows :

I have to acknowledge your letter of the 8th instant, further on the subject of the establishment of a cold storage establishment at St. John, and I beg to refer you to my letter of the 12th October last, in which the object of the department in assisting in the establishment of fishermen's bait freezers is fully explained. Your letter seems to imply that you are still under the impression that this department is prepared to aid general cold storage establishments of a commercial character; but the information contained in the pamphlets forwarded to you in my previous letter must have made it plain that the sole object of these fishermen's bait freezers is to supply bait to the actual fishermen at times when it could not otherwise be procured. The localities you mention—Halifax and Canso where freezers of a larger kind are being tested are essentially ports of call for fishing vessels, and the sole object of the freezers established there is to enable visiting fishermen on the way to the banks to secure bait to carry on their fishing operations. No such conditions appear to exist in the neighbourhood of St. John.

In all his correspondence with the department there was never the slightest intimation from Mr. Williams that he ever thought of engaging in a cold storage plan such as was contemplated under the Cold Storage Act passed two or three years ago. In his application he makes no mention whatever of the character of the enterprise which he had in mind ; he designates it merely as a cold storage warehouse ; whereas the application of Mr. Macoun, which was made the day before, I think, states that they were to engage in the establishment of cold storage warehouses for the preservation of food products ; and that was the object of the Cold Storage Act. In the application of Mr. Macoun it was stated that they had secured land at St. John and had under option lands at Halifax, where they contemplated establishing another branch. The New Brunswick Storage Company had exemption from taxation by the city of St. John ; and after Mr. Graham and Mr. Macoun became interested in it, they made a further application to the city of St. John for exemption from taxation. I believe this was unnecessary, for later they secured lands from the Crown, which were not taxable. Mr. Williams never made application to the city of St. John for exemption from taxation. In fact, I am told that on the occasion that the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company asked for exemption from taxation, he appeared before the city council and publicly stated that he did not want any lands, did not require any government aid, did not require exemption from taxation. I submit that the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company went about this enterprise in a business-like way. I submit that Mr. Graham and Mr. Macoun took the proper business course in allying their interests with those of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company.

The other point about which I wish to make a few observations is the contention that the corporation known as the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company was over subsidized, unnecessarily assisted, by both governments, and that the cost of the construction of the whole plant was paid for out of the subsidy and that there was a

profit left. Any fair-minded man reading the letters to Mr. Williams as they appear upon the files to-day must necessarily come to the conclusion, first that Mr. Williams never intended entering upon a project such as was contemplated to be subsidized by the Cold Storage Act, and that he exhibited no business acumen whatever. His letters to the Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture in almost every case were not couched in terms likely to emanate from a man of good business standing. He insinuates in one letter that the Minister of Militia stated that the enterprise could be floated out of the subsidies they were about to receive from the Dominion and provincial governments and leave a construction profit besides. The Minister of Militia denies that. He could well deny it; and it would not be necessary to have his denial to know that the statement of Mr. Williams was absolutely false and financially impossible.

Now, let me say a few words on the financial aspect of this matter. The hon. senior member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) discussing this matter the other day, said:

> We have to take the figures as they are put in the official correspondence, and the claim for the 30 per cent subsidy was on an expenditure of $125,000. If that statement is correct this fortunate company obtains in guarantees and subsidies from the Nova Scotia and Dominion governments $127,500 for building a plant which cost $125,000.

That statement was absolutely unfounded. No person reading the record, even carelessly, could reach such a conclusion. Any hon. gentleman who would give the matter even casual consideration should be unwilling to make such a statement in this House upon his responsibility as a member. In the first place, the company has received from the New Brunswick government only a guarantee of $60,000 principal and interest. They have received from the government of Canada $15,000. So, at the most, this is only $75,000. And the statement is made that they have already expended over $169,000. It is evident from this statement of facts that those interested had not failed to put into the enterprise some of their own capital or the capital of somebody else. But the statement is not as good as that for the company. The Minister of Militia has stated, I believe, that the company has spent $165,000. I am advised privately that it has spent $169,500. Let us take it at $165,000. Now as against this, they have received the guarantee of the Province of New Brunswick upon $60,000 worth of 4 per cent bonds. I do not know whether these bonds have been sold. I should be very much surprised indeed if this enterprise has been able, during the last twelve or eighteen months, to sell these bonds. But if they have pledged them as collateral with any banking intitution in this country, I venture the statement they would not get more than 90 for them. This would give them $54,000. Add the $15,000 received from the Dominion government, and you find a total of $69,000 of subvention from both governments against an expenditure of $169,000. Yet hon. gentlemen talk glibly about the construction of the whole enterprise out of subventions with a construction profit besides. The purpose of aiding these cold storage plants was a very proper one, and I believe the policy will do a great deal for Canada. This plant should do a great deal particularly for St. John. It does not necessarily benefit the province of New Brunswick alone, for Ontario and Quebec will, perhaps, derive greater advantage, as they are large exporters of perishable food stuffs through the port of St. John in the fall and winter seasons. This subsidy of 30 per cent payable by the Department of Agriculture is not, it must be remembered, handed over to the corporation at once. They receive 15 per cent of the cost upon completion of the plant. Assuming the cost in this case at $165,000, they would receive $24,750 upon completion of the plant. They have received only $15,000. In December, 1908, they would receive 7 per cent more or $11,550; in December, 1909, they would receive $3,300; in December, 1910, $3,300; in December, 1911, $3,300; in December, 1912 $3,300, or a total of $49,500. Yet hon. gentlemen speak as if this full subvention of 30 per cent is taken from the public treasury and handed over immediately to the corporation. Such is not the fact. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) knew that. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) knew it. The hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) knew it. Yet these gentlemen deliberately make their statement in a form which shows that their desire is to make the country believe that this company has received $49,000 or $50,000 from the government of Canada, and $60,000 from the New Brunswick government, neither of which is correct. The purpose of distributing this subvention of 30 per cent paid by the Dominion of Canada over a period of seven years was a good one. It was anticipated that any cold storage project in St. John, Halifax or elsewhere would not be a profitable enterprise for some few years at least. I take it that the purpose of the subvention was to aid the operation of the plant after its completion rather than to aid the construction. I think that was a very wise provision. Were this subvention paid immediately after construction, there would be a great opportunity for persons to make a profit on construction, and then, in the event of the enterprise proving financially disastrous, they could well afford to permit it to end there.

Now, these are the only two features of

the question that I arose to discuss. I submit that the declaration made by the Minister of Militia on Wednesday last was a fair and frank one. He, being largely interested in lands in the Annapolis valley, on which are grown fruits and other perishable food products, naturally became interested in a large cold storage project. He interested another gentleman who had similar interests. They decided to unite their interests and to dispose of them to a corporation, receiving in consideration bonds and stock of the company. He endeavoured to make a flotation of this proposition in England, but failed. Later finding an Act of parliament is passed which might possibly entitle this corporation of which he is the promoter to a subsidy, he decides to withdraw. The matter was taken up in another form and the Minister of Militia declares that he did lend his interest to the successful carrying out of the project, and did whatever he could to make it a success, but had no financial interest in it. The government of New Brunswick evidently had faith in the enterprise, because they gave a subvention—it should hardly be called a subvention, however—a guarantee of principal and interest of $60,000 of bonds for a period of forty years. These bonds, of course, must be retired by the company. Upon the board of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company two members of the executive of the New Brunswick government are entitled to sit; and I think, though I am not sure, that the Minister of Agriculture is also entitled to representation on that board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit it was a fair proposition for the government to grant this subvention to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. The location was an ideal one for such a plant. It could not possibly be hoped that such an enterprise would be financially successful for the first few years, and it was necessary for the successful inauguration of that enterprise that the Department of Agriculture should assist it. We have nothing to do with the assistance given by the government of New Brunswick, as I said before. I cannot regard Mr. Williams as ever having been a serious application for this aid from the government. He never intimated to the government that the enterprise he had in mind was of the character contemplated by the Act passed two or three years ago under which cold storage projects were to be assisted. I do not believe that the gentleman, judging from the correspondence upon the public files, was a man capable of carrying that out to a successful conclusion. He gave no bona fides of his intention to engage in it, never bought any land, never applied for exemption from taxation, and never made proper application here, such as required by the Act, and he never filed his plan. I submit, therefore, that there is nothing in connection with this whole transaction which warrants the time that has been occupied in parliament in discussing it. There was nothing in it that would justify the action of the hon. member for North Toronto who, instead of moving a resolution referring the whole matter to the Committee on Privilege and Elections, makes the insinuation that the action of the Minister of Militia in relation thereto was of such a character as to require him to tender his resignation.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). I think perhaps if the people of this country had some knowledge of the manner in which the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) deals with what he is pleased to term the important business interests of the country, if they had the same acquaintance with his conduct in dealing with these matters as members of this House have, I think his speech on this question would at least provoke a smile. He has found fault with my hon. friend from North Toronto for having introduced this subject and brought on this discussion. His principal objection to the discussion has been that it is not of sufficient importance to warrant us in devoting so much time to it. Well, Sir, it is really refreshing, to me at least, having some knowledge of the manner in which the hon. gentleman conducts himself in the Public Accounts Committee, to learn that he has experienced a change of mind, and I hope a change of intention for the future, and that he will no longer follow a course in the Public Accounts Committee which has won for him the reputation of being one of the chief obstructionists. I am sorry that this discussion has caused him such a shock at seeing public business obstructed, as he says, and now that he has experienced a change, I hope he will make an attempt in the Public Accounts Committee to deal with the public business henceforth to come before that committee in a proper manner and will endeavour to promote the investigation.

The excuse offered by the hon. member for Lunenburg for the conduct of the Minister of Militia in this matter was that it was a perfectly legitimate thing for him to pool his interest with the interest of Mr. Graham in an endeavour to advance their material interests in fruit growing and agriculture. Well, if I had not such an intimate knowledge of the condition of the affairs of Mr. Graham, the associate of the Minister of Militia, I would not marvel as I do at the partnership between these two gentlemen, as stated by the minister himself. I did not know, I take the word of the minister for it, that he is very largely interested in the cultivation of fruit and agricultural produce in the Annapolis and Cornwallis valley, but I would like to know where the corresponding interest of Mr. Graham comes in. It is intimated that Mr.

Graham had a corresponding interest in some other portion of the country, and that these two interests were going to be pooled for the advantage of somebody or something. Well, I happen to know that Mr. Graham has no such interests as would enable him to pool anything with the Minister of Militia and Defence. Then the hon. member for Lunenburg suggests a reason why this Canada Land and Produce Company was abandoned. From the discussion that has taken place, I would suggest this answer to his query: It became apparent to those who were promoting the Canada Land and Produce Company that the object sought to be obtained by them might be obtained in some less public manner than by their becoming members of that corporation, and that by some such means as have been exposed, or attempted to be exposed, by the discussion of this matter, the same ends might be attained without publicity being given to the position occupied by the Minister of Militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that Mr. Graham possesses no interests in Belleville and Ontario generally in fruit and cold storage business?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, you understand me in a sense to say that; he is not a producer himself, as the Minister of Militia asserted that he was. Mr. Graham has been carrying on for a number of years what might be called a broker's business in the city of Belleville, or a commission business, that is, he has been receiving for transportation to the old country fruit, hay, cheese and different farm products.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Has he not a large cold storage establishment in Belleville?

Mr. PORTER. He has a cold storage establishment, not a large one.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Does he not manufacture dried fruit and vegetables? Has he not eight or ten different places in Ontario where he manufactures evaporated fruit?

Mr. PORTER. There was a time, I may say, when Mr. Graham was interested in a number of industries of that kind in the province of Ontario, and, in fact, outside of Ontario in some of the states of the Union. But, that day passed away a long time ago, or some considerable time ago, these businesses are now all in the hands of the Bank of Montreal, and Mr. Graham does not own or pretend to own one cent of interest in them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is only fair to Mr. Graham to say that Mr. Graham does own these properties, but that the Bank of Montreal has large security upon them from him. The hon. gentleman surely does not wish to drag Mr. Graham's private affairs in here to his injury. It is only fair to Mr. Graham to make that statement.

Mr. PORTER. I certainly would not have done so had not the minister asked me the question that he did and which provoked an answer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman stated here that Mr. Graham had no property or interest at all in Ontario.

Mr. PORTER. I said that he had no such property or interest as was mentioned by the minister to be pooled with the property of the minister. I repeat that statement.

Sir FRERERICK BORDEN. The Bank of Montreal, at the time, was cognizant of what was going on. Mr. Graham produced valuations by competent valuators showing property to the value of $100,000 and the Bank of Montreal was prepared to indorse the scheme and to accept the bonds which would have been issued by Mr. Graham in lieu of its lien upon the property. That is the statement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Bank of Montreal taking that position with Mr. Graham. The Bank of Montreal has got into such a position with Mr. Graham that it is really forced to carry Mr. Graham to some extent to save itself.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is a very unfair reflection to make upon a worthy man.

Mr. PORTER. I have no objection to offer to the scheme of assisting cold storage in the Dominion if it is done in a proper, open and legitimate way. I think that cold storage has been and will be proved to be an important factor in advancing the interests of the country. But, when a minister of the Crown having means of knowledge, not possessed by the ordinary individual, is at least seen to be mixed up with a matter of this kind in some way—I will not go so far as to say in what way—that alone is sufficient to warrant a discussion of the matter in this House. I do not agree with the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) when he raises the question as to whether or not the opinion exists in the country that the minister is connected with this business. I know that to some extent the opinion does exist in the country that the Minister of Militia is connected with this thing and not only the Minister of Militia, but it is common talk that the Minister of Agriculture himself has also some interest in this matter. I have heard it stated outside of this House and I have seen it stated in the newspapers?

Mr. FISHER. What kind of an interest?

Mr. PORTER. I will not say what kind of an interest, but I say that it is most im-

portant that the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Agriculture, if you will, should be afforded at least the opportunity of denying that they have any such interest in it.

Mr. FISHER. I will not take the trouble to deny such nonsense.

Mr. PORTER. The discussion which has been brought on by my hon. friend from North Toronto has afforded an opportunity to the Minister of Militia of denying any connection with this matter, which he has done in his own way, and I think that instead of criticising my hon. friend from North Toronto he should thank him for the privilege that he has had at least of attempting to clear himself of any imputation. There are certain points in connection with this question that are beyond dispute. There are certain things that are admitted that, to my mind, at least, require something more than a mere denial on the part of the minister to free himself of the impression that does exist that he has some connection with this business. It is certain that it has not been denied that the government, through the Department of Marine and Fisheries, have established the practice or policy of assisting bait freezing institutions.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It still exists.

Mr. PORTER. Well, it did exist at one time.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It does yet.

Mr. PORTER. Very well, I will take the minister's word for it. What I say is that it did exist and, at that time, as far as this discussion has shown and as far as I know, that was the only department of the government that was assisting enterprises of this kind.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not at all; the hon. gentleman is not familiar with the statute. The Department of Agriculture was giving a bonus to the extent of five per cent upon $40,000 invested in cold storage, if I remember rightly.

Mr. PORTER. Not for bait freezing institutions.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. PORTER. That was established by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Quite so.

Mr. PORTER. It is also admitted that Mr. Williams made application to the department for assistance to enable him to establish a bait freezing institution in St. John. His application was the first that was properly made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and it was the first that was made for the establishment of a cold storage system in the city of St. John.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was the only one made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. PORTER. Yes. Well, then, it was the first one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I can say to my hon. friend that he must be in error as to that, for I happened to know as a member of the provincial government that some seven or eight years ago the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company was incorporated, that it was proposed to give them the aid of the New Brunswick government, that they acquired a lease of land from the Intercolonial Railway for the purpose of establishing cold storage, and I understand that they had made an application to the Dominion government for the aid which was provided under the original Cold Storage Act. That must have been four or five years before Mr. Williams made any application.

Mr. FOSTER. We are supposed to have all the papers down and that does not appear in them.

Mr. PORTER. That does not appear at all and that does not alter the position that I take that at the time Mr. Williams applied his was the only application before the Department of Marine and Fisheries for assistance in establishing cold storage for bait freezing purposes in the city of St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For bait freezing. I was referring to general cold storage, for fruit and farm produce.

Mr. PORTER. The question arises here: Was Williams treated fairly and squarely in connection with his application for cold storage, and was the Minister of Militia a party to an application for assistance for establishing cold storage in St. John? The next question is: Was the fact that the Minister of Militia was an applicant or was interested in a company which was an applicant, the cause of Williams not receiving the treatment he otherwise would have received? Let me examine the conditions as I understand them. Williams made his application in October, 1905, and he followed the matter up during a whole year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To the Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. PORTER. Yes, to the Marine and Fisheries.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But at that very moment there existed in the Department of Agriculture a law under which assistance was given to general cold storage.

Mr. PORTER. That does not affect the issue at all.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But it is true.

Mr. PORTER. It does not affect the argument I am making.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It does very much.

Mr. PORTER. He made his application in 1905, and he followed up that application, and as an evidence of his intention and ability to carry out a scheme of that kind he forwarded recommendations of various persons and corporations who were in a position to judge of his qualifications and of the honesty of his purpose. That continued for nearly a year before anybody else appeared upon the scene.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Always for fish, however.

Mr. PORTER. At that time it came about that the whole matter of aiding cold storage projects was to be handed over to the Department of Agriculture, and when that became known Mr. Williams made an application to the Department of Agriculture for assistance in the same manner as he had made his application to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Williams' application was made to the Department of Agriculture on the 7th of December, 1906, and the application of the company represented by Mr. Macoun was made on the 5th of December, only two days prior.

Mr. FOSTER. But with this difference, that the application of Mr. Macoun was an application for information only. The application of Mr. Williams was an application for subsidy as well as for information.

Mr. PORTER. That is quite right, but I am treating them both as being applications, which is the most favourable construction that can be placed upon the position of Mr. Macoun.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 151) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Crawford.

Mr. LENNOX. When we were last dealing with this Bill the Minister of Railways proposed an amendment to my amendment, but as the hour for private Bills was exhausted I had not an opportunity of expressing my objections to it. The minister pointed out that the wording of his amendment was the same as the wording of section 11 of the agreement, being the schedule to the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill of 1904. I regard the position under the minister's amendment as worse than the Bill without qualification, while my amendment is an important security for the people. One of my principal reasons for objecting to the minister's amendment is that it casts a new burden upon the people. Under the Act of 1904 the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, if they should build the branch lines, could saddle upon the country such branch lines as they did not desire to retain, and if the government of Canada determined to operate the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway they would be compelled to take over those comparatively unremunerative branch lines. This is extending the difficulty and making us not only subject to take over such comparatively useless branch lines as the main company may see fit to build, but also binds us to take over the branch lines built by the subsidiary company, the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company. Therefore, I am very anxious to defeat this amendment by any legitimate means that I can adopt. I am glad that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is in the House, because I think for once I shall have his valuable assistance in defeating this amendment to the amendment. If I have his assistance, with his well known ability, I have no doubt I shall be eminently successful, and as he is an astute lawyer, logical of course to the last degree, I am sure I shall have his strong support. I assume that this proposed amendment has not been recommended by the Governor General in Council, because that has not been mentioned—of course if it has been recommended in that way my argument does not apply, namely—that it is out of order. I have three very eminent authorities in support of that proposition, first the dictum of the Minister of Public Works, second the opinion of the deputy Speaker of this House and, third, the ruling of the Speaker of this House. It will be remembered that when I introduced the amendment some few weeks ago and it came up in the House on the 8th of this month the Minister of Public Works argued that the amendment was out of order because it was a proposal to impose a burden upon the revenue of the country and that the consent of the Governor General in Council had not been obtained, and of course could not be obtained by a private member. He argued that it certainly would be out of order but for the proviso at the end of it that the work should not be taken over without the consent of parliament, but the hon. gentleman further showed by his argument that even with that proviso at the end of my amendment it was still out of order under the British North America Act. I propose to call your attention to the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). The amendment to the amendment, as proposed by the Minister of Railways, is substantially the same in

wording as my amendment except that my amendment aims at taking over all lines we see fit to take over, and the amendment of the minister proposes to take over only such lines as the railway company do not see fit to retain. But my amendment has the proviso that that shall not be done except with the consent and sanction of parliament, which proviso saved my amendment, as was decided the other night and which proviso is not in the amendment as proposed by the minister.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). My amendment has that proviso in it. As typewritten it had not, but within five minutes after handing in the amendment I added that proviso.

Mr. LENNOX. As it appears in 'Hansard' it has not, and as read by the minister it had not.

Mr. GRAHAM. Five minutes after it was read by the chairman that proviso was in.

Mr. LENNOX. It was not read by the chairman. The chairman did not read it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I had it put in inside of five minutes after I gave the amendment.

Mr. LENNOX. As I always want to be eminently consistent I shall not pursue that branch of the argument, but as suggested by my friend (Mr. Lancaster) I shall pursue some of the other branch lines. These three companies are substantially one and the same company, the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company. The government is building the eastern division, and from day to day as time goes on we are more and more realizing the amount of money we are putting into that enterprise. The advantages are all in favour of the railway companies as contrasted with the position of the country. The Grand Trunk Pacific Company get all the good end and we get all the bad end; they get all the easy part and we get all the difficult part, and therefore the government should safeguard the people to the extent of seeing that if we put our money into the building of this eastern division, and we are compelled to take it over at the end of fifty years, or if after it is built—and this is not a remote contingency—the Grand Trunk Pacific Company do not take it at all, but it is left on our hands, we should be able to obtain such branch lines as are feeders to it or as connect the cities of the south with it, upon reasonable terms. Now, in the Act of 1904 we have the provision which, as the Minister of Railways says, is copied in the amendment which he proposed the other day, 'that the government shall, if at the expiration of the said lease if it shall determine to undertake the operation of the said eastern division, take over such branch line or lines as the company may elect not to retain.' The position is this, that if in any event we operate the line at the end of the fifty-year period, we have not the right to take over the paying branches, but we are compelled, whether we want to do so or not, to take over the branches which the railway company do not want to retain, which will be the branches which are not paying. We have not an option, as under the amendment I propose, of taking them over. If we have an option, it is beneficial to this country, but if we are saddled with the necessity of taking them over, whether we want them or not, and are compelled to take over such branch lines as the company do not desire to retain our position is not only not improved in over what it was when this Bill came into the House some weeks ago, but we are in a vastly worse position. I protest against that condition of things. Let me call the minister's attention to something else. I was inclined to think that the minister had paid very little attention to the drafting of this amendment, not only because I did not find the proviso in 'Hansard' or anywhere else or get any track of it until the minister mentioned it now, but because this section, as now worded, is practically senseless. Let me call the minister's attention to how it works out. It says:

> At such value as may be agreed upon, or as may, in case of failure so to agree, be determined in the manner provided by paragraph 24 (2) of the said contract.

There is no contract in this Act that we are amending. Before that it says:

> The government shall, if at the expiration of the said lease—

There is no lease mentioned in the statute we are dealing with. This is simply very slovenly—if the minister will allow me to say so—and unsuitable wording to accomplish any purpose. This is brought in without consideration from a statute which deals with a lease and with an agreement, but the statute we are dealing with refers to neither lease nor agreement, and, therefore, the amendment in that respect is not appropriately drawn. I will not take much time over that, because it can be easily amended. But, more than that, this provision is meaningless. If we turn to the statute that it is taken from—that is paragraph 24 of section 2 of the agreement—we find that that provides:

> If, in any question arising under the provisions of sub-paragraphs (a), (c) and (e) of this paragraph, the parties shall fail to agree, the matter in difference shall be determined by arbitrators, to be appointed in the manner provided by paragraph forty-seven of this agreement: provided, however, that, if a board of railway commissioners shall be here-

after appointed under the authority of an Act of the Parliament of Canada, having powers substantially as proposed by Bill No. 21 of the present session of parliament, then such dispute shall be determined by such board, from whose decision herein either party shall have the right, without leave, to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Now, when we turn to paragraphs (a), (c) and (e) we find that paragraph (a) is 'reserving to the government, in respect of its ownership, present and future, of the Intercolonial and any other line or lines of railway, running powers and haulage rights over the eastern division of the railway; paragraph (c) is 'securing to the government in respect of its ownership, running powers and haulage rights over the western division,' and paragraph (e) is 'securing to the company running powers and haulage rights over the Intercolonial Railway or any portion thereof.' How can that have any application to the matter we are dealing with now? Evidently the minister or whoever drafted this did not turn to the sections and see how they would work out, and the result is that when we do trace them up we find that they become absolutely senseless. If the minister does not want to adopt the full measure of relief that I propose I regret it very much, but in any event, if he sincerely wants to have this workable, and I have no doubt he does, he should frame a provision somewhat on the lines on which I framed it, making it complete in its wording.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will detain the committee but a moment. I will not attempt as a layman to reply to my hon. friend's legal argument. The question of this amendment is one that was not considered by me until after an objection was raised by the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) in the first discussion of this Bill, that this Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, although representing the same interests as the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, had been organized to get away from the provisions which we had in the old agreement as to taking over branch lines.

If that were so, I think it was very reasonable that it should not be allowed to be done. We wanted not to put them in a better position than the Grand Trunk Pacific. I have had a clause drafted the same as in the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, but I say frankly to my hon. friend that I am not anxious to press this amendment to the amendment. I cannot consent to his amendment, but, if it will meet him half way, I propose that both his amendment and my amendment to the amendment should be dropped and that the Bill should be passed as it came from the Senate. The effect of the amendment to the amendment is, ostensibly, to necessitate the taking over by the country of certain branch lines. It is debatable whether that would be best or not. Personally, I am inclined to think that no injury would be done the country if we were compelled to do that. I gave my reasons in support of that view and will not go into the subject again. But, as I have said, I am willing, if it will meet the hon. gentleman, that the Bill should be accepted as it has been passed by the Senate.

Mr. LANCASTER. I listened to this discussion on two or three previous occasions as well as to-night, and whether the amendment of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is absolutely the best possible or not, yet, as the best thing proposed, I would adopt it. I certainly think that some such amendment should be made covering the point that the hon. member has in mind. The amendment, as I find it in 'Hansard'—and I trust that on this occasion 'Hansard' is correct—reads as follows:

2. In case the government as defined in the schedule to the National Transcontinental Railway Act, 1903, in pursuance of the terms of the said schedule shall at any time determine to undertake the operation of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, the government shall thereupon and thereafter have the right to take over all or any of such of the lines of railway authorized by chapter 99 of the Acts of this parliament of 1906 as are connected with or running from a point or points in the said eastern division——

And here I pause to emphasize the fact that that means the lines of the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company and not the Grand Trunk Pacific Company.

—at such value as may be agreed upon between the government and the company; and in case they cannot agree the amount to be paid by the government to the company the amount shall be determined by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, from whose decision either party shall have the right, without leave, to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Now, so far, I have not heard one word advanced by anybody to show that this is not a proper provision.

Mr. KNOWLES. May I ask a question? I have no doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has given a great deal of attention to railway charters. Why should a provision such as this be put in this charter more than any other that happens to cross the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. LANCASTER. I am afraid I shall have to make my remarks longer than I had intended. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) and every other member of this House understood the peculiarity of this charter. Here was a very vexed question beginning in 1903. The two

political parties disagreed as to the wisdom of the bargain made with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. We made a certain arrangement with the company wherein we were almost sure to lose—much more sure to lose if they did not make money than if they did. The probabilities of the company earning money and paying dividends had everything to do with whether the guarantees of this government as endorsed would fall upon them, that is whether we should be called upon to make good the money that the Grand Trunk Pacific would borrow on the strength of the guarantee. In 1906, when the Branch Lines Company was to be incorporated, I took the position in the Railway Committee and in this House that we ought not to create another entity with power to build branch lines, but that the building of the branch lines should be part and parcel of the Grand Trunk Pacific. My argument was—and, if I do say it myself, it was never answered—that, in case of a dispute as to division of freight between a company originating traffic and the trunk line which takes over that traffic and carries to its destination as to the division of the freight, the railway commissioners would probably, and very properly, give the lion's share to the originating company; therefore, if we guaranteed the liabilities of 'A' and then permitted him to carry on in the name of 'B' a business more profitable than that which he carried on in his own name——

Mr. KNOWLES. Did the Grand Trunk Pacific represent 'B' in that case?

Mr. LANCASTER. The Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company is not the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. The case is as if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) were to ask me to endorse his note and then he were to carry on the profitable part of his business in his wife's name and yet, while allowing her to make the profits, would refuse to make her responsible for the obligation on which I had endorsed. It would be as though a man went to a bank for money and the bank were to say: If you get So and So to guarantee you, we will give you the money; then, having got the money, he divides his business into profitable and unprofitable parts, makes it impossible for the endorser to gain any of the profits and yet leaves him liable for an obligation which could not be redeemed because relating to the unprofitable part. In plain English, that is what we did when we incorporated the Branch Lines Company. Of course, we cannot go back on that. I am not suggesting that; but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) asked me why it made a difference, and I am trying to tell him. I understand that my hon. friend from South Simcoe wants to try to stop this from going any further.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) does not understand me. There is no evidence that the capital to be put into the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines is in the slightest way identical or associated with the Grand Trunk Pacific. If he will show me any reason for believing that it is, one great doubt in my mind will be removed.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think it makes any difference how they raise the money. These two are the same concern, the same people. Nobody believes anything else. The hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Knowles) will not say that they are different.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think so.

Mr. LANCASTER. A different crowd?

Mr. KNOWLES. Before the lines are built and in operation, there may be different capitals invested altogether.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well let us see who the men are in this Branch Lines Company. Here for instance, is Mr. Charles M. Hays. Everybody knows who Mr. Hays is—he is president of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and second vice-president and general manager of the Grand Trunk. Then there is Mr. Frank W. Morse, who is vice-president and general manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Then there is Mr. William Wainwright. Does not everybody know that he is one of the principal officers of the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific? Another is Mr. W. H. Biggar, who, as we all know, was assistant solicitor of the Grand Trunk and who now occupies the position formerly held by Mr. John Bell as general solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway system. And then there is Mr. D'Arcy Tate, assistant solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway. Now those are the people who are incorporated in the name of the Branch Lines Company.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the gentlemen who take out a charter are not necessarily those who will finance the charter. There is absolutely no reason to believe that because Mr. Wainwright, Mr. Biggar and their associates have taken out a charter, that therefore some of the investors' money is going to be in that railroad.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not say that the same people are going to lend the money to build the road, but these are the principal debtors whose liabilities the government of this country are going to guarantee, these are the people who can make us liable on these bonds that we guarantee, according to how they manage their affairs. The Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk Branch Lines Company are one and the

same concern so far as relates to the running of that railway and the making or losing of money, and therefore the sticking the people of this country so to speak, on their bonds. Now some such amendment as proposed by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is necessary at this juncture. No one has said yet that there is anything wrong with it, every one has said that there is no objection to it. Then it goes on to say :

If any such line of railway, so to be taken over, shall have received any grant or grants under the provisions of any Act of the Parliament of Canada, the amount of such grant or grants, without interest, shall be deducted from such value, and the difference only shall be payable by the government upon the taking over of the line.

Now why is not that only fair but necessary, in the interest of the country ? But now the minister proposes to withdraw his amendment on condition that the hon. member for South Simcoe withdraws his ; in that case we will have neither. The proposition of the Minister of Railways that brought me to my feet, was that if he succeeded in getting my hon. friend from South Simcoe to drop his amendment, he, the minister, would drop the amendment to the amendment, and in that case we would have neither the one nor the other. I appeal to the Minister of Railways if that provision should not be either in this amendment to the amendment, or in the original amendment of my hon. friend from South Simcoe. I say again that it is absolutely necessary if we are not going to let the Grand Trunk, and the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk Branch Lines, and any other concern that the Grand Trunk chooses to put before this country as a company that is going to be affiliated with it—I say if we are not going to let them do anything they please, if we are not going to hand over to them the sole control of everything in sight, and the right to tax the people to this extent, then we must put some such amendment as this in the Bill. Then it says :

Provided, however, that nothing in this Act contained shall authorize the government to take over the said lines of railway or any of them without the consent of parliament, previously obtained, to the exercise of such right of taking over as aforesaid.

Now surely we have got to have some such provision. If the Minister of Railways will draw a section that protects the people, though it uses different language from this, I will support it. But we must have something of that kind somewhere in this Bill. When we passed this charter in 1906, I, over and over again, to the extent of making myself an annoyance perhaps to some gentlemen in the Railway Commission, insisted on a clause that nothing we did for that Branch Lines Company should interfere with any of the rights of the people in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific. That did not carry. Why ? Because the Grand Trunk Pacific would not have it, and the government would not force the Grand Trunk Pacific to take it. It was argued that we were incorporating a different company, under a different name, which would be capitalized perhaps by different people, and therefore, although they were going to become affiliated with the Grand Trunk Pacific, we should not force them to relieve us from liability on the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I proposed in the Railway Commission, and I think again in the House, that there should be a clause in the Grand Trunk Branch Lines Company charter that nothing therein contained should impair or take away the right of the people in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, or should put them in the same position as if the Grand Trunk Pacific itself had built these branch lines under the original charter, and that was voted down by this House. Everybody in this country knows that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk Branch Lines Company are one and the same concern, and are working for the benefit of the Grand Trunk Railway. Therefore when we proposed in 1906 that nothing in this Act which is now being amended should take away any of the rights that we had already, and that everything we did for that company should have the same effect, as regards these branch lines when they were built, as if they had been built by the Grand Trunk Pacific themselves, when we could not get that, when the government voted that down, the present Minister of Justice who took charge of the measure instead of the then Minister of Railways, put in that qualified section which is now being amended, that it should not affect our rights in some regards only. Now the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) must recognize that his own side of this question was represented in this House in 1906 by the present Minister of Justice, who drafted and put in a clause dealing with the principle of the matter, but not to the full extent it ought to be dealt with, that is to say, that the Branch Lines Company was connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific, and you will find in the original Act of the Branch Lines Company a clause saying that it should not affect the right of the country as against the Grand Trunk Pacific Company in some respects, and in those respects only. But my point is that this government did undertake to say that the one had something to do with the other, that they should be dealt with in some respects as if they were one and the same concern.

If my hon. friend wants to tell us that the Grand Trunk Branch Lines Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are entirely different matters and should

not be mixed up the best answer I can give him is the section of the Act of 1906 which was drawn by the Minister of Justice and which says to the contrary. I and another hon. gentleman made the contention in the Railway Committee that there should be full protection to the people but we succeeded in getting only a compromise and not the full measure of protection that I thought ought to be enunciated in the Act. I want to say to my hon. friend that the Minister of Justice declared in this section the very opposite to what my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals tells us should be adopted when he put this clause into the Act in lieu of the one which I was moving which was more general in its terms and which was designed to protect the people entirely and not in the limited way that this does. Section 32 of the Act to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, passed in 1906, provides that :

The provisions of paragraphs 39, 42, 43 and 44 of the agreement which forms the schedule to chapter 71 of the statutes of 1903, and so much of paragraph 45 of the said agreement as provides that traffic shall not be diverted to ports outside of Canada, shall apply to the company in the same manner and to the same extent as if the lines of railway hereby authorized had been constructed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Surely, in view of that, my hon. friend will not say that there is nothing at all in the contention that one company is affiliated with the other and that we should not mix them up in legislation. Surely, in view of the section passed by this parliament, drawn by the Minister of Justice and offered to parliament in lieu of the full protection that I was contending for in the interests of the people in every respect, my hon. friend will apologize to the House and recognize that he was entirely wrong in saying that they were two companies and that they were not connected one with the other. The Minister of Justice knew that in these matters that are mentioned here there must be some protection in regard to the people's rights, in regard to the guarantees which they gave and the benefits they expected to receive from the incorporation and development of this company or scheme known as the National Transcontinental Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, this ocean to ocean line. The Minister of Justice recognized, although he was, as I thought and still think, not doing what he ought to have done to protect the people in regard to the guarantees and the great liabilities which they were assuming in assisting the Grand Trunk Pacific to construct this line, that in that matter the statute should be amended and he put in the clause which I have just quoted and which distinctly says that these paragraphs shall apply in the same manner and to the same extent as if the lines of railway hereby authorized had been constructed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I am afraid that the Minister of Railways and Canals sometimes forgets that all we are doing by this Branch Lines Railway Company could have been done by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company itself. I always was opposed to giving the Branch Lines Company these rights as it looked to me like an attempt to give another company, under an entirely different name, but with the same people behind it, the right to acquire all the benefits that the branch lines will give them because this will be the paying part of the railway and at the same time not make provision to assist the parent company which is our debtor and which is the debtor of the capitalists who have taken the bonds guaranteed by the country. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) proposes here an amendment that if any of these branch lines are taken over by the government the government shall be able to select the lines they want. As it is now the government have to take the lines that the Grand Trunk do not want, only such lines as the Grand Trunk choose, to use an ordinary expression, to dump upon the people of the country. Such lines as they have found do not pay them very well they can force the people to take. Surely we can get over that. Let us have a little judgment. Let us once in a while try and protect the people of the country a little. Let us have one day in the month when we can unanimously in this House remember that we represent the people and not the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Grand Trunk. Let us break the ice a little this hot weather, let us say : We have some rights in this country that we must keep our eye upon. Here we are saying deliberately : We will help you all we can to build these lines of railway ; we have given the whole credit of Canada to assist you to get money to build them in one way or another and while we think that there are one or two things that ought to be attended to, we will leave them aside and we will say that we will help you to do all these things. We will give you lines in every direction ; we do not know how many will pay, so that you need not worry whether they will pay or not. We say, go on and build them, we will get the money and those that you find do not pay you can throw upon us and we will buy them from you.

Mr. KNOWLES. Is there anything in this proivsion to compel the government of Canada to buy these lines, or is it only an option ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The amendment to the amendment says just what my hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) asks me. I will read it to him :

In case, during the currency of the lease of the eastern division, the company shall have

constructed a branch line or lines running from a point or points in the said eastern division, the government shall, if at the expiration of the said lease, it shall determine to undertake the operation of the said eastern division, take over such branch line or lines as the company may elect not to retain.

Did any one ever hear of such a bargain being made from the people's standpoint ?

Mr. KNOWLES. Is it compulsory—may take over ?

Mr. LANCASTER. It is compulsory. My hon. friend wants an option on a piece of property or a business ; will he make a contract that he undertakes to take just that part that the other man chooses to sell to him and no other part at all ? Would my hon. friend, if he wanted to buy out of a departmental store, make a bargain that he would take only such departments as the other man chose to sell him and go without the rest of them ? That is practically what the people are doing here.

Mr. KNOWLES. I will gladly make a bargain that I at any time ' may ' buy.

Mr. LANCASTER. Suppose that we arrive at the stage where the people declare that under the provisions of this Act they determine to undertake the operation of the eastern section. It has always been argued that one of the advantages that the people have in regard to this railway is that they can, if they choose, undertake the operation of the eastern section. Suppose they undertake to operate what they own, what they have paid for, what belongs to them and if they want to do that they have to take such branch lines, connecting with that railway as they want ?—no, not as the people want but such as the Grand Trunk say they must take.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend does not want to hear it. He perhaps wants to vote it through deafly as well as blindly. But, I want to give my hon. friend an idea of what he is voting for if he votes for this charter the way it is. We some day perhaps are going to operate the eastern section. If we undertake the operation of the eastern section, of course, we will want the branch lines which connect with the eastern section. Will we have the privilege of taking such branch lines as we desire ? No, we must take such lines as the Grand Trunk Pacific want to sell, such lines as the Grand Trunk Pacific has no use for. We will be meeting our antagonists and business associates operating branch lines that were worth something while we were operating branch lines that are useless, that produce no freight and while we will have to pay a big price for them these lines will be of no use to us.

I do think that the Minister of Railways who has charge of this legislation in the interests of the public ought to sit down with the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and draw up a section that will protect the people of this country. The Minister of Railways must see that there is no way of protecting the people of Canada unless some such amendment as that proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) is adopted.

SUPPLY—COLD STORAGE FOR BAIT.

The hour for private Bills having expired, House resumed on the motion of Mr. Fielding that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). When the House rose at six o'clock I was pointing out some of the undisputed facts which to my mind lead to the irresistible conclusion that Mr. Williams who had made application for assistance to his cold storage project, was not treated in a fair and proper manner by this government and was not treated in the same manner as was the company with which the Minister of Militia was connected. I had arrived at the stage where there was an application made for assistance by Mr. Williams on the one hand and by Mr. Macoun on the other. These two applications were received within two days of each other and there seems to be good reason why the application of Mr. Macoun who lives in Ottawa should antedate the application of Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams had no means of ascertaining when the announcement would be made by the Minister of Agriculture as to the assistance that would be afforded these concerns, as to what form it would take, or as to what would be required from the applicants. On the other hand Mr. Macoun had ample means of knowing all that. The Minister of Militia was connected with his company and the circumstances in connection with the announcement to be made by the Minister of Agriculture had no doubt been discussed in the presence of the Minister of Militia, and so, as appears to have been the case, there was an opportunity of getting in ahead of Mr. Williams. Both of these applications were answered on the same day by the Minister of Agriculture, but the answers were not identical. The answers given to Mr. Macoun's application did not cast any doubt upon the scheme, but left the impression that it was a certainty, whereas the reply sent to Mr. Williams referred to the contingency of the Bill, which the Minister of Agriculture was about to present, receiving or not receiving the assent of the House and thus casting a doubt upon it. That alone was enough to throw cold water upon the application of Mr. Williams, to put him in doubt, and to cause him to hesitate and delay about going to further expense in connection with the

matter. From that time in December no action was taken until about the 1st of April, when Mr. Williams—no doubt having ascertained that the Minister of Militia was interested in the application opposed to his —wrote pointing out that fact and asking in a very polite way the very direct question whether his application was going to be considered or whether it was the intention to give the preference to the company with which the Minister of Militia was connected. It is singular that all through this transaction from the beginning to the end, whenever Mr. Williams got busy and wrote to the department, the cold storage company with which the Minister of Militia was connected got busy also. And so, after Mr. Williams wrote on the 1st of April, we at once see the company with which the Minister of Militia was connected getting busy again and taking action before the Minister of Agriculture. The correspondence leads pretty irresistibly to the conclusion that the company with which the Minister of Militia was connected was being favoured by the government, while the proposition of Mr. Williams was being discouraged as much as it could be. Matters drifted along from the date of Mr. Williams' letter in April until some time in June, nothing being done by either party. Following the letter of the first, a letter was written by the minister to Mr. Williams on April 11, 1907. This is the way Mr. Williams is treated. In that letter the minister says :

Sir Frederick Borden has made application, on behalf of a company with which he is connected, and I have viewed his application very favourably.

Following that we find the company itself getting busy again and Mr. Graham writes to the Minister of Agriculture under date April 13. Very little time was lost. In that he says :

Sir Frederick Borden requested me——

Mark you, he is the hired man of this company, the employee of this company and he is requested by a gentleman who is connected with the company :

—to interview you in reference to aid for our cold storage propositions.

Not the cold storage proposition, as the minister would have the House believe from his remarks this afternoon, for which an application was made by Graham on his own behalf, but here is an inquiry by Graham, 'on behalf of our cold storage proposition at St. John. Then he says :

I learned from Mr. L. S. Macoun that you had advised him that everything had been arranged in connection with this matter, and therefore it would be unnecessary for me to bother you any further in reference to the matter in question.

Mr. PORTER.

That is most important in this connection, it seems to me. Mr. Macoun advised him that everything had been arranged in connection with the matter. That left nothing to be done if the statement made in that letter is true, as I believe it to be. The Minister of Agriculture assumed the same position as did Mr. Macoun in the matter and as Mr. Graham had been advised to assume. The Minister of Agriculture writes a letter on the 16th of April :

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 13, and note what you state in regard to your visit to Ottawa last Thursday.

What he stated in regard to his visit last Thursday was that he had consulted Mr. Macoun and found that all arrangements had been completed. The minister finishes his letter with :

This is quite satisfactory.

Assenting to what had been said by Macoun and reasserting the position that everything in connection with the application of the Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Company had been completed. That is important in this view of the matter. The reason urged by the ministers during this discussion for not treating further with Mr. Williams was that he had filed no plans and specifications at the time when these two letters were written, when everything was said to have been arranged with the company with which the minister was connected, there had not yet been a plan or a specification filed on behalf of that company, and I conclude and I think it is the only conclusion one can draw from it, that so far as the Produce and Cold Storage Company was concerned the Minister of Agriculture could complete an arrangement without any plans or specifications being filed. With Mr. Williams they did not even call upon him to file plans and specifications, but because he had not filed plans and specifications they ignored his claim altogether, and granted this subsidy to the Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Which they never did.

Mr. PORTER. Now let us see what sort of encouragement they further gave to Mr. Williams. On June 3—and mark you, the plans and specifications of the Canada Cold Storage Company were not filed until the 11th of June—Mr. Williams wrote to the Minister of Agriculture and after having received the information that the application of Sir Frederick Borden had been made and had been considered favourably, and the fact being as is proven here, that everything had been arranged in connection with it, although that was not known to Williams, he writes and says :

I have already spent considerable of my money going to Ottawa and endeavouring to

obtain a grant for the cold storage warehouse in St. John, and do not feel like spending any more money in getting up plans and specifications if the preference is to be given to Sir Frederick Borden.

He does not receive a reply to that letter denying that a preference is given to Sir Frederick Borden, or what action is being taken with Sir Frederick Borden, but he receives a reply from the deputy minister during the absence of the minister saying :

If you will submit your application it will receive due consideration.

His application was in months and months before. He is not asked to file plans, &c., and they will be considered. He was not told : We have not only considered the application of Sir Frederick Borden favourably but have taken action to arrange all matters in connection with it and therefore the thing is closed so far as you are concerned and you may as well quit. That would have been a correct statement of the position and a frank statement to make to Williams. But the matter is allowed to drift on. At that stage the application was in the name of the Canada Produce and Cold Storage Company, but everything had been arranged with that company and an effort had been made to make financial arrangements to float it. If what has been stated in this debate is correct, then it occurs that something must be done, some reason occurs to the parties interested to make a change. Having made certain of getting the assistance from the government it seems to have occurred to some one——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that Williams was never asked to send plans of any kind.

Mr. PORTER. He was sent forms for making application.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has before him Williams' letter of June 3, saying to the Minister of Agriculture

I received blanks for application for cold storage warehouses. In your letter of April 11, you gave me to understand that nothing could be done unless plans and specifications were submitted, and you also stated that you looked favourably, etc.

He was then asked for plans and was told to——

Mr. PORTER. What was the use of asking him at that late stage ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is another thing. The hon. gentleman was giving the House the impression that Williams was not asked to submit plans.

Mr. PORTER. He was not asked to submit plans at any time when it would have been of any service to him to submit plans, and then he got this letter, because at that time, when the blanks for making his application and sending in his plans and specifications were given to Mr. Williams, the matter had already been closed up, as the minister himself said in the correspondence which I have read.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I never said any such thing.

Mr. PORTER. Then I do not understand the English language. When he says everything has been arranged, that certainly means that nothing has been left, and the Minister of Agriculture assents to that, as I have already read.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not at all. He said nothing of the kind.

Mr. PORTER. I will read it. Mr. Graham says to the minister :

I learned from Mr. Macoun that you had advised him that everything had been arranged in connection with this matter.

Then the Minister of Agriculture, referring to that letter and to what he said, uses the expression : 'This is quite satisfactory.' I do not know you could put it in more precise and definite language.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is somewhat different from the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. PORTER. It makes a great deal of difference, because here was Mr. Williams making an honest application, and he was entitled to fair and honest treatment on the part of the minister, without any partiality being shown to one applicant over another ; while an arrangement with the Canadian Produce and Cold Storage Company was made secretly. It was not done publicly apparently, but in some hole-and-corner or underhand way, while Mr. Williams was led to believe that the matter was still open, and was encouraged to go on and incur further expense to have plans and specifications prepared and to send those plans and specifications into the department, when he had received no answer to his communication as to whether or not the minister was to have the preference ; and what would have been the result ? The very same result that we have to-day ; the subsidy would have been granted, as it was granted, to the Canadian Produce and Cold Storage Company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It never was granted. There never was such a company organized.

Mr. PORTER. I have heard the minister say that several times. There was a company of that kind chartered, and according to this correspondence the application was

made in the name of the Canadian Produce & Cold Storage Company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And never was granted. It was absolutely abandoned.

Mr. PORTER. Let us see whether it was or not. Mr. Macoun was the secretary, and here is what he says when he made application on the 5th of December, and this is the application that was acted on :

I beg leave on behalf of the Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Company, Limited——

In the reply to that, the Minister of Agriculture says :

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of December 5 and note your application on behalf of the Canadian Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Go on. There was no agreement made whatever—absolutely none.

Mr. PORTER. What I have said I stick by—I say that an application was made on behalf of the Canadian Produce & Cold Storage Company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Of which nothing whatever came.

Mr. PORTER. Well, Mr. Graham and those who were associated with him got the advantage of that application—

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not at all.

Mr. PORTER—because there is no further application made by them. They simply file their plans and specifications on the 11th of June.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mr. Graham made application in his own name.

Mr. PORTER. Up to that time they were all acting in concert—Graham, Macoun and the Canadian Produce & Cold Storage Company; and when affairs were in the condition that I have pointed out, it became apparently advisable to the persons who were interested, that the Canadian Produce & Cold Storage Company should be dropped or hidden from view in some way ; and so Mr. Graham, who is an employee of the Canadian Produce & Cold Storage Company——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is not an employee ; it does not exist.

Mr. PORTER. It is stated in the address of the hon. Minister himself that Mr. Graham had been employed on behalf of the company, and he gave the reasons why —because he was a man of large experience in cold storage, would carry out his undertakings, and so on. At that time, for some reason which is not disclosed here—and perhaps we may not be able to get at the bottom of it—it occurred to the parties who were interested in this matter that it would be better for future proceedings to be carried on in some other way ; and so we find that Mr. Graham, who had been engaged for some months in St. John in making arrangements for the erection of this plant or the perfecting of this plant, has made some arrangement with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, and he writes to the minister asking that the name of that company be substituted for that of the Canadian Produce & Cold Storage Company. And so the agreement is prepared, executed and carried out. Now, it does seem to me, without treating the matter further, that the written evidence and the facts that are beyond any question or dispute, show as clearly as the noonday sun that Mr. Williams and the Canadian Produce & Cold Storage Company were not treated in the same way—that the latter was treated most favourably and with every consideration by the Department of Agriculture, while Mr. Williams was discouraged, if not in every possible way, in a sufficient way to prevent him from putting in any plans and specifications, thus affording some peg on which the hon. Minister could hang his hat if the matter ever came under discussion in this House.

Another feature of the matter is connected with the absorption of the Canadian Produce & Cold Storage Company. Failure had followed the effort to raise funds in the old country, and who was here in this company who had the financial backing to carry on this enterprise ? Mr. R. J. Graham, from what has already been said in the House, was not in a financial position to do it. Mr. McAvity who was a man in good circumstances had contributed his part by handing over the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company and its charter, but that did not provide any funds with which to erect the plant.

Then there were Mr. Macoun, secretary-treasurer, Mr. A. I. Trueman and Mr. Ross, who had the management of the business. In that list of names I do not see any reasonable prospect—if that is all that is behind it—of carrying out this enterprise. Another reason given by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and concurred in by the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), was that Mr. Williams did not make a bona fide application and did not intend to—that is, they insinuated that he would not—carry out the proposition of a sufficient and effective cold storage plant. I think that, if remarks of that kind are to be made at all, they would apply just as well, if not better to the board of directors, as I see the names here, of this New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. But the fact

is they went on. The money came from somewhere. It did not come from England. I doubt if it came from the board of directors; they have not disposed of their stock? Where did the money come from? It came in part from this government and the local government of New Brunswick; $15,000 has been paid by this government and $60,000 has been guaranteed by the government of New Brunswick. But where did the rest of the money come from? Now, it is interesting just at this stage to note the statement made in the newspaper published in St. John which was read by the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) this afternoon, stating that after the change of the local government in New Brunswick, the Minister of Militia himself had an interview with the premier of the province of New Brunswick in reference to the additional $30,000 grant that was to be made by the local government for the purpose of assisting this company. Now, that is only a few months ago. If there has not been time since June, 1907, for the Minister of Militia to free himself entirely from the financial interests of this concern I would like to know how long a time it is going to take. We find the minister only a short time ago so interested on behalf of the public of Canada that he is inquiring of the local administration of the province of New Brunswick about the $30,000 that is to carry on this enterprise. I think it is only fair to conclude from the written evidence and testimony given here in the letters that passed between the various applicants and the department, that the company with which the Minister of Militia was connected did receive more favourable treatment than did Mr. Williams who applied on behalf of himself or a company that he was going to organize. I ask the question, why was that done? Could there be any other answer than the fact that he was Minister of Militia and Defence? And if that was the reason, if the fact of the hon. minister being a member of this government influenced the conduct of his colleague to grant favours to him that would not be granted to the ordinary individual, I do not hesitate to say that that act is one to be condemned by parliament and by the country. The Minister of Agriculture suggested—in fact, made the bald statement—that he had waited five long months from June until September for Mr. Williams to perfect his application. Now, while we are bound to take the statement of the minister in this House, is there not a fair and cogent reason for the lapse of five months' time at that particular stage? Where was the Minister of Agriculture and where was the Minister of Militia and Defence during that time? I think the Minister of Militia said himself that he was attending the imperial conference. So instead of waiting five months for Mr. Williams I think the fact will be found to be that the Department of Agriculture was waiting for the return of the Minister of Militia before taking action in this matter. For we find that, very shortly after his return, the matter was consummated. I think that something more is desirable than the mere statement, the solemn statement, of the minister to allay—to put it in a mild form—the suspicion that all these circumstances create. If it is true that the minister has nothing whatever to do with this matter, that the action of the Minister of Agriculture was not influenced by the fact of his colleague's position in the matter, then it is to the advantage of the hon. gentleman himself that the subject should be fully and properly investigated and that he be afforded every opportunity, by some means to be taken by this House, of showing that he was not connected with the enterprise in a way unsuited to his public position, or in such a way that private interests or the interests of his country have suffered at his hands.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I do not feel after what has been advanced that I should go very fully into this question. There are some points that have been very conspicuously brought out that I do not regard as very pertinent to the inquiry. For instance, the hon. member for Lunenburg (A. K. Maclean) and the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) have been at great pains to show that probably some blame attached to Mr. Williams, that he did not pursue his application as vigorously as he might have done. I venture to say that is not an important question in the discussion now before us. It is a comparatively unimportant question whether Mr. Williams did or did not pursue the matter on which he was engaged as vigorously as he might have done, and it is not a matter of vital importance whether Mr. Williams was right or wrong. The point seems clear that the Minister of Agriculture advised Mr. Williams that the Minister of Militia had made an application which was favourably entertained by the Minister of Agriculture, and that Mr. Williams, rightly or wrongly, took this as a pretty clear intimation that he was not in the running. In other words, it seems clear that by the action of the Minister of Agriculture and the position the Minister of Militia had assumed in connection with this matter, the incorporation of the company and the promotion of his scheme, an outside and independent party was frightened out of the field. The important, crucial point in this case is—whether a minister of the Crown has so connected himself with the distribution of public funds which should go without trammel to those entitled to them, that a person who would otherwise have been induced to apply and would have got the benefit of that sub-

sidy was driven away; and that a minister of the Crown occupied an exceptionally favourable position in the matter.

Now, going back a little, what is the situation? This is one point we should keep track of, that before the time when the Minister of Agriculture introduced this resolution of December, 1906, we had already two—I believe three—laws providing for subsidies. We had provisions which enabled them to establish bait freezing stations on a small scale, and we had provisions which enabled the government to subsidize bait freezing stations on a large scale, giving them fifty per cent on the original outlay, and I think $2,000 a year afterwards. We had also the general provisions for cold storage, and the fact that we had a cold storage law in force at the time that the Minister of Militia determined to incorporate his company and float this scheme, is a most important fact that must not be lost track of in considering the question whether the minister put himself in a position which was not consistent with the public interest, or with the high position he occupied as a minister of the Crown. We had a statute which provided that wherever a cold storage station was established whenever a commercial cold storage plant was constructed, according to the regulations of the government, the parties would be entitled to five per cent upon their outlay up to $40,000. So the minister does not get rid of the difficulty by saying that he went into this transaction and floated this company to go into the cold storage business, and was frightened off as soon as he discovered the enlarged subsidy policy of the Minister of Agriculture, because the fact was that before he conceived this scheme there was a subsidy law upon the statute-book. Does any one believe for a moment that the Minister of Militia did not intend to avail himself of that Act in the scheme which he inaugurated in the fall of 1906? It is only a question of degree. The minister must admit that when he conceived the scheme of forming a company, and applied for incorporation, and associated with himself Mr. Graham and his son-in-law, he knew there was a law on the statute-book giving a subsidy to cold storage companies, and that he intended at the time to avail himself of the provisions of the law which then existed. It is no excuse, he does not get rid of the difficulty by saying that when he found what the matured plan of the Minister of Agriculture was, he determined not to go into the scheme, or in other words, to disassociate himself from that scheme. Now, to be perfectly fair with the minister, I will read what he said:

While I was in England in 1906, application was made under instructions given by me and Mr. Graham jointly for the incorporation of a company. It was intended, I may say at once and frankly, that my properties in Kings county, orchards and farms, should be made a part of this company, and Mr. Graham, of Belleville, I believe a prominent Conservative, a great fruit dealer and well up in cold storage and all matters pertaining to agriculture, was to have taken an interest and to put his properties into the company in the same way as mine were to be put in, and we were to accept bonds and a certain amount of stock for these properties. It was expected that money would be raised in England to carry on the business, and it was expected also that a portion of the money would undoubtedly be invested in the establishment of cold storage plants in different parts of Canada. Was there anything wrong in that? Was there anything highly improper in that?

Well, I call attention to the fact that the minister, in almost the next sentence, says that there would have been something wrong if he had proceeded with that scheme after he knew what the policy of the Minister of Agriculture was.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I am misreported there, the word 'not' was left out in the next sentence after what the hon. gentleman has read.

Mr. LENNOX. I will read the next sentence.

This was all arranged before it was expected that any policy such as that afterwards decided upon would be brought down by the government. When the Minister of Agriculture saw fit to adopt the policy of aiding, somewhat largely, cold storage, I felt that, so far as I was concerned, it would be undesirable for me to own stock in any company which was receiving from the government a subsidy, although under the law I do not know that it would have been.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The first part of that sentence is all right, but the word 'not' should be in.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand the minister to say that when he found a matured scheme by the Minister of Agriculture to grant subsidies, he thought it would be improper for him as a minister of the Crown to go on and organize a company, and to receive a subsidy from the government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I said 'undesirable.'

Mr. LENNOX. Well, if it was undesirable in the case of a large subsidy, it was also undesirable in the case of a small subsidy. The minister knew at the time he was incorporating this company as well as any one can know to-day, that there was a provision of existence, of which he would avail himself, for subsidizing a company such as he was floating. Therefore it is hard to understand how the minister can draw the distinction. It is just as wrong, I suppose to be guilty—well, I

won't give the illustration that occurred to my mind, but you cannot draw the distinction. Now let me show how the matter stands. It is a peculiar fact that just the old policy is pursued in this matter that we find in so many cases. The old plan is that whenever there is going to be—I won't say a raid upon the government—but whenever there is going to be something to be taken out of the public treasury for the benefit of individuals who are dealing with this government, almost invariably it is done by incorporating a company. So we find that in this case, in the month of October, 1906, the hon. gentleman, according to his own statement, sets about incorporating a company. We have the same thing in the case of the Ross Rifle Company, although Sir Charles Ross is the only gentleman who is a member of the company; we have the same thing in the North Atlantic Trading Company, and we could not find out who they were; we had the same thing in that famous Sub-Target Gun Company, we had Mr. Hartley Dewart and others forming themselves into a company; we had the same thing in connection with the raid upon the government in the case of the Carbide Companies, and more recently we had the Falconer deal and the Falconer Company as its sequence. So that for many years it had been the practice to form companies for the purpose of dealing with the government, companies composed of clerks and unknown persons. Now the minister incorporates a company, the Canadian Produce and Cold Storage Company, and in order to meet objections of this afternoon, there is an attempt to separate the action of Mr. Graham from the action of Mr. Macoun and from the action of the minister. I want to say, as the minister himself states here, that this application was made on behalf of himself and Mr. Graham, and that the connection of Mr. Macoun with the matter as secretary of the original company, and as associated with the subsequent company with which this is amalgamated, is distinctly admitted. So that every step, whether by the minister, or by Mr. Macoun, or by Mr. Graham, shows that they are identical, they are all representing the company. Now what is the next step in the matter? I might next refer to the peculiar attitude of the Minister of Agriculture. He tells us, when this letter is read to him, that we cannot depend upon him, that his language is not exact, that it is a little loose. Well, the minister can take that position if he likes, but when his attention is called to the fact, not only by his own letter, in which he admits that the Minister of Militia has made application on behalf of a company with which he is connected, but when the matter is referred to on several occasions and his attention is practically challenged by the letters of reply that Mr. Williams sends from time to time, it is pretty hard to realize that the Minister of Agriculture is quite correct in saying that he did not appreciate the position at the time. I think we ought to be prepared for something of the kind on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture for, if I remember rightly, speaking in the city of Montreal on a most important question a year or so ago, he said that we wanted no preferential treatment, that we wanted nothing in return for the preference that we gave to Great Britain, and when taxed with it in the House he said that he was not speaking as minister but in his private capacity only. Then, when later on, the hon. gentleman assured us that he had, on a most important question, a valuable letter, upon which our rights in reference to Japan hinged, the hon. gentleman found that again he was not to be depended upon, that he had not such a letter and never had had it as a matter of fact. It took him two years to find that out. And in this matter, although from time to time, his attention is directed by the correspondence, which I shall not read, to the point that a minister of the Crown is occupying a position in regard to this matter which must have inevitably challenged the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, it takes him until the day before yesterday to realize and to know that the language which he used on June 13, 1907, was perhaps not actually correct. I will refer just to a few of the letters in connection with this matter. It has been so fully and ably discussed on this side of the House that I only require to quote a few letters and add a few references to the position which has been taken by prominent men in Canada and Great Britain on matters similar to this. There is a most important letter directed to the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on August 15, 1907. I am not going to read that, but I am going to say that there are in it a great many important statements, statements which are in conflict, I regret to say, with statements made by the Minister of Militia and Defence. It is one of the unfortunate circumstances in connection with this matter that when you find a minister of the Crown in the race with outside individuals for personal gain you are apt to get these unhappy conflicts, and although we in this House are prepared to take the statements of the Minister of Militia we must bear in mind that the position does not add to the dignity of parliament or to the dignity of the minister, and we must also bear in mind that we are not the court of last resort and that although we may be prepared to take the statements of the Minister of Militia in contradiction of the statements of Mr. Williams, a warm supporter of the government and, I assume, a respectable man, the public may not be quite so anxious to take

them without a grain of salt. We have to bear in mind too that statements are contained throughout this correspondence in which the testimony of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) is invoked from time to time, and it is a significant fact, that, so far in the progress of this debate, although that hon. gentleman has not been absent from the precincts of this House, he has not seen fit to come to the rescue of the Minister of Militia and corroborate his statements by adding his testimony in contradiction of those of Mr. Williams. Although we have a number of statements introducing the name of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals showing us that by his knowledge a great many of these matters could be established, we have not the testimony of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals in any way in contradiction of them. There are ways and ways as the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals says, of doing things and if it is true of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, who departed from the government some years ago, how much more true do we realize it to be now with our knowledge of the devious ways which have been laid bare by our investigations within more recent times ? There are ways and ways of doing things and that is what we are complaining of. On December 5, 1906, the day that the resolution was introduced by the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. L. S. Macoun writes a letter which is put forward now as an application made by that gentleman for this subsidy. You cannot read an application into the wording of it, but you can read this in it, that he was very promptly acquainted in some way with what was going on. We must recollect this point too that when we come to deal with this question of the letter of Mr. Fisher, which he wants to qualify, as I understand it, this is the only application that was ever made, and it is made, not by the Minister of Militia, but by the secretary of the company and it is the company that was applying at that time. When the Minister of Agriculture speaks of the application of the Minister of Militia he speaks of the application made by the secretary of the company, Mr. Macoun, on behalf of Sir Frederick Borden, who was admittedly the chief promotor of the scheme at the time. I do not think I need read that letter. The next letter I will read, it is as follows :

St. John, December 7, 1906.

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I beg to make application for assistance to a cold storage warehouse which I and associates desire to establish at the port of St. John. The application is made by me under the terms of the proposed Act in accordance with resolution of yourself before the House of Commons. I will make a more formal application when the matter can be dealt with in exact terms, but I desire to lodge the present application with you. I have already had correspondence with yourself on the subject of cold storage, and am very glad to find that you are disposed to place the government's assistance on a more liberal basis. St. John is well situated for a cold storage depot, and I feel that a pretty strong case can be made out for a grant of assistance by you for a warehouse here. If it is necessary to make for the present any more formal application will you kindly advise me of its necessity.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) F. E. WILLIAMS.

That is a pretty definite application and it is a more definite application as I understand it than the application I have referred to on page 23 of this return and which has already been read to the House.

On December 13, 1906, the following letter was written by the Minister of Agriculture to Mr. Macoun :

L. S. Macoun, Esq., General Broker,
Ottawa, Ontario,

Dear Mr. Macoun,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 5, with reference to the Bill I am introducing to provide better cold storage facilities for perishable products.

I note your application on behalf of 'Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage, Limited,' and shall be glad to furnish you with all the information available when our departmental arrangements are completed. In the meantime I have obtained and beg to send you herewith 'Hansard' report of the debates in the House on the subject up to the present time.

Yours very truly,
SYDNEY FISHER.

On the same date December 13, 1906, the following letter is written by the Minister of Agriculture to F. E. Williams and Company :

Messrs F. E. Williams & Co., Ltd.,
St. John, N.B.

Gentlemen,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 7th with reference to the Bill I am introducing to provide better cold storage facilities for perishable products. I note your proposal in that connection. If the Bill receives the assent of parliament, when our departmental arrangements are completed I will be glad to furnish you with all the information in regard to the details. In the meantime I obtained and beg to send you herewith 'Hansard' reports of the debates in the House up to the present time.

Yours very truly,
SYDNEY FISHER.

There is a difference between these two letters which I have not noticed before and I think it worth while to call attention to it. In answering the vague letter of Mr. Macoun which merely asked to be informed of the proceedings from time to time Mr. Fisher says :

I note your application on behalf of Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage, Limited.

But in the corresponding place in the other letter he says :

I note your proposal in that connection.

Is there any significance in that distinction ? Is the Minister of Agriculture then—I don't know—forming the idea vaguely in his mind that he will not give Mr. Williams too good a chance and that he will put him off with vague phrases in the meantime. He also uses the phrase in the letter to Mr. Williams :

If the Bill receives the assent of parliament.

Which casts a certain doubt upon it and which may have some significance having regard to the fact that the phrase is not used in the other letter and having regard to the other matters which subsequently arose. On the 8th of April Mr. Williams writes again :

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—Some time ago I made an application to your department for a grant for a cold storage plant to be established in St. John. Previous to this I had put in an application to Hon. Mr. Brodeur for a grant from the Marine and Fisheries department. The last time I was in Ottawa Hon. Mr. Brodeur informed me that they were going to merge the whole grant for cold storage in the Government Cold Storage Act. I had the pleasure of meeting and talking the matter over with your good self in the presence of H. R. Emmerson, Sir Frederick Borden and Hon. Mr. Brodeur.

That part of the transaction is not denied as fully as it might have been :

At that time Sir Frederick Borden had a proposition which he was trying to carry out and wanted my friends and myself to go in with him, he and his son-in-law being the prime movers in this scheme.

That is denied as I understand it by the Minister of Militia but I can only say——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is utterly false.

Mr. LENNOX. I accept the proposition of the Minister of Militia but I must again express regret that in the race for this private gain between a minister of the Crown and an outsider, the public may well reserve doubts upon the question.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. How sorry you are for that.

Mr. LENNOX. I regret it very much.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am sure.

Mr. LENNOX. I hope the minister who is so prompt to-day in asking people to accept his statement will accept mine with the same candour.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am willing to take my chance.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he deny there was any proposition made for a compromise ?

Mr. LENNOX. He says now it is utterly false.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I say the statement contained in that letter is false.

Mr. FOSTER. That there was any compromise proposed ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, not with me. I never had any talk with the man on business lines.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Macoun seems to put it exactly the reverse.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I don't know anything about that.

Mr. LENNOX (reading) :

Mr. Emmerson all along assured me that my proposition was first in the hands of the government and he and Mr. Brodeur had promised to give me a bonus from the fishery department and now that is merged into your department I should have first consideration, and I would like to know by return mail if my application is to be granted for a cold storage warehouse in East St. John, or is the application of Sir Frederick Borden to be accepted instead.

Mark the language there. That statement that Sir Frederick Borden is making an application is not denied but is rather corroborated in the correspondence :

Hon. H. R. Emmerson now being out of the government I have to turn to you direct. Kindly give me a direct reply as soon as possible and you will very much oblige me, as I have other plans which I want to carry out if I am not to receive the government aid.

I am inclosing copies of some of my letters to Mr. Emmerson on this cold storage subject, which will convey to you my ideas and feelings regarding the matter.

As I understand it these are letters complaining very distinctly of the position the Minister of Militia occupies in reference to this matter, and Mr. Williams brings it to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture in the most direct possible way, and this would be calculated to prevent the Minister of Agriculture making any unconscious slip with regard to the position of Sir Frederick Borden in the matter. It is hard to realize how the Minister of Agriculture could have made any slip when he came to write the letter of the 11th of April. This letter concludes :

I trust it will not take too much of your valuable time to peruse the same and become a little acquainted with the cold storage proposition in St. John.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) F. E. WILLIAMS.

On the 11th of April, 1907, with the definite statement before him that Sir Frederick

Borden was connected with this other company the Minister of Agriculture makes this reply :

April 11, 1907.

Mr. F. E. Williams,
St. John, New Brunswick.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 8. I may say that we have not yet made any grant for a cold storage warehouse in St. John. Sir Frederick Borden has made application on behalf of a company with which he is connected, and I have viewed his application very favourably.

Not a question of being interested in the valley of Annapolis, not a question of being interested on behalf of constituents, not 'has recommending or interesting himself in a scheme,' but 'has made an application on behalf of a company with which he is connected :'

And I have viewed his application very favourably.

We are bound to take the statement of the Minister of Agriculture. It always affords me great pleasure to do so, but it does violence to my judgment. I find it is only my extreme confidence in the hon. gentleman and a parliamentary rule that enables me to do so, because if it were some one with whom I was less acquainted, in whom I had less faith, I would say that was about as conclusive and as damning as it could possibly be upon this question.

None of the applications——

Again applications.

None of the applications, however, are in a position to be passed upon absolutely.

I cannot make any promises without definite plans and specifications and full information as to what the people applying for may be prepared to do.

Yours truly,
SYDNEY FISHER.

Then we have this letter which is most important, and which nullifies many of the interjections of the Minister of Militia this afternoon. Mr. Graham wrote this letter on April 13:

Belleville, Ontario, April 13, 1907.

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Sir Frederick Borden requested me to interview you in reference to aid for our cold storage propositions at St. John and Halifax. It is our intention to complete the one in St. John this season.

Mark you, he receives the request or the instruction from the gentleman who is the chief promoter of this scheme. This brings it down as late as April 13th, long after the time when the Minister of Militia points out to us he had taken fright from the fact that the Minister of Agriculture was increasing the grant to cold storage plants—willing to take a little out of the public treasury as a minister of the Crown, to benefit in competition with outsiders but when a large proposition was made he took fright. Down to the 13th of April, at all events, we have the most cogent evidence that he was the prime mover in this concern and suggested to his chief subordinate, Mr. Graham, to interview the Minister of Agriculture 'in reference to our cold storage propositions.' The letter continues:

—when I reached Ottawa Thursday night I learned from Mr. Macoun that you had advised him that everything had been arranged in connection with this matter and therefore it would be unnecessary for me to bother you any further in reference to the matter in question. This will explain why I did not interview you in regard to the matter and if any further application or information is required please advise.

Yours truly,
R. J. GRAHAM.

That was only two days after the Minister of Agriculture told Mr. Williams that no plans had been completed and

None of the applications, however, are in a position to be passed upon absolutely.

And led Williams to understand that he was not then at all events definitely committed to the adoption of Sir Frederick Borden's scheme.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I might say to the hon. gentleman that on April 1st I left Ottawa for England and was at that time on the sea.

Mr. LENNOX. Of course I take the minister's statement for that, I did not know it. I do not think that matters at all, because this man is speaking on behalf of the company. I did not understand the minister to deny that Mr. Graham was correct in saying 'Sir Frederick Borden requested me to interview you.'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Since I am appealed to I have no objection to saying that I saw Mr. Graham a great many times prior to my leaving for England, and it is quite possible I may have advised him to see Mr. Fisher with reference to carrying out the idea of constructing this cold storage at St. John, but I have no recollection of any particular occasion, and I am quite sure I did not advise him to consult Mr. Fisher with reference to any particular plans or schemes.

Mr. LENNOX. It is only another of those unfortunate contradictions. I am bound, on account of the parliamentary rule, to take it that Mr. Graham is not correct in what he says.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I did not say that.

Mr. LENNOX. He says: 'Requested me to interview you' which is an entirely different thing.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is putting an improper and unfair construction on the letter.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think so. When this gentleman says 'I am requested by Sir Frederick Borden,' I understand that he means that Sir Frederick Borden is the moving spirit in it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Macoun says that this gentleman is their hired man.

Mr. LENNOX. If it were only that Sir Frederick Borden was advising him he would say so. However, I am quite willing to have the minister's explanation as he gives it. My attention has been called to this that both the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and the Minister of Militia have made statements in the House impugning the standing of Mr. Williams.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I made none.

Mr. LENNOX. I am advised on reliable authority that I should contradict this and say he is one of the most prominent, reliable and successful merchants in St. John, thoroughly able financially to carry out the whole cold storage enterprise without assistance, that he is a very large importer of fruits from the West Indies, does a large provision business in all lines and understands the ins and outs of the cold storage business while not one of the members of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company knows anything like as much.

Mr. FOSTER. And at his first application had the endorsation of the most prominent Liberals in St. John.

Mr. LENNOX. And had the recommendation, if that is worth anything—it used to be worth a great deal—of the ex-Minister of Railways, and had the promise and the assurance of the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The next letter is dated April 16th, 1907:

Mr. R. J. Graham,
Belleville, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 13, and note what you state in regard to your visit to Ottawa last Thursday. This is quite satisfactory.

Yours very truly,
SYDNEY FISHER.

What do these words 'this is quite satisfactory' mean? They mean that everything contained in that letter is substantially correct, that there is nothing to qualify or contradict, and therefore that everything has been arranged in connection with the matter as he says. That letter is signed by the Hon. Sydney Fisher.

Then we have a letter of the 3rd June, 1907:

The Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—I received blanks for application for cold storage warehouses. In your letter of April 11 you gave me to understand that nothing could be done unless plans and specifications were submitted and you also stated that you looked favourably upon giving this grant in St. John to Sir Frederick Borden

I have already spent considerable of my money going to Ottawa and endeavouring to obtain a grant for the cold storage warehouse in St. John, and I do not feel like spending any more money in getting up plans and specifications if the preference is to be given to Sir Frederick Borden. I have written very strongly on this matter. I would again kindly request that you inform me plainly if it would be worth while proceeding to get plans and specifications ready to submit to you.

Was that ever put right in regard to that matter? Was he ever told that Sir Frederick Borden was not making an application? Was he ever told that Sir Frederick Borden was not the favoured applicant or that he was wrong in assuming that he was shut out? I do not understand that he was. I understand that that letter remained unanswered and is unanswered to-day. Was this man led to understand that he was not in the running, that he might as well give it up? He puts it plainly when he says he wants to know if there is any use of spending more money to prepare plans and specifications, because if not he wants to give the matter up. He calls attention to the fact that he has written protesting against the government giving a grant to a cabinet minister in preference to an independent outsider, and he finally appeals to the Minister of Agriculture asking him to inform him plainly if it would be worth while for him to proceed to get plans and specifications to submit to him, and he gets no answer. When the First Minister writes to him calling his attention to the fact that he has put in no plans, what does it amount to? It amounts to the refinement of cruelty to make such a statement in the face of the fact that that letter remained unanswered. I have nothing more to say about the letters. If ever a complete case was established of a minister of the Crown having taken a position inconsistent with his high office by putting himself in rivalry with an outsider for a grant of public money, I venture to say that that was the position occupied by the Minister of Militia, not upon controverted testimony, but upon his own admitted statements in the House. What does that lead to? I want to call attention very briefly to what follows. I do not want to take any position that I cannot adequately sustain. An hon. gentleman said yes-

terday that probably this was an infringement of the Independence of Parliament Act. I am not setting myself up as an authority, but speaking from my own view of things I cannot see it in that light. But there is some thing far more important than the mere question of the Independence of Parliament Act. There is the unwritten law that guides the conduct of ministers in the great parliament which we copy and try to emulate, which ought to be and generally is far more effective than any Independence of Parliament Act. I am not going to say whether the minister should take the position that was suggested to him, I think in the kindliest spirit, by the hon. gentleman who commenced this discussion the day before yesterday. To a great extent he relied upon reading the correspondence which had been brought down by the government in this matter. He made no hostile criticism of it, but rather appealed to the hon. gentleman's own sense of the fitness of things, and I am prepared as a younger member of the House to leave it just in that way to the hon. gentleman whose position is assailed, necessarily assailed by the circumstances that have been detailed, and to call to his attention a few examples in the hope that in this parliament—which has had great traditions in the past and which I hope will maintain those high traditions in the future—these examples may illustrate the position that a minister of the Crown should occupy in a case of this kind. The right hon. gentleman who leads the House knows the absolute freedom from entangling and suspicious connections which that great parliamentarian, Mr. Gladstone, always insisted upon. It was one of the very bright spots in his brilliant career that he insisted upon all the members of his government keeping free not only from business connections which would in any way embarrass the actions of the government, but all connections which would at all bring suspicion upon the high position which he was determined should be occupied by himself and his ministers. Then I call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the case of the Rt. Hon. W. H. Smith—to one circumstance in his life which is related in a letter he wrote to the president or other high official of the Bank of England at a time when it was in an embarrassed position. The bank had applied to Mr. Smith for assistance, and had suggested that he take a directorship in the bank or shares by way of recognition of the assistance he gave. What did Mr. Smith do? He said no. He wrote back: 'I will advance to the bank £100,000 for its temporary assistance, but I will not take a scratch of a pen in return; I will take neither a directorship nor a share in the bank, because I want not only to be free from any entangling alliances of that kind, but I am determined to preserve myself free from the possibility of suspicion.' I draw attention also to the case of Sir Richard Webster. The right hon. gentleman who leads the House will remember that in the Parnell case Sir Richard Webster, occupying the position of Solicitor General, not a member of the cabinet, acted on behalf of the 'Times' newspaper, and in connection with the Parnell incident dealt with political questions, and the right hon. gentleman will remember the position taken by many of the prominent men in the House of Commons in discussing that question, as to the evil effect of people associated with the government of the country taking sides on questions with which they would afterwards have to deal in the House. If that is true of questions which may be discussed in the House of Commons, how much more injurious is it for a minister of the Crown to sit in Council, assisting in determining whether it shall or shall not be the policy of the government to grant the public funds in aid of any public enterprise, joining in trying his own case, and then to go as an outside individual and put himself in the position of getting the benefit of that which he voted secretly in the cabinet council. Then take the other minister of the Crown, the hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution on December 4, 1906, the Minister of Agriculture, and what position does he occupy? Did he take the country into his confidence? When he explained that he had been incubating this matter for months and years, did he tell us, that already not only had he formed an opinion that it was a desirable thing to do, but that he was in negotiation with certain parties, and to whom he had practically committed himself.

Then, we had the instance of Mr. Chamberlain referred to, but the fact was not referred to that, as I understand it, Mr. Chamberlain, on going into the government dissociated himself from the business interests with which he had been so long financially concerned and of which he had been the guiding spirit in the early years of his life on the ground that he was going into an office whose duties might be antagonistic in those interests. He severed completely his connection with business concerns that might, at some future time, have dealings with the government.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite different from the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes. But it is probably like the hon. gentleman's other statement; he will be likely to revise it as he has revised many other statements he has made on previous occasions. And not to be beggared for authority, let me give a high one, cited here to-day. Would it not be well to adopt the principle advocated by Sir

Richard Cartwright? If the Minister of Militia or the Minister of Agriculture had taken to heart the language of their associate, Sir Richard Cartwright, this thing could never have arisen. Let me refer to two other notable instances which will be well known to the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). One was the case in 1876 of Lord Henry Lennox, a notable case. All that could be said was that at the instance of prominent and distinguished men, Lord Henry Lennox had taken some shares in a continental railway. He was to have been paid £100 sterling per year as a director of the company. He did not inquire into the circumstances. It was established beyond doubt that he was not familiar with the circumstances, that every thing unstable in connection with the actions of the company was wholly unknown to him. All this had happened two years before he became a cabinet minister. And because a judge of the High Court of England commented on the case to the extent of saying that the action of these hon. gentlemen was a matter which would require explanation—that is as far as Lord Coleridge went in the matter—this hon. gentleman, who was a member of the board of trade—(he may have been president)—as soon as the matter came to his attention, tendered his resignation. The resignation was not accepted immediately, but, on further consideration, at a later date it was accepted and he retired from his position, expressing his great regret at severing his relations with a position to whose duties he was sincerely attached and of which he was, I understand, an able administrator. Then there was the case of Mr. Mundella, which was referred to the other day. The language employed by Mr. Mundella may be properly read:

> I felt that the public had a right to be assured that the administration of the duties attached to my office should be free from the slightest suspicion that any conflict might arise between personal and public considerations.

That is the rule that must obtain if we are to have the high character of public life conserved. Further on he says:

> Few know how much attraction the discharge of the duties of my office had for me.

The office of the hon. Minister may have the same attraction for him. A minister devoted to his duties must have special regret in giving up his position.

> I was able to deal with subjects with which throughout my life I had been associated, and to attain results for which I had worked long and hard. To leave unfinished the task a man has set himself to accomplish is a sacrifice I can scarcely exaggerate, and certainly I was reluctant to make it.

And he sums it up:

> One word more. Conscious of right, my mind is fully assured that when all I have done in connection with my personal affairs shall be fully and fairly ascertained, my friends and the public will know, as I know now, that I am entitled to declare that throughout my life, which has been dependent upon my own exertions, I have preserved my character free from stain or dishonour.

There is one other authority to which I would like to refer. I had not it at hand at the time when I reached the point at which I would like to have introduced it. It was in connection with Mr. Gladstone and the position which has been occupied by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Smith, Mr. Childers and others maintaining the high position of ministers of the Crown unsullied from the slightest suspicion. The 'Law Times,' of February, 1906, contained an article from which I will read a few lines:

> The government have certainly done well to impose upon themselves as self-denying ordinance in regard to the public directorships held by their members. It will be within the recollection of most members of the profession that one or two unfortunate incidents have, during the last few years, drawn attention to the undesirability of holding concurrently government and directoral office. No responsible person would impute dishonourable motives to the persons most chiefly concerned in these instances, but it is, none the less, a safer and simpler course to adopt for a minister of the Crown to free himself from duties which might conceivably clash with the great office he holds. In these strenuous days it is moreover only fair to the shareholders that their directors should not be absorbed in work which, if honestly fulfilled, must demand the minister's undivided time and attention. So complex are the workings of modern business that a conflict between duty and interest might conceivably arise at any moment, and this is not a state of affairs which, on public grounds, should be allowed to perplex those responsible for the conduct of the nation's affairs. We trust that the example now set may commend itself to all future occupants of ministerial offices without regard to party.

I need have little further to say about this resolution. I am glad that it was introduced by my hon. friend from North Toronto in a non-partisan manner, without the exhibition of any feeling. I would have been glad if that tone had been preserved. An hon. gentleman on this side of the House complimented the Minister of Militia upon the spirited way in which he repelled the attack. I wish I could compliment him upon his able generalship as well. I think that probably if he had eliminated from the opening of his remarks those bitter and acrimonious references to my hon. friend from North Tor-

onto, he would in the end have been able to deal just as successfully with the subject of justifying himself.

In reference to the Insurance Commission, I want to say in closing, and with as distinct a challenge as I can, that notwithstanding what the Minister of Militia has repeated here to-day, I have gone through that inquiry pretty fully; I acquainted myself thoroughly with it at the time it was discussed in this House, I followed the arguments of the Minister of Justice, I know the references that were made, I am acquainted with the letters that were read here to-day and were read then, I know their significance; and I say again that, in the sense in which the Minister of Militia spoke the day before yesterday in attacking my hon. friend from North Toronto as having done wrong, not only did the Minister of Justice fail to prove it; not only did that court of inquiry, that court of inquisition, the Royal Commission on Insurance nominally so-called, but in reality an inquisition to try and blacken and slander the character of two of our strongest men on this side of the House, utterly fail to do so; but neither the Minister of Justice, with all his great ability, nor any member of the House, can prove the charges or insinuations made against my hon. friend. I have pointed out both the admissions of the Minister of Militia in regard to this matter, and the evidence from other quarters. Numerous other authorities can be cited of men in public life who have refused to be embarrassed by outside associations. For instance, take the case of Sir John Abbott in our own parliament. I am informed that when he became Prime Minister he was the owner of a large number of shares in the Canadian Pacific Railway. He thought that possibly, by reason of that company coming to parliament from time to time for legislation, it might be regarded as inconsistent that he should occupy the position of leader of the government and at the same time hold those shares, and he sold them at a sacrifice of sixty-five cents on the dollar, rather than be subject to the imputation of occupying a doubtful position in that regard. I have pointed out the attitude of other distinguished men in both Great Britain and Canada. Therefore I move this resolution:

That all the words after the word 'that' be omitted, and the following be substituted therefor:

This House is of opinion that ministers of the Crown should not be connected with associations or companies seeking contracts, aid or subsidies from the government of which they are members.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have followed this discussion from the first word to the last with a good deal of interest, and some curiosity also, because the subject was not altogether new to me. Shortly after my return from England last year, I was called upon by a letter received from the gentleman whose name has been often mentioned during this debate, to give some attention to it. Before I go any further, I must say to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and to those who have spoken on the same side of the House in regard to this matter, that in my humble estimation they have been extremely unfair, both towards my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, and still more towards my colleague the Minister of Militia. The hon. member for North Toronto, as has been said, introduced this motion in a speech which, in some respects, was moderate and fair enough, but which in some particulars, I think he will agree with me on reflection, was the reverse of fair and moderate.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Prime Minister kindly point out those particulars?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will certainly. As I said, shortly after my return from Europe, I received a letter from Mr. Williams, which was read by the hon. member for North Toronto, and which therefore I will not read again, calling my attention to what he deemed to be an injustice committed towards himself by the Minister of Agriculture, in this, that he had been an applicant for a subsidy voted by parliament for the establishment of a cold storage, that his application had been denied, and that the same subsidy had been given to a company in which the Minister of Militia had interested himself. He did not put the latter fact to me in the words I have indicated, on the contrary, he stated in so many words that the subsidy had been given to a company in which the Minister of Militia had a prominent interest—I forget the exact words at the present time; but I know my hon. friend will agree with me that that was the sense of the letter which was addressed to me. It was my duty therefore under the circumstances to give some attention to the matter, and I did it all the more readily because I understood that Mr. Williams was a very respectable citizen of the city of St. John, and also a prominent Liberal. It is of no particular interest to the House to remind it that the policy which had been introduced by the Minister of Agriculture of bonusing plants for cold storage in different parts of the country, had been received with great favour by both sides of this House. The Minister of Agriculture had also come to the conclusion that it would be in the public interest that such a plant should be established in the city of St. John, and I

think we can all agree with that when we consider the important shipping facilities which are afforded by the city and harbour at St. John. After looking into the matter I found that two applications had been put into the hands of the Minister of Agriculture. One was by Mr. Williams himself, one was by Mr. Macoun, who is the son-in-law of the Minister of Militia and Defence, and who acted in behalf of the company of which it is no use to speak at any length at this moment. Both these applications had the support of friends. Mr. Macoun's application was supported by the Minister of Militia, who was a colleague of the Minister of Agriculture. The application of Mr. Williams was supported by my then colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals of that day, the present member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). As is natural under such circumstances the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Railways of that day favoured, as best they could, the interests of their respective applicants. Under such circumstances I put it to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), I put it to any man in this House: What should be the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture? Here were two parties, both respectable, both represented to be able to carry out this contract, both represented to be able to perform the duties attached to it and both having the support behind them of their respective friends. What was the Minister of Agriculture to do? If my hon. friend from North Toronto had been Minister of Agriculture, what would he have done? What could he have done? In what manner could he have disposed of the question? Would he have given the subsidy to the one or the other? Would he have given the subsidy to Mr. Macoun in behalf of the company which he represented, or would he have given it to Mr. Williams? If he had given it either to one or to the other, simply upon the ground of showing favour to one or other of the parties, either to the party represented by the Minister of Militia, or to the party represented by the then Minister of Railways and Canals, such a conclusion would have been most unsatisfactory. The Minister of Agriculture thought, and thought very properly, that under such circumstances he would give the subsidy to the party who, in his opinion, could show that he was the more deserving, the better equipped and the more likely to carry out the intent of the Act; that is to say, to promote the commercial policy which was involved in the voting of the subsidy by parliament. Mr. Macoun, in behalf of the company which he represented, filed his plan and specification, showed to the ministers, in black and white by an actual document deposited in his hands, how he was prepared to earn the subsidy voted by parliament, what he proposed to do, the buildings, the equipment and the plant which he proposed to erect. The Minister of Agriculture very properly asked the same thing of Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams made his application. It is of no use to refer to the fact that Mr. Williams had, long before the matter came into the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, made also to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a similar application. It is of no use to look into that. It is not a case of first come, first served, because the subsidy should go to the one most deserving of it. At the time that Mr. Williams applied to the Minister of Agriculture he was given the same answer: File your plans and specifications and then I will be in a position to judge. But, I call the attention of the hon. member for North Toronto, of every hon. gentleman who spoke on that side of the House and of every hon. gentleman who sits on that side of the House also, to the fact that with every one of these requests of the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Williams, very much, it seems to me, to his own injury, and very illogically, refused to comply or to give a direct answer. It is evident from the correspondence that Mr. Williams would not file his plans and specifications unless he had an assurance in advance that his plans and specifications would be adopted. Let me here, to emphasize this point, quote the letter of Mr. Williams in which that is made very clear. It was written to the Minister of Agriculture on the 3rd June, 1907. This letter has been quoted more than once but I quote it again to clinch the point which I have just been making

Dear Sir,—I received blanks for application for cold storage warehouse. In your letter of April 11, you gave me to understand that nothing could be done unless plans and specifications were submitted, and you also stated that you looked favourably upon giving this grant in St. John to Sir Frederick Borden. I have already spent considerable of my money going to Ottawa and endeavouring to obtain a grant for the cold storage warehouse in St. John, and I do not feel like spending any more money in getting up plans and specifications if the preference is to be given to Sir Frederick Borden. I have written very strongly on this matter. I would again kindly request that you inform me plainly if it would be worth while proceeding to get plans and specifications ready to submit to you.

If this means anything it means that Mr. Williams, the writer of this letter, would not file plans and specifications unless he was told in advance: Yes, you may go to the expense, you may prepare your plans and specifications, you will get the contract. Could such an answer be given by the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Prime Minister think that is a fair interpretation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, I do think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Of these words ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do think so. What else could it be ? Could any other answer be given than the answer which was given ? I ask my hon. friend that question now.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I would have to take into consideration the immediately preceding announcement which had been made by Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams had been an applicant for more than a year, first under one and then under another and he had been shunted off, properly enough, from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries under his systems to the new system under the Minister of Agriculture. He transferred his long pending claim or application to the proper minister and made it on the 7th day of December, 1900. It was not long after that until,in a communication, he was told by the Minister of Agriculture : Sir, Frederick Borden has made application and I look favourably upon his application. Now, you have a defenceless private individual pitted against a powerful minister and the minister who is to decide upon these applications telling him to his face that he has an application in from a minister and 'I look very favourably on it.' From that day to this Mr. Williams could get no statement from the Minister of Agriculture that if he went to the expense of getting plans and the like of that he would even get fair consideration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When my hon. friend rose I did not expect that he would interject a speech into my speech. I should have known better because I have known my hon. friend for a long time. I blame myself and I do not blame him. He is true to his nature and therefore let us now go on with the argument.

Mr. FOSTER. I wanted to give all the information I could.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture spoke very frankly and I think the very frankness of the Minister of Agriculture is something which my hon. friend from North Toronto cannot understand.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps so ; I am so used to the frankness of the First Minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Agriculture said frankly and fairly : I have an application also from Sir Frederick Borden which I view very favourably. He did not tell him that he need not apply any more. He did not put him off, but he told him that : Although I look upon this application favourably and even very favourably I am bound to give you satisfaction, I am bound to hear you, I am bound to consider your applications ; file your plans and specifications and I shall decide accordingly between the application supported by Sir Frederick Borden and the application supported by Mr. Emmerson, because there was on the one side Mr. Emmerson and on the other side Sir Frederick Borden.

The Minister of Agriculture could not have done otherwise than to ask Mr. Williams to file his plans and specifications so that he might judge between the two applications which had the better equipment and to which the subsidy should go in order best to accomplish the object parliament had in view in voting it. I believe that no other decision could have been arrived at by the Minister of Agriculture. But, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is prejudiced upon the question and he has started with the object of finding the Minister of Militia at fault, and the whole of his speech, although very dulcet in tones except the latter part of it. tended to endeavour to place responsibility upon the Minister of Militia. If Mr. Williams had followed the advice given him by the Minister of Agriculture and filed his plans then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would have been in a position to determine whether the Minister of Agriculture had done right or wrong in granting Mr. Macoun's application, but since Mr. Williams would not put his plans and specifications before the Minister of Agriculture what other conclusion could the minister arrive at than to give the subsidy to the party who had complied with the rules and regulations and filed his plans and specifications ? I do not think anything else could have been done than what the Minister of Agriculture did. Mr. Williams is a political friend of mine though not a personal friend, and when I looked into the papers I wrote him my opinion very plainly. I told him that since he had refused to comply with the request to place his plans and specifications before the department, the Minister of Agriculture could have taken no other course. I rely on the spirit of fair play of every man in this House to say if such is not the case, although of course my hon. friend from North Toronto will not be convinced by anything we can say to him. Since there were two applicants before the minister and one of them refused to comply with the very reasonable request made him, it seems to me there can be no cause for complaint. If my memory serves me right the Department of Agriculture asked Mr. Williams not once but on two or three occasions to file his plans and specifications. Last fall when I was appealed to I looked into the matter with some care and consideration—I do not say I looked into it minutely so as to become acquainted with all the details, but I looked into it sufficiently to satisfy myself as to the salient points and these salient points I have stated to the House and upon them the Minister of Agriculture gave his decision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At what date were the plans and specifications furnished to the Minister of Agriculture ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say.

Mr. FOSTER. June 11.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it all depended upon an examination of these, why should the Minister of Agriculture look so favourably upon either one application or the other on the 11th of April ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no doubt he looked favourably upon the application because he saw in it elements of certainty and elements of progress, and I understand the result has been that the company has exhibited great diligence and great enterprise in the undertaking. At all events the Minister of Agriculture stated frankly to Mr. Williams that he looked favourably on the application of Mr. Macoun, and Mr. Williams knew he had a strong competitor and it was open to him to make the best case he could before the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture came to the conclusion, and I believe rightly, that he would give the subsidy to Mr. Macoun's company, and in view of the circumstances before him I do not see how it would be possible for him to come to any other conclusion. I have said that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) had been very unfair in some of his statements, and in reply to his request I will give him an example of that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) quoted from the letter which I wrote Mr. Williams the following sentence :

It was the intention of the Minister of Agriculture, should your application be filed, to consider it in connection with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, the one on whose behalf Sir Frederick had interested himself.

and this is how the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Foster) commented on that :

There again the Prime Minister declares that Sir Frederick Borden was interested in this company.

Nothing could be more ingenious and unfair than that comment. I said that Sir Frederick Borden had interested himself on behalf of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company and my hon. friend has twisted that into a statement that I said that Sir Frederick Borden had an interest in that company. Of course, the distinction between the two is very obvious. Interesting one's self on behalf of a company and having an interest in that company are two things absolutely dissimilar.

Mr. FOSTER. What did the Prime Minister say ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Prime Minister said that Sir Frederick Borden had interested himself on behalf of that company and therefore I think the hon. gentleman should admit, now that I call his attention to it, that it was an absolutely unfair comment for him to state that I said Sir Frederick Borden had an interest in that company. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) need not look at me in that fashion ; the hon. gentleman deserves the compliment I pay him when I say that I do not know any man in this House who has so loose a tongue in making insinuations, nor do I know any one who has so thin a skin when he is retaliated on. If it were a fact that the Minister of Militia had had an interest in the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company which got the contract, there would be something to be said as to the motion of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of which company is the Minister of Agriculture speaking in the letter to which I have already referred ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The company for which Mr. Macoun first applied was the Canada Lands Produce and Cold Storage Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Oh, yes, it is mentioned there.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But this company did not get the contract, the contract was awarded to another company known as the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company.

Mr. PORTER. After an amalgamation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Where does my hon. friend see that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is no amalgamation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend see anything to show that there is an amalgamation between the two parties ? The statement is made and not contradicted that the Canada Lands Produce and Cold Storage Company, though incorporated, never was organized.

Mr. PORTER. If the right hon. gentleman will permit me, since he has asked the question, he might refer to the letter at page 9571 from Mr. Graham to the Hon. Sydney Fisher, in which he says:

As I have arranged with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company to amalgamate my interests with theirs.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. His interest.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall read the whole letter:

As I have arranged with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company to amalgamate my interests with theirs, re cold storage at the city of St. John, you will be good enough to substitute the name of the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company in the agreement——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (reading):

—instead of my own.

The point we were discussing was whether or not the Canada Lands Produce and Cold Storage Company had been amalgamated with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company and the evidence given of this amalgamation is the letter of Mr. Graham that he has amalgamated his interest, not the interest of the Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. PORTER. He had no interest except in that company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then you accept everything? There is no connection that I can see between Mr. Graham and the Canada Lands, Produce and Cold Storage Company.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Graham's letter said it was on behalf of the other company when he made the application.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Where do you find any evidence of amalgamation between the two parties? And moreover what has that to do with it in view of the statement made against the Minister of Militia that the contract awarded was a contract to a company in which he had an interest. It matters not what happened before, but the contract was awarded to the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company and we have the word of the Minister of Militia, which has not been contradicted, that he has no interest whatever either directly or indirectly in that company. He made that statement as full, as complete, as deliberate as it could be made. No one has questioned it or can question it, unless it may be for the purpose of contradicting it by direct evidence. The minister has stated more than once to the conviction of everybody that he has absolutely nothing to do with this company. If the Minister of Militia had been connected with the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company, then I would understand the lecture which has been given us by the member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) as to the character which ought to prevail in public life in this country. I have no exception to take to the statements of the hon. member on this point, I agree with him entirely. But whilst it is very true that the code of ethics in Great Britain is what he has stated it to be, that no public man should be interested at all in any company or association which may have anything to do, directly or indirectly, with the government, is he prepared to say that that has been the code of ethics in this country? Is he prepared to say that the same code of ethics which has prevailed in England and which I agree with him ought to prevail in this country, has been the code here? Surely he knows the history of this country too well not to know that this has not been the code in this country. I do not care to quote examples and would not quote them, but for the fact that one has been quoted to-day, the case of Hon. Thomas White, who was owner of the Montreal 'Gazette.' Mr. White was one of the most honourable men who ever sat in this House, but he was connected with the Montreal 'Gazette' which had a large printing contract with the government of that day. Some exception was taken to this, and the answer was that the law of the country allowed it, and that the seat of the member could not be imperilled, that a member of the government or of parliament could be associated in a company which had dealings with the government. That was the code of ethics twenty years ago. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) says that we should have another code of ethics, that we should not be satisfied and that we should make it the rule that no member of parliament and especially of the government should be connected with any association or company that may have any dealings with the government. I subscribe altogether to this doctrine. It is new in the political life in this country, but it is not too late to accept it. I am prepared to accept it in its entirety. My hon. friend has quoted Sir Henry Lennox, Mr. Chamberlain and other men in Great Britain who, in order to be absolutely above reproach, have taken some action on which the hon. member has commented favourably. Mr. Chamberlain stated in the House on a charge brought against him that he had severed his connection with all the companies with which he had been associated, and which had contracts with the government. How is it that my hon. friend did not give the credit to the Minister of Militia of having done exactly the same thing in this matter. The Minister of Militia followed the example of Mr. Chamberlain. The minister stated so himself in the speech he delivered yesterday, saying that when he found the Minister of Agriculture had introduced a Bill which was to provide for large subsidies he severed his connection absolutely with this organization.

Mr. LENNOX. My reason is that the Minister of Militia retained his connection with the company until he accomplished all that he set out to accomplish, and as his son-in-law remained the beneficiary of that contract the severing of his connection was too late to prevent the driving off of other independent applicants.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has no right to speak in that way. He has no figures and no data to substantiate what he said. I will quote to him the assertion of the man interested. The Minister of Militia himself at page 9590 said:

When the Minister of Agriculture saw fit to adopt the policy of aiding, somewhat largely, cold storage, I felt that, so far as I was concerned, it would be undesirable for me to own stock in any company which was receiving from the government a subsidy, although under the law, I do not know that it would have been. I would have been going beyond my right in doing so.

Though he would not be going beyond his right in doing so, though he would not have violated the positive law of the land which allows a member of this House and of the administration to be a shareholder in any such company, yet he knew the force of that unwritten law to which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) alluded a moment ago, that a member of the government should not be connected with a company of this kind even although he could do so under the law of the land, and he gave up all his interest in this company. He has told us further that he has not a dollar of stock in the company which received the subsidy, that is the New Brunswick Cold Storage Company. He has received no benefit from it and expects none either directly or indirectly. Therefore, my hon. friend has complied with the very reasoning which has been put before the House this afternoon by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). He has followed the example of Mr. Chamberlain, he has severed what connection he had, if he ever had any, with this association, and therefore he stands to-day before the House in the position of being absolutely free from the criticism which has been hurled at him from the other side of the House. As to the motion which has been made, the government is quite prepared to accept it, and to say in reference to the future and the recent past, 'this House is of opinion that ministers of the Crown should not be connected with associations or companies seeking contracts, aid or subsidies from the government of which they are members,' and we shall not offer any opposition to this motion, but accept it readily.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, the motion which has been preferred by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has received better favour at the hands of the government than the civil service resolution which was offered to the House a few days ago and summarily rejected. On that occasion the Prime Minister himself declared that he was entirely in sympathy with the resolution, and the Minister of Finance came very close to making the same statement. Yet although all the members of the government were presumably in favour of the resolution, they could not accept it because it was tantamount to a vote of want of confidence, while here is a resolution which supervenes upon a discussion which, according to the right hon. gentleman, has not been at all a non-partisan discussion as the other most assuredly was, according to his own admission; here is what he has declared to be an unfair, severe, unwarranted and unbased attack on the Minister of Militia and Defence, upon the Minister of Agriculture and upon the government, confined not to the member for North Toronto, but, as the Prime Minister has just said, participated in, and in much the same spirit, by every member who has spoken on this side of the House; and yet he accepts the resolution as one that is not a want of confidence at all.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. What connection is there between the resolution and the speeches?

Mr. FOSTER. I am talking now to the Prime Minister, who is listening very attentively, and I do not want to be drawn off from the effect that I think I am producing upon him. Why does the Prime Minister adopt such different courses in the lapse of less than two days? What is the consistency in it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I told my hon. friend the other day.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the Prime Minister could show as much. He denominated my speech as a very unfair one, and I asked him to point out the clauses in which I had been severe or unfair. After due cogitation he pointed out one little clause in which it is very much the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee as to what the Prime Minister said and as to what I said; and he quotes that as an example of my unfair and biased and unbased attack on the Minister of Militia and Defence. The Prime Minister in his letter speaks of 'the one on whose behalf Sir Frederick Borden had interested himself.' I made a running and quick comment on that as follows: 'There again the Prime Minister declares that Sir Frederick Borden was interested in this company.' If I had said that he had 'interested himself' in this company, there would have been no criticism on the part of my right hon. friend, because then I would have been absolutely quoting his words; but as I did not absolutely quote his words, but declared that Sir Frederick Borden was interested in this company, he cites that as an example of very unfair attack. Well, if I never get any more rasping criticism

than that, I think I shall pass through this House and this world quite lightly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will my hon. friend allow me a question? Did not that sentence and the whole speech of my hon. friend mean that Sir Frederick Borden had a substantial interest in that company?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my right hon. friend exactly what I meant and what I concluded, and my conclusion would have been absolutely absurd if I had not been convinced, after a thorough study of the documents, of the course I was pursuing, and of the trend of the whole matter under discussion. My opinion and my belief is—and I cannot find that it is shaken in the least by what the Prime Minister has said—the documents all point that way, that Sir Frederick Borden, one of the Prime Minister's own ministers, sat with him at the round table of the government, was privy to, took part in the preparation and bringing to the point of passage in this House, of legislation which provided subsidies out of the revenues of the country for a cold storage establishment, that Sir Frederick Borden upon his own admission during that very autumn, when this was being discussed and prepared, busied himself in incorporating a million dollar company for the double purpose of taking over property belonging to himself and going into the commercial cold storage business for the subvention for which the government's policy as aided in by himself was carefully thought out and brought up to the point of enactment. Am I wrong in that?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Militia and Defence put words into my mouth that I did not use in my speech. He said that I charged him with procuring legislation of this kind in order that he might himself take advantage of it. He may search my whole speech through and he will find no statement of that kind. What I did say was this, that Sir Frederick Borden helped to prepare, was privy to, and as one member of the cabinet was responsible for, that very legislation of which he proposed at the same time by the formation of this million-dollar company to take advantage.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not true, that is all.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it true or not that Sir Frederick Borden, during the autumn of 1906, procured the incorporation of a million-dollar company with the express purposes of taking over his own properties in part and of going into commercial cold storage business in part?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Go on.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister of Militia deny that? Will the Prime Minister deny that? Well, I have as good authority as can be obtained on that side of the House, the authority of the minister himself, who stated it in this House. That company was called the Canada Lands and Produce Company, and application was made by Mr. Macoun. As to Mr. Macoun, I asked frankly, and I found out—and it is nothing against Mr. Macoun, nor is it the least argument why he should not be engaged in that or any other business——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. You had a good deal to say about the son-in-law business the other day. You thought it was a reason then.

Mr. FOSTER. I neither thought so, nor said so.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. No. But there is the statement of fact: Mr. Macoun, the son-in-law of the Minister of Militia and Defence, makes application the second day after the legislation is announced by the Minister of Agriculture, for a subsidy. For whose company, I ask the Prime Minister? For Mr. Macoun's company? For Mr. Graham's company? He made application, as he himself states for 'our' company, the Canadian Lands and Produce Company, for which the Minister of Militia and Defence himself declared he procured the incorporation and told the House the reason why he procured it.

Mr. LENNOX. He and Mr. Graham?

Mr. FOSTER. He and Mr. Graham and Mr. Macoun. Mr. Macoun makes application to the Minister of Agriculture, not for himself, but for the company which he calls 'our' company—because he is interested in it, I suppose. Now, we believe what Mr. Macoun says, and in his letter to the Minister of Agriculture he states that Mr. Graham was hired, his services were procured, because he was a practical man and they proposed to have Mr. Graham to manage their cold storage operations. Search the whole records through, and what other men do you find connected with the company than Mr. Macoun, the Minister of Militia and Defence and Mr. Graham? Mr. Graham is the manager, the practical man; Mr. Macoun is the secretary—so he denominates himself—and Sir Frederick Borden is the chief incorporator, according to his own statement made before the House on Wednesday. This is the first application and it was put in on December 5, one or two days after the legislation was announced by the Minister of Agriculture. Now, on the other hand, we find Mr. Williams, a private individual, who, from October, 1905, up to that time had been pushing an application

for cold storage before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and who, at last, was told that he must now make his application to the Minister of Agriculture who was bringing in wider legislation. So, Mr. Williams puts in his application to the Minister of Agriculture on December 7, 1906. Strictly speaking, Mr. Macoun's application is for information and not for a subsidy, but it was evidently taken by the Minister of Agriculture as a general application, and he so replies to it in his letter to Mr. Macoun. Mr. Williams' application was absolutely an application for a subsidy according to the terms of the legislation—it is a bona fide straight application; he states what he wants and asks for the subsidy. Now, I think the Prime Minister left out some very important things. He said: What was the Minister of Agriculture to do? Here were two applications, one supported by the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) and the other supported by the Minister of Railways and Canals. It does not seem to me that that is the way in which it ought to be put. Is the Minister of Agriculture there simply to balance between two of his own colleagues as to which of them he shall select as the recipient of a favour? The Prime Minister was nearer right when he said it was the duty of the Minister of Agriculture to choose the application which, in the end, he thought to be the best and the company that would probably best carry out the enterprise. But I ask the Prime Minister to take this into consideration—Mr. Williams did not come without recommendation. The Minister of Militia and Defence, in that rather cross and heated manner in which he commenced his discussion of the matter, declared that Mr. Williams was a very unworthy man and a disappointed man, and that his statements were untruths and misrepresentations. The Prime Minister came nearer the truth, I think, when he stated that Mr. Williams, so far as he knew was a very estimable man. So others thought. Mr. Williams came here with Mr. McAvity's recommendation behind him with the statement that he would receive all the support that could be given him in his application. He came with the recommendation of Mr. McKeown behind him, one of the lights of the Liberal party in the city of St. John. He came with the recommendation of Mr. Robertson behind him, with the recommendation of Mr. Trueman behind him and the hard steady work of Mr. Trueman for months and months in his favour, besides recommendation from citizens not so partisan as these I have mentioned. They vouched for his character, and they vouched for his ability. Now, here is what the Prime Minister overlooked: After Mr. Williams had put in his application on December 7, he attended in Ottawa himself with Mr. Trueman, his worker, and probably his solicitor. He attended here in company with Mr. Emmerson, and conference after conference was held. And it was during these conferences that Mr. Williams came to the conclusion that there were forces against him in the shape of the Minister of Militia and Defence that he found it would be difficult for him to overcome. The Minister of Militia has the advantage of being on the floor of parliament. He stands up and faces you, Mr. Speaker, and says: Mr. Williams' statements are untruths and misrepresentations, and I content myself with a general denial of them. And his word must be accepted. Mr. Williams has not a seat in this House; he is a private party, a business man. He may have all character, means, reputation and position, but his word does not go in this House against the statement of the Minister of Militia for the word of the minister must here be taken. So, we must have a little sympathy for Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams states that when he came and pressed his application he found the Minister of Militia and Defence entrenched. And he found the Minister of Militia and Defence ready, and able, and willing, to say to him: Mr. Williams, I have an application in, and my application is favourably received by the Minister of Agriculture. And Mr. Williams' statement is that the Minister of Militia and Defence gave him to know, squarely and plainly, that he had not much chance in competition with him.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is false—Mr. Williams' statement is false.

Mr. FOSTER. I am giving Mr. Williams' statement of it. Now, a man who is vouched for by the names I have given, a man who has passed all his life in the city of St. John, a reputable man, a successful business man—his statements are worth something outside of this House, and you cannot ignore them inside this House. Mr. Williams stated that the Minister of Militia and Defence told him that he could get a subsidy and that he had influence to make it impossible for Mr. Williams to get it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I never said that.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) says that he never said that. But Mr. Williams says he did. Mr. Williams goes further, and he states that the Minister of Militia either suggested or it was suggested to him, I think he says he suggested, that they pool their issues, both of them having interests. Let us see if we cannot agree to

pool our issues. Williams says that was done in the presence of Mr. Trueman, that Mr. Trueman was to prepare the agreement, that Mr. Trueman did prepare the agreement, and that the agreement was placed before the minister, and then the minister refused an arrangement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not true.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Macoun, the son-in-law of the minister, states that Mr. Williams did make a proposition, that it was considered, and that it was not agreed to by our company, that is by himself, and the Minister of Militia, and possibly Mr. Graham, because Mr. Williams wanted too much. If Mr. Macoun is to be believed, there was something then in that. But Mr. Williams wrote to the Minister of Railways and Canals a letter on February 20, in which he detailed to the minister the circumstances of the case, and I think I had better read that letter and the reply of the minister thereto. I have not the letter that was written to the Minister of Railways and Canals, that is on the other file, and is with the 'Hansard' but I will read Mr. Emmerson's reply. Mr. Emmerson, writing on February 28, 1907, says :

Dear Mr. Williams,—I am duly in receipt of your letter of the 20th instant, inclosing a memorandum of agreement between your self and Mr. L. S. Macoun.

Why was it with Mr. L. S. Macoun ? Mr. Williams says it was with Mr. Macoun because the Minister of Militia suggested that it be made with Mr. Macoun so that his own name should not be brought into it. Now here is the memorandum of Mr. Williams to the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the Minister of Railways and Canals acknowledges the receipt of that memorandum and goes on :

I may say that I am now taking up this matter with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I will advise you later as to the outcome.

Yours truly,
H. R. EMMERSON.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. With the Department of Militia and Defence, according to that ; it was not in connection with the Department of Agriculture at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, and why ? In that letter Mr. Williams details exactly what he says took place, and he says that he has Mr. Brodeur's influence, and he has of course Mr. Emmerson's influence ; Mr. Emmerson and Mr. Brodeur had been working together in order to get the subsidy. Mr. Williams invites and asks for the influence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as well.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. According to the reasoning that has been applied to me, the Minister of Railways and Canals on the one hand, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the other, would be interested in Mr. Williams' company ; that would be the inference.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not make that inference.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If you treated them in the same way as you treat the Minister of Militia.

Mr. FOSTER. I take issue with the Minister of Public Works, because of the statement of the Minister of Militia that he got up a million dollar company that he was the chief promoter in it, along with the two others, Mr. Macoun and Mr. Graham. We have not any such statement from the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that they are interested in the Williams company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What was the date of the letter you just read from Mr. Emmerson?

Mr. FOSTER. February 28, 1907, and the letter that was writen to Mr. Emmerson was on February 20.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And Mr. Williams' application to the Department of Agriculture was on the 7th day of December prior to that. This was evidently to the Marine and Fisheries Department. He seems to have been wobbling a little from one side to the other.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all, the statement I made is absolutely true, the application of December 7 was to the Minister of Agriculture, and you will find it if you care to go through the papers. Mr. Emmerson takes it up with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in order if possible to influence the Minister of Agriculture to do the right thing by Mr. Williams. Now I want to call the attention of the Prime Minister to another thing. These things that I have been speaking of must be taken into account with Mr. Williams. Having gone through that rough experience personally, he comes to the conclusion that he has fought a pretty hard fight with the Minister of Militia. Then shortly afterwards when he asks for something a little more final, he receives that letter from the Minister of Agriculture, who tells him that he has received an application from Sir Frederick Borden on behalf of a company with which he is connected, not in which he is interested, but with which he is connected—the Prime Minister knows that is the verbiage of the letter,—and he tells Mr. Williams right on the top of that that he is very favourably inclined to the proposition of the Minister of Militia and Defence. You must take that in connection with all these personal conferences that Mr. Williams went through with here, from December 7 until that date in

which he personally and by Mr. Trueman's aid, did all that he possibly could in order to forward his application. Now the next thing that I think the Prime Minister does not take into account is this: Mr. Macoun had made an application on December 5. Mr. Graham is specially instructed by the Minister of Militia to go and see the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Graham starts from Belleville and comes to Ottawa. When he gets to Ottawa he confers with Mr. Macoun, and Mr. Macoun, who made the application for the minister's company, informs Mr. Graham, who is in the service of the minister's company, that he himself has seen the Minister of Agriculture and that everything has been settled between them.

The Prime Minister remembers that letter and he remembers the letter of the Minister of Agriculture just three days afterwards written to Mr. Graham telling him he has received his letter, that is all satisfactory, or words to that effect. Now, the Prime Minister must give some force and some weight to transactions, letters and words of that kind. Is it reasonable that Mr. Graham came upon that date, the 11th day of April, and made application for a company other than the minister's company? Is it reasonable that when he came here Mr. Macoun, who was the secretary of the company and who had made application for information on the 5th December, met him and said to him: It is all right, Mr. Graham; you do not need to go and see the minister; he and I have had a conference and we have settled this matter satisfactorily, and then, on the top of that, for Mr. Graham to get a letter from the Minister of Agriculture telling him that he had received his letter giving this information to the minister and that it was satisfactory? From that very day, it seems to me, that Mr. Graham, Mr. Macoun and the Minister of Militia and Defence had that subsidy in their pockets for their interest, whatever it might be. That is, I think, a reasonable conclusion to come to from these circumstances plainly as they are placed upon the records and plainly as they appear.

Now, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture was very positive day before yesterday about two things. He taxed me with unfairness because I had not read his reply to Mr. Macoun's application as well as his reply to Mr. Williams' application. If he had been listening to me he would have known that I had read both of them and that they are expanded in 'Hansard.' He was equally certain that Joseph Chamberlain made screws and all other kinds of goods and sold them to the British government while he was a member of the government, but it turns out that it was absolutely foundationless and it has been read twice over to-day that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain dissevered himself from all connections of that kind before he went into the government. Now, I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture to revise another statement, or rather to give us some information. He states in a letter that he has received an application. I will read it so as to be sure:

April 11, 1907.

Mr. F. E. Williams,
St. John, New Brunswick.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 8th. I may say that we have not yet made any grant for a cold storage warehouse in St. John.

The minister's mind was running upon a grant.

Sir Frederick Borden has made application on behalf of a company with which he is connected.

What for? The context shows that it means the grant.

—and I have viewed his application very favourably.

What application? The application for the grant.

None of the applications, however, are in a position to be passed upon absolutely.

Now, will the Minister of Agriculture tell us what he means or what Mr. Macoun meant, Mr. Macoun, in the first place, by telling Mr. Graham that he had had a conference with the Minister of Agriculture and that it had all been settled satisfactorily, and he, himself, in replying to Mr. Graham's intimation of this by saying in his letter that it was satisfactory. What does he mean by that? Will he tell the public what took place at that secret conference between him and Mr. Macoun where this was settled? Mr. Williams could not have any windfall like that. Mr. Williams was not in it at all, but Mr. Macoun goes to the minister and has his conference. Here are the instructions of the Minister of Militia and Defence to Mr. Graham to come up and interview the Minister of Agriculture and see about these things carried out by Mr. Macoun who had had his conference, and as he says to Mr. Graham had settled it satisfactorily and as the minister afterwards said it was satisfactory. That is one question I would like the Minister of Agriculture to answer. The other is this. He writes to Williams:

Sir Frederick Borden has made application on behalf of a company with which he is connected.

When did Sir Frederick Borden make application and will the minister bring down the application that he made? We have a right to either the answer as to the fact or a right to the papers upon the fact.

Mr. LENNOX. Or both.

Mr. FOSTER. Or both. Will the minister say that the application of Sir Frederick Borden that he refers to for a company with which he is connected was the application put in by Mr. Macoun on December 5 ? If he does what becomes of the Prime Minister's contention that the Minister of Militia and Defence never made an application? Or will he say that he refers in that letter to another application, to an application made personally by the Minister of Militia and Defence? If so, I think that would elucidate it and be equally destructive of the supposition that has been put forward by the Prime Minister in regard to this matter. Those are certain points that I think this House will require some information upon and if I insist upon it being given as strongly as I possibly can, and as calmly as I possibly can, I hope that nobody will declare that I am crooked mentally and morally and that sort of thing.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is all settled.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all settled. I will not refer to it again, because the minister took it back as soon as he said it. These are some things that will have to be elucidated. The Prime Minister seemed to see nothing in all this other than what was proper for a cabinet minister to do. I know there are men in my right hon. friend's cabinet who, if they were on the deciding bench, as the Minister of Agriculture was in a case like that, and if it were patent as it seems to be in this case that a minister had a direct interest in a company, would have counselled their brother minister not to pursue it any further, that it would be an improper thing for a minister to form a million dollar company or to be the chief man in it and to apply either through Mr. Macoun or himself or both for a grant under the legislation which had been passed by this House and to press his claim before one of his colleagues and against the outside public for this subvention. I think there are men in Sir Wilfrid's cabinet who, under these circumstances, would have taken some sort of a position like that. If they are not there now there have been such men there. Could the Prime Minister think of such a thing as Mr. Gladstone or Lord Salisbury sitting as Prime Ministers in Great Britain and having a sordid thing like that carried out, they privy to it, and allowing it to go on? The Prime Minister says, as a sort of apology : Our tone has not been so high. Yet he has been cited to-night the instance of Sir John Abbott, a man of great honour and of much the same ideals in reference to public life as those which are held in England, and which the Prime Minister declares he holds in common with the English nation ; Sir John Abbott resolutely and promptly divested himself of everything that could possibly militate against his being unprejudiced, fair and without the shadow of an accusation when he took the premiership and entered into the cabinet of this country.

That shows as high a spirit as was shown by these illustrious examples that have been quoted to-night. But, the Prime Minister says that the Minister of Militia divested himself the moment he saw himself coming to the point where there would be a reception of subsidies from the government. But for how many long months did he proceed first in incorporating his company, then in attempts to float his company in England and maybe elsewhere according to his own statement and then making his application for a grant to his own company the Canada Lands Produce Company? All that was done and done while the Minister of Militia was the company or a prominent man in the company, and down to a few weeks or months ago the Minister of Militia had not ceased to interest himself in that same company, or if not in that same company in a company with which was amalgamated the interests of his old company, at least in so far as they referred to Mr. Macoun and Mr. Graham. The question has been raised, and it is of some moment : Who were the men interested in the old company, what money did they put into it, what interest did they have, where do these interests lie to-day. I put this to the Prime Minister: What show had Mr. Williams in the competition against the forces that we have described. Look at the situation in the city of St. John. There were men who years ago had obtained a most valuable franchise but did not put it into force ; they had an issue of $60,000 of bonds guaranteed principal and interest by the local government for cold storage plant of a certain kind. They did not seem to be much in the line of carrying out that project, but when Sir Frederick Borden went to the city of St. John, or when Mr. Graham his manager went to the city of St. John and when they made the statement to Mr. McAvity and others : See here, we have practically got a subsidy from the Dominion government—read that letter from the Minister of Agriculture that Sir Frederick Borden has made an application for a grant for a company with which he is connected, and that the Minister of Agriculture views it very favourably, and add to that the statement which they are so apt to make: We are sure of the subsidy. Now Mr. McAvity and the rest of you, will you kindly tell us whether you will pool with us or not, can you get along with yourselves; you can't get this subsidy because we have a cinch on it; in view of that what chance had these gentlemen except to pool with these newcomers and amalgamate their interests ? Mr. McAvity was the very man who wrote on behalf of Mr. Williams and said that the influence

of himself and others of the party would be behind him in his application for the cold storage subvention. But Mr. McAvity fell away, and Mr. Trueman fell away, and every one of them fell away and Mr. Williams was left high and dry. And yet under all these circumstances the Prime Minister thinks Mr. Williams was in fault because, having these multiplied instances before him, he did not go to the expense of preparing plans and specifications and putting them in, when on the 11th of April from this correspondence it appears as if the whole thing was settled between Mr. Macoun, Mr. Graham, and the Minister of Agriculture. Let me show the Prime Minister how positive these men were. When in the end Mr. Graham put in his application and filed it with Mr. Ruddick on the 11th of June, the Minister of Agriculture says: I did not sign the contract I kept it open until November to let Mr. Williams have a chance. But watch the confidence of Mr. Graham and these gentlemen. After having been told by Mr. Macoun, it is all settled; after having the letter of the minister saying it is all right; after having all these things they go ahead and make their plans and get their sites, and go on with their operations and on the 11th June Mr. Graham makes his application, and listen:

Professor J. A. Ruddick,
Dairy Commissioner, Department of Agriculture.

Dear Sir,—Herewith I inclose application for cold storage subsidy at St. John, New Brunswick. Attached are all the papers required by the Cold Storage Act including schedule 'A' filled out as required by the Act; exhibit 'I' showing the installation contracted for with the Armstrong Company.

They were so certain of it that they went out and made a contract for a most important part of the plant with the Armstrong Company. That is an indication which has some weight and it all goes to show that Williams seems to have been well advised when he came to the conclusion: It is not worth while for me going on any further and putting in plans and specifications for I am as certain as can be that unless the Minister of Agriculture will give me some assurance that it has not passed beyond the ken of decision there is no use of my going to any more trouble or expense; the only thing left for me is to put my grievance before the Prime Minister and maybe some one coming after me will reap benefit from my misfortunes in that it may make it impossible for a minister of the Crown to take such a position in the future.

I do not want to carry on this discussion further. Now Sir, I have looked over my speech—I make a good many speeches in this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. That is one statement of mine which always draws a hear, hear from the government benches. Sometimes I make pretty strong speeches but I call the Minister of Militia and Defence to witness that this speech of mine, considering the material I had at hand, was a mild-mannered treatment of the whole subject from top to bottom. Suppose I cry peccavi and say I did not quite rightly quote the first Minister with reference to that 'interest' business, what else has the Prime Minister to find fault with in that speech? Was it because I suggested at the last, in an earnest manner for I felt earnest, that the Minister of Militia would do well to hand in his resignation as any English Minister certainly would have done and no longer embarrass the government which he loved in his heart and which he supported in his practice Was that it? Why, when I treated it in such a mild and broad and non-partisan way, why did the Minister of Militia get up and call me crooked mentally and crooked morally?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That was in a moment of weakness.

Mr. FOSTER. It was, and will he make another confession, and in answer to the question as to why he should go out of the range of this discussion entirely and import another and old—and maybe some time or another—recurring discussion of an entirely different thing connected with my private business, now was that also in a moment of weakness?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Strong then? He had the good sense after he had done it, to say it had nothing at all to do with this subject. That is down in 'Hansard' and you cannot get it out. It is in the revised 'Hansard' and there it stands. Was that in a moment of weakness? it ought to have been. If I had wanted to have provoked the Minister of Militia I could have done it. Is it to be part of the warfare that every time I bring up a subject before this House I am to be slugged, as the Prime Minister invited the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) to do only two sessions ago? When we were discussing a question and a certain part of the question was reached, he nodded to the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) to get up and attack me on my private record. I saw him do it, and I saw the accordant action by the hon. member. The Prime Minister says I am thin-skinned. My skin is inches thick now.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Then there cannot be anything but skin.

Mr. FOSTER. Well that is one of the bright remarks that will come from that wide western area under the hat of my hon.

friend. He is generally good natured about it and I do not get cross with him. I did not get cross yet with the Minister of Militia although he was not justified in pitching to me in that way on that subject.

Amendment (Mr. Lennox) agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to move that the House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole forthwith.

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

Customs—salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, $1,705,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. The other evening as reported at page 9502 of 'Hansard,' the Minister of Customs said that we generally passed his estimates in five or ten minutes, and he did not think a longer time was necessary that night. Of course he was mistaken in that, but if he was anxious to get through I do not understand why he did not give the information as to how the contingencies were to be expended, and particularly the information in regard to the remark of the leader of the opposition as to the repealing of the Civil Service Act in this general and very rough way in this item. This has been going on for years in this country, the evil is increasing. I wish to quote from 'Hansard', at page 9502, just what was said on this point:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a matter which is very strongly criticised in the civil service report and that criticism I entirely concur in. If your Civil Service Act at present does not permit you to carry on the business of the country as it should be carried on, why not amend it? It is not advisable to have a provision in item after item declaring that it is in contravention of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. PATERSON. This has been going on for years and years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And unless it is stopped it will go on for ever.

That is all I can find on that point and I must protest against the minister's action on not furnishing the information. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) drew the attention of the minister to the commissioner's remarks on the subject, at page 29 of the report under the title of 'Customs.' The commissioners there say:

This is one of the three departments whose outside service is recognized by the Civil Service Act. The salaries of officers in the outside service are duly scheduled, but unlike the other two departments (Inland Revenue and Post Office), no annual increments have been given. The chief positions in the outside service of this department are political appointments. Every collector of customs has been appointed from the ranks of the party in power at the moment. Many of the inspectors are in a similar position, and, under a clause in the Civil Service Act waiving the examination of persons appointed to positions requiring special and technical qualifications, almost all the appraisers in the outside service of this department have been appointed without undergoing the Civil Service examination. By no chance can an officer of the Customs Department (outside service) be removed from one point to another. If a vacancy occurs in a collectorship at any one point no capable officer can be sent to fill the position from any other point. In the service of this department there are many anomalies and incongruities. In order to avoid the necessity of examinations a new class has been created under the name of 'examining officers,' a class not found in the schedule to the Civil Service Act. In Montreal no officer is graded as 'cashier'; in Toronto there is a cashier. At the last session of parliament the Minister of Customs obtained a grant of $100,000 which has been distributed in amounts of $100 or $150 to officers within the limits of salaries laid down by the Civil Service Act. No officer at the apparent maximum of his class participated in the bounty. The salaries in the outside service seem to have been graded by the amount of revenue received. A first-class collector, say of Montreal or Toronto, receives $4,000 per annum. It would appear that if the revenue was quadrupled no increase of salary could be given. The salaries of the other employees in the Customs seem to have been graded proportionately to the salary of a collectorship.

Stopping there for a minute, I would like to know from the Minister of Customs what he is going to do about it. Is he going to pay any attention to the criticism of his own appointed commission in regard to this matter? The item before the chair calls for an increase of $100,000 for the very matters criticised by that commission, and the Minister of Customs seems to think that because these things have been going on for years and years no further justification for them is needed. That is all the answer that he gave to the leader of the opposition. I understand that he complains that we were unfair the other night in not giving him supplies. I put it to him as a reasonable man and an old politician would he expect to get much Supply after an answer of that kind to an important question put by the leader of the opposition, or by any other reputable member of this House? The people on both sides expect us to criticise the expenditures of the government. If there is any fault found with us it is that we do not get enough information from the government before we pass the supplies, so that we could distinguish between what is proper and what is improper expenditure. In answer to the leader of the opposition, the head of the critics of the government, the Minister of Customs did not say one word to justify this constant repealing of the Civil Service Act, except that the practice has been going on for years and years. That was not only no answer, but it multiplied the grievance the hon. leader of the opposition mentioned. The Civil Service Act does not contemplate any such thing as we are being asked to do,

and the Minister of Customs must expect that we shall require some full and reasonable statement of what the policy of this government is going to amount to, so that we shall understand what we are committing ourselves to when we are asked to vote an increase of $66, for salaries and contingent expenses and the like of that 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' For my part, representing the people that I do, the time has come when I must insist as far as I am able on the government announcing some defined policy as to how far we are expected to repeal the Civil Service Act in this crude, rough, slipshod and improper way. I pause for a minute to allow the Minister of Customs, before I proceed further, to give us an idea of the policy of the government with regard to this, I trust he will not ask me to enlarge upon it further.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Carried.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg the minister's pardon; it is not carried.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No one is speaking.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) had better not begin any little performance of that kind. I have seen it tried here before, but I never saw it work. I was astonished, the other evening, that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) treated this subject in so very casual a manner. We pointed out many cases in his department and others in which the Civil Service Act is wiped out for the time being—apparently, whenever it is found convenient to wipe it out. The Minister of Customs said he did not care very much about it—he did not seem to be very much concerned. What is the use of a Civil Service Act? What does it mean? Has the minister any idea why it should be kept there if it is to be dispensed with whenever it is found convenient to dispense with it? Is it beyond the bounds of human ingenuity to devise such amendments—these hon. gentlemen have had the opportunity for twelve years—as to make this step unnecessary? There will be cases, no doubt where considerable inconvenience would result from very strictly adhering to these terms——

Mr. PATERSON. In that sentence the hon. gentleman answers himself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister think so? Then, his idea is that the proper course for a judge would be to dispense with a statute whenever he found it inconvenient to follow it. That is the idea of one of our chief lawmakers as to the binding character of the statute.

Mr. PATERSON. You say it is to be dispensed with sometimes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Duncan Ross). Shall the item carry?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the Minister of Customs decides to treat with contempt a matter which has been made the subject of recommendation by three men appointed by this government, presumably for their ability and character, and if he decides to treat the committee with contempt as well, I suppose we cannot very well prevent it. But I would like to take up another matter and ask him what he has to say about the defalcation of the Collector of Customs at Huntingdon? The matter has already been brought to the attention of the House and I will give him the circumstances. In 1905, according to the minister's own answer in this House, given on the 18th of last March, upon inspection of the outport at Huntingdon, B.C., by Inspector Clute, irregularities were discovered and Mr. Donald Fraser, sub-collector, was thereupon placed under suspension by the inspector. A thorough investigation of the outport was then made and deficiencies to the amount of $4,241.46 were found to exist, which amount was paid by Mr. Fraser to the inspector of customs at that time. When the report of the inspector was received by the department, an order in council was passed dispensing with Mr. Fraser's services. The first information I want is, on what date was the report of the inspector received by the Department of Customs?

Mr. PATERSON. First, I may say, with reference to the point brought up by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), it is not my custom to treat my fellow members with any disrespect whatsoever. The course I have taken has been taken because I will not lend myself to helping to place an obstruction in the way of getting votes for the pay of men who have discharged their duty. Therefore, I intend to confine myself to the item. The member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) may have had his own reasons for being away; I find no fault with him; but this matter was fully explained the other night when the subject was under discussion. I think the leader of the opposition should not find fault. He had a full explanation given, and he must have been satisfied with that explanation, for he went home, I trust, and to his couch and slept peacefully, notwithstanding this clause 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.' Therefore, I ask the hon. member for Lincoln not to ask me to repeat what satisfied—if anything would satisfy—the leader of the opposition on this point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What did the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. PATERSON. I said that this clause was put in for one sole purpose—that, in many of the ports the business of the country required that we must either appoint a larger staff of additional officers or we must continue to pursue the course which has been pursued year after year and put in this clause in the estimate to enable us to pay men who work over-time, which is contrary to the Civil Service Act. And my remark that this has been passed year after year was for the purpose of showing that, if this had been improper, it would have been criticised before, but had never been criticised before.

Mr. LANCASTER. It has been criticised every year.

Mr. PATERSON. Never before. And the Civil Service Act is not designed to apply to such cases as these. What was in mind when this provision of the Civil Service Act was adopted was that a clerk may have shown special aptitude and the government desires to give him an allowance of over $50 as provided by the Act. But, so far as the matter before us is concerned, this has never been criticised.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I myself criticised it for six years.

Mr. PATERSON. Not on this item.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But I have referred to the general practice, so it is no use for the minister to say that.

Mr. PATERSON. We are not discussing other items now. I want to keep the leader of the opposition and other hon. members to the item; and I say that this item has not been criticised before. If you ask whether we are going to continue it or not, I say we are going to continue it. It would be my idea to carry it on even if the new Civil Service Act comes into force, if necessary. I said that the leader of the opposition had answered himself, because he said that it would be impossible to have a Civil Service Act in which you will not have occasion, time and time again —he did not use these words—to do exactly what is done now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not express myself in that sense. The minister thoroughly misunderstood me. I have stated my view many times, and I should think that every man on the treasury benches would understand it. I say: Amend your Civil Service Act so that, in cases of emergency, such as the minister has mentioned, the service could be performed for the country without violation of the law; do not violate the law in fifty or a hundred items of your estimates every year. I am sure I have said that ten times during the last five years in this House.

Mr. PATERSON. That is, we should introduce a Civil Service Act providing that, where the minister considers it necessary, it may be dispensed with.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be your amendment.

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly, and what other could the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) suggest ? I think we had better leave it as it is in the Civil Service Act, so that we can make the exception whenever it is necessary and defensible. In reference to the matter at Huntingdon, that is in the hands of the Department of Justice and is being dealt with.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know at what date the report of that inspector was received. I will tell the minister candidly why I am asking. I understand that no action was taken against the collector for certain reasons, which will be detailed later, but that since the 18th of March, when the matter was brought up, some further steps have been taken. I want to know at what time the report of that inspector was received.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot give the date.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it will have to be given before this item passes, because I have some comments to make upon the action of the department in that connection.

Mr. PATERSON. I would like to hear them now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I cannot make them unless I know at what date that report was received. I want to know how long the department has been guilty of negligence in dealing with this matter.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you assume there was negligence ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I say if the facts which have been submitted to me are correct, there cannot be the slightest doubt that the department has been guilty of negligence.

Mr. FOWLER. It argues a strange state of mind on the part of the Minister of Customs to ask if there has been negligence in dealing with a matter that occurred in 1905. The minister perhaps does not realize that we are now in 1908.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, and this year is getting on, too.

Mr. FOWLER. Which adds considerably to the negligence which already exists. Now surely the minister, realizing that the opposition is in an inquisitive mood, ought to be prepared to answer these questions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have read the reply of the minister, but it does not give the information I have asked for. In addition to the information already given, I could refresh his memory by informing him that

so far as I understand, it was Mr. Inspector Clute who made the inspection in the first instance, and reported a deficiency of $4,241.46. But I am asking for the date when Inspector Clute made that report.

Mr. PATERSON. It would not be long prior to the 18th of March when I gave my answer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. According to the answer which the Minister gave on the 18th of March, the inspection was made by Mr. Clute in September, 1905. Am I correct in understanding that the report of Inspector Clute had been received by the department, say, in October, 1905, or thereabouts?

Mr. PATERSON. I fancy it would be a little later than that, it takes a little while to make a report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it true that since the 18th of March a further investigation has been made by Mr. Inspector Busby ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why was that further investigation so long delayed ?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) said he understood that this collector had stated that he had secured more, or had not given it all up. At any rate, he intimated there were further defalcations of which this man had been guilty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for Brantford spoke also on the 19th of March.

Mr. PATERSON. It would be close to that time that the second investigation took place.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for Brantford on the 19th March, debating some other question, made this statement :

I gave him (the Minister of Customs) one instance in his own department yesterday, and if we discovered that much by asking a single question, is it not likely that there are others to be discovered ? The minister told us that he had investigated this matter, but if my information is correct he did not get at the bottom of it.

My information is that this particular party who had to make $4,200 of a refund and who has not been prosecuted, has made a public boast that he is ahead of the game.

Mr. PATERSON. Are you accusing me of taking the money ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am not accusing you of taking the money but I am accusing one of your servants, and I am pointing out that you have not administered any punishment to him, and although you have asked him to disgorge $4,200, I do not think you got all the money back. Do you hear that ?

Mr. PATERSON. I did not hear that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Well, listen to it again. I am told that this man who refunded the $4,200 has made public boast that he is $10,000 ahead.

That is what the minister no doubt alludes to ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There was afterwards an investigation made by Inspector Busby. What was the result of that investigation ?

Mr. PATERSON. Within a day or two after the statement of the hon. member for Brantford I wired for Inspector Busby to go and make a thorough examination or a further examination into the facts of this case. He went. Inspector Clute, only a few months before he discovered the defalcation, went there, inspected the office and reported everything as being proper. Then we got some outside information that led us to think that there were things that were not right and so I ordered him to go back and make another examination. He went back and discovered what is alluded to there and he secured a large amount of money from this officer. We supposed that we had got at the bottom of the defalcation. It was Inspector Clute's duty to do so. He has since been superannuated. He was a very old officer, he had been in the service for a great many years, but I felt rather annoyed that he should have made an examination of that port only a few months before and that the defalcations were not discovered at that time. I wrote him a very plain letter on the matter. Then he made his report and I had supposed that he had covered the ground thoroughly. The hon. member for Brantford said what he did the other day and I instructed Inspector Busby to go and make another thorough examination and report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Speaking on the question of negligence, at the idea of which the minister was so much shocked when I mentioned it a moment ago, does not he think it a fairly good evidence of negligence on the part of the department that a matter of this kind should be allowed to go for two and a half years without proper investigation? The minister takes no action until he receives information from a member of the opposition.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not see that there was negligence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would not one have supposed that a department so well organized as the Department of Customs would be able to obtain as much information on this subject as my hon. friend from Brantford?

Mr. PATERSON. We should have been if our inspector had done his duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minster has not told us yet what the report of Inspector Busby amounted to. How many more thousands has he reported?

Mr. PATERSON. He reports $5,800 more paid.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which is exactly in line with the information I have, and the minister will admit that up to the present time this information which came to myself in the first place and which was handed over by me to the hon. member for Brantford, as chairman of the committee which looks after the Department of Customs on this side of the House, has been fairly correct up to date. I would like to give him another piece of information and he can tell me whether or not it is correct, At the time of Fraser's dismissal, I am informed, that Mr. J. B. Kennedy, a member of this House, insisted on full restitution and also that Fraser be prosecuted but that Mr. Kennedy was overruled by the Liberal machine which arranged a compromise by which Fraser was allowed to retain a large amount of public funds and go free. That information comes to me also.

Mr. PATERSON. We know nothing of that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That comes from the same source as the other information which has proved to be accurate, as the minister admits. Why was it that Fraser, after he admittedly had become a defaulter and had embezzled moneys to the extent of more than $4,000, was not prosecuted? Why was he not prosecuted before the matter was brought up in the House?

Mr. PATERSON. The fact is that every defaulter has not been prosecuted in the past.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that the only reason?

Mr. PATERSON. That is not the only reason. We find that men, under circumstances of this kind, make all kinds of pleas, that it is a breach of trust, that although they have taken the money they intend to return it and they have not in every case been prosecuted. Many cases happened long before I came into the department in which restitution had been demanded and made. As to the degree of guilt, that, of course would depend on the view that the judge might take with reference to the matter. Before I came into office private sureties were taken to provide for defalcations of that kind and in cases of defalcation the sureties were called upon. In some cases they paid part of the defalcations and in some cases they did not. In many cases the department took such money as they could get from the bondsmen and that was the end of it. I thought that system was not satisfactory, and we organized a system by which we put all these men under guarantee company bonds and we have an arrangement with them that whenever we put a new officer on, his name is sent to the company, he is on then and if the company give three months notice that they will not carry him, of course, we tell the man that he will have to provide other security or leave the service. If a defalcation takes place we notify the company of it and the amount of the surety is paid. Since I have had charge of the department the revenue has suffered no loss whatever.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know how far Mr. Clute may be in fault. I have no information upon that. I wish to be understood as not casting any reflection on any officers of the department in the criticisms I have made. I have no reason to believe, apart from Mr. Clute, that there has been any negligence on the part of the officials. The information at my disposal would not permit me to say that. My information is that this was part of a political arrangement; that the failure to prosecute this man was due to political influence and not due to any negligence on the part of the officers. Here is a man with a defalcation of over $4,000; he is not prosecuted until information comes from a private member of the House. After three years it is found that he has $6,000 of the public money in his hands, and now at last proceedings have been taken. What is the principle which guides the minister in determining whether or not such a man should be prosecuted?

Mr. PATERSON. Prosecutions have not followed on any case in the Customs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why not?

Mr. PATERSON. Restitution has been made in every case I know of since I took office. I am a little surprised that the leader of the opposition should place credence in the report that my action in this matter was because of political motives. I thought the hon. gentleman would not harbour that thought in reference to me. I see I have not quite as good a position in his eyes as I thought I had.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have had too long a legal training to pronounce judgment before I know all the facts and I am only now asking for the facts. Did I understand the minister to suggest that prosecution or no prosecution depends on restitution? I think the Postmaster General will tell him that to act on such a principle would be compounding a felony.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not compound any felony.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would seem like it from the explanation given by the minister. If they do not make restitution do you prosecute them?

Mr. PATERSON. Under the old government there were cases in which restitution was not fully made and in which no

prosecution followed, but I do not think there has been a case in my time in which restitution has not been made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The principle seems to be that a man may go ahead and steal; if it is not discovered he keeps the money and if it is discovered he makes restitution and there is no punishment.

Mr. PATERSON. When irregularities occur the inspector suspends the officer and the commissioner approves of his suspension and the inspector then makes a thorough examination of the books and sends in a final report. If the defalcation is made good the inspector reports that also and an order in council is passed dispensing with the services of the defaulting officer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can understand that a case may arise where an officer had been careless and the defalcation small and where there never had been any criminal intent; I can understand that in such a case no proceedings should be taken when restitution is made. But here is a case where a man was several thousand dollars behind at a small outport and one hardly believe there was not criminal intent. Did the Minister conclude there was no criminal intent in this case?

Mr. PATERSON. I think it was a bad case, and when the information came to me, as it only came through the remarks of the member for Brantford, we at once instructed Inspector Busby to go thoroughly into it, and the case was handed over to the Department of Justice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the man under arrest?

Mr. PATERSON. Inspector Busby telegraphed the other day that the man was arrested and pleaded guilty and will be sentenced on June 8.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any security for the $5,800?

Mr PATERSON. That has been paid.

Mr. FOWLER. Tell us about the Gardiner case at Fort McLeod.

Mr. PATERSON. That was for a small amount and restitution was made. That was dealt with by the guarantee company.

Mr. FOWLER. And there was no prosecution?

Mr. PATERSON. No, they did not prosecute.

Mr. LANCASTER. If that is not compounding a felony it comes perilously near it. According to the minister's statement, if the man makes restitution, which of course is no punishment, he is not prosecuted for his dishonesty and crime against the country. The people will believe that the government are encouraging crime by not punishing these men.

Mr. PATERSON. I understood the leader of the opposition to say that there might be exceptional cases.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said where there was no criminal intent.

Mr. PATERSON. It is very hard to tell about the criminal intent. The rule of the department has been that where there has been tampering with the money we have not been able to overlook it. If a man is overcome with liquor once or twice we stand that, or we stand carelessness, but where there is direct tampering with the funds, we have never hesitated to dismiss the person.

Mr. FOWLER. But you do not prosecute.

Mr. PATERSON. Is it to be understood that in every case there should be a criminal prosecution?

Mr. LANCASTER. Where there is criminal intent.

Mr. PATERSON. But where there is doubt about it and they say they have a very small salary and intend to pay it back—

Mr. BARR. It seems to me we have arrived at a most dangerous period in the history of our political life. A man may be caught stealing a loaf of bread to keep his family from starving and he is sent to jail, but a man can steal public money in connection with the civil service and we say: That is all right, pay it back at your leisure. It seems to me it is no excuse to say this has been going on for some time. We know it has been going on in the department of Customs to a very large extent. In the case brought up by the hon. member for Brantford, complaints had been made, an investigation was held and the man was censured. I understand he has not made restitution.

Yet all that was done in that case was the removal of the man for the time being from office. The information we have been able to drag from the Minister of Customs on these matters is very meagre. We need a new Civil Service Act, one that will place civil servants in this respect in the same position as all other classes of the community. Other institutions require their trusted officers to give security, either through a guarantee company or through friends; but in some cases, in the civil service, a man guilty of defalcation is not even dismissed. We have had the promise of a new Civil Service Act; but I do not know what advantage we can expect from it so long as there is only one class of the com-

munity who can take advantage of it. If a young man has not a pull, no matter what his ability is, there is no object in his passing the civil service examination. The time has come for removing the civil service from the political arena and awarding positions in it according to merit. So long as we permit the machine to recommend those appointed to positions in the service, we shall have the state of affairs that now exists. We have this year the enormous increase of $80,000 for extra work in the Customs Department. Last year the increase was $50,000 and the minister gave a long explanation of why that was required; but this evening he has chosen to take a different course, and he seems to think we should vote it off-hand without any explanation whatever. Now that it is half-past one, it seems to me that it is unwise to prolong this discussion, to hold up this House any longer. The opposition are not responsible for obstruction ; we would not be doing our duty to our constituencies and the country under existing circumstances if we did not do as we are doing. We have said to the government, bring down your important measures first ; bring down your Election Bill, which we have been alarmed about since this House met, which was promised in the Speech from the Throne, and which, if the government had not been afraid, would have been brought down in the first two or three weeks of the session, but which they are trying to force through in the dying hours of the session.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Duncan Ross). The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the Election Bill under this item.

Mr. BARR. The chairman has no right to complain unless some member raises an objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I think I am quite within my duties as chairman in calling his attention to the fact that he is discussing the election law instead of the item before the committee.

Mr. BARR. I must say that it is unusual for any chairman to call a member to order unless an objection is raised by some other member.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong.

Mr. BARR. The Minister of Agriculture does not know everything yet ; there are several things that he might learn. We have an excellent chairman, and I have no doubt that he means well. But to return to the subject. I think we have reached a very serious crisis in this country. It has been contended by many that the Minister of Customs has not been criticised by the opposition as much as would be for the good of the country. Everybody believes he could not be anything but honest. I have no doubt if his officers were as honest as they should be the work would go on all right. But when you see $80,000 instead of $50,000 last year, for over-work, we know it is utterly impossible for the Minister of Customs, or any other minister, to supervise it and see that it is properly managed. And where there should be the protection of the Civil Service Act, we find that in many cases it is simply set aside. This looseness of administration is intended to allow the appointment of men unfit to fill these positions but who are recommended by the partisan supporters of the government. It is no wonder that we have so many defects in the Customs administration. There is no reason for this large amount spent in over-time——

Mr. LANCASTER. They do not allow us overtime when we work extra hours.

Mr. BARR. We are servants of the people and are expected to do any kind of work at all hours. Many of us who have seen the customs offiers at work know that it is impossible for the minister to know whether they are earning their money or not.

Now, it is not in the interest of the country that we should discuss these items at this hour of the night. I think one of the shortcomings of this House is we do not have regular hours in which to work. It should be understood altogether that we do not go on after 11 o'clock. If we did so we should make more progress. We have not accomplished much to-night and the minister knows we are not likely to accomplish much. I think this discussion should close and we should take it up again in more reasonable hours at a future day.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the committee understands the position with regard to the Civil Service Act, and I ask the committee not to discuss that question any more. But the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has brought up a question which is important and in bringing which before the committee he is discharging his duty. The subject is one with regard to which he ought to have all particulars, and it is a matter upon which I would like to know the opinion of the House—it is a very serious matter in my estimation. I refer to the defalcation at Huntingdon. I say it is a very serious matter that such a defalcation should take place just a few months after our inspector had made this examination and reported all correct. When the information came to us from outside—I do not know whether from Mr. Kennedy or not—the officer was immediately told to go back to Huntingdon to investigate the report that there had been a defalcation.

Mr. FOSTER. That had happened after his previous visit or before?

Mr. PATERSON. I think it happened before.

Mr. FOSTER. He ought to have found it the first time.

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly he should. It is impossible for myself or the commissioner or the deputy commissioner to know what is going on in such places as Huntingdon if our inspectors cannot be trusted to make correct reports. The inspector was an officer of thirty years' standing and had given faithful service. It may have been that the length of his service had detracted from his efficiency. He might have been superannuated before, and on the discovery of his error I thought I would not have him dismissed, but recommended that he should be superannuated. I had not the slightest idea, nor had our officers, that when the man went the second time, and especially after the rebuke that was given him, he would have failed to do the work thoroughly. I can only suppose he was incompetent for it. But when the information was given us by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) we made another investigation. There was the further amount of defalcation which he had not discovered and which the man admitted and for which he made restitution on being arrested, and my officers tell me that he is to be sentenced soon. Now I am glad this has come up. We have odd cases like this.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have given the minister all the statements that have come to me about this. It is asserted by this same correspondent, whose information seems to be very reliable, that it was perfectly well known at the time when this defalcation took place, that this man had really embezzled, if that is the proper term, a great deal more money than the amount reported, and that this was perfectly well known long before Mr. Busby made his examination. There is another peculiar circumstance about it, but for which I cannot vouch. It is asserted by the person who gave this information to me that the amount for which this man settled in the first instance was in excess of $4,241.46, although that was the amount reported by Mr. Inspector Clute. If that is correct, it gives a great deal of support to the statement that in that neighbourhood it was perfectly well known that the man had embezzled more than the amount reported. The amount, I am informed, which was returned to the department was in the vicinity of $5,500. I do not know whether that is true.

Mr. PATERSON. I am at a loss to know what became of the excess of the $4,200. Would that involve the presumption that Mr. Clute kept part of the money?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not at all.

Mr. PATERSON. Then where did it go?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It went to the department, as I am informed. The information given to me is that, although Mr. Clute reported a defalcation of $4,200, this man made restitution of $5,500, and I would like to know if that is true.

Mr. PATERSON. I am informed that it came in two amounts. The first amount was $3,800, and after a further examination another $400 was discovered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then my information as to the $5,500 is not accurate?

Mr. PATERSON. We didn't get it, and that would involve that Mr. Clute kept the money.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no suggestion against Mr. Clute at all.

Mr. PATERSON. It must be either with him or with us, and I certainly have not got it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not accuse the minister of having any of it. But it is apparent that there were $4,200 taken and restored nearly three years ago, and a further defalcation of $5,800 which has been discovered since the hon. member for Brantford brought the subject up in the House, the minister thinks has been restored since. The suggestion made to me in the letter was that the settlement was for $5,500, although but little over $4,200 had been reported, giving credence to the idea that the officers, or some of the persons in the department knew at the time that the report was not an exhaustive report. But it is not worth while discussing if the information is inaccurate.

Mr. PATERSON. The report came to me that the defalcation amounted to so much and restitution had been made of the money.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This information comes from an ordinary every day citizen of British Columbia, a man who has no special means of knowledge. The statements contained in the letters I have read have been matters of common notoriety out there for months, even years.

Mr. PATERSON. I am anxious to learn all I can about this matter, because I would like to know if the leader of the opposition now would give me any information as to what charges are made with reference to political action in this matter.

M. R. L. BORDEN. I may read again exactly what is said about it:

At the time of Fraser's dismissal, Mr. J. D. Kennedy, M.P., insisted on full restitution, and also that Fraser be prosecuted. Mr. Kennedy however was overruled by the Liberal machine, and arranged a compromise by

which Fraser was allowed to retain a large amount of the public funds and go free.

That is the statement. It is a matter of common rumour and belief in that part of the country, and certainly that part of the rumor which charged that man with having a large amount of public money in his possession, notwithstanding this settlement, has proved to be absolutely correct. During these two years and a half he has had nearly $6,000 of the money of this country in his pocket. That was a matter of common notoriety all round that country, as I am instructed, because the man who sends me this information is not in a position to know anything more about it than any other citizen residing in that vicinity.

Mr. PATERSON. If it is only a rumour, it is an unjust rumour. If he restored more than the $4,200, what became of the excess? Such monies are paid into the credit of the Receiver General, in the bank.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister asked Mr. Kennedy about it?

Mr. PATERSON. I saw Mr. Kennedy some time ago and I said to him, We have found a further defalcation on the part of the collector at Huntingdon, and we are prosecuting him in reference to it. But he did not intimate any such thing as the hon. gentleman has now stated. I have given the hon. gentleman every scrap of information I have.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will send out the report of this debate to my informant and ask him if he has anything further to report upon it. He is a very intelligent man and may afford some further clue.

Mr. PATERSON. I will be very glad to know it. I want to understand what the sense of the House is in reference to prosecutions in every case in which irregularities take place.

Mr. FOSTER. In a case in which your guarantee company makes an arrangement do you wash your hands of all liability or responsibility and leave it entirely to the guarantee company to do as they please? If that is so it strikes me that that is where a great wrong is done. I do not think that the department responsible for the administration of Customs has any right to allow any set of men outside of itself to decide the question as to whether an officer who is a defaulter should be prosecuted or not. I do not think that any department should denude itself of the right to follow and punish a defaulter. It is responsible and the country will hold it accountable.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think we should be too hard upon the Minister of Customs. I think the Minister of Customs is commendable because he has pursued a different policy from that pursued by at least one other department of this government. The Minister of Customs has in all cases dismissed the party who defaulted. In some other departments in place of dismissing the defaulter they have promoted him and increased his salary. In the Department of the Interior there is the striking case of Wagner who was employed as an interpreter for certain foreigners and who was proved to have been guilty of defrauding the persons whom he was appointed to protect. He was confined in the penitentiary.

Mr. PATERSON. He was punished.

Mr. FOWLER. Briefly but as soon as he emerged from the penitentiary he was promoted. Then, take the case of Joseph Nixon who was also guilty of defalcation in office. He was connected with the lands branch. Joseph was dismissed for a little. He was not punished. He has recently been appointed to a new office of some responsibility and, if my information is correct, an office in which he can pursue the same methods that he pursued in the office he held before. He has been appointed superintendent of stores at Nepigon on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. FOSTER. He will be able to make classifications.

Mr. FOWLER. He will soon qualify for that, I have no doubt.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not profess to manage my department any better than other ministers manage theirs. I am just as human as they are and I make mistakes just as well as they do. We try to discharge our duties properly. Is it my duty to prosecute in every case? I have dismissed men from the service in whose behalf there have been pleas made by wives and sisters because I felt that as the administrator of a public department these things get out and have a bad influence upon the service. When this question came up it looked to me to be a very serious thing and I wanted to ascertain what the course of the department had been in the past. I made inquiries and my officers told me that they were not aware that there had been any prosecutions entered, although they were aware that there had been defalcations which had not been made good. I said: You surely never held out any inducement that if restitution were made that would end it. I will read a list of defalcations that have taken place in the past.

Mr. FOWLER. These have all taken place before 1896.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There have been defalcations since 1896.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes, but I think this is the first prosecution. I did not intend to read that list of names and I am very sorry I have done so but with the consent of hon. gentlemen I think the names might be omitted from 'Hansard.'

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the names should be published in 'Hansard.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You might allow them to be withdrawn.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I am very much pleased that the names are not to be published. It is really too bad I mentioned the names.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister will agree that it will be very unwise to lay it down as a principle that there should be no prosecutions.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not lay it down as a principle. I should like to know if it should be laid down as a principle that in every case there will be prosecutions. Of course these cases are all open and can be put into court at any time. I may say to the House that many of the men I had to dismiss had my sympathy and it takes all there is in me to be impelled by a sense of duty to dismiss some of them. Every one knows the man has lost his position because of the defalcations and he goes out on the world branded, and there are pleadings from relatives and friends showing how the poor fellow's life is ruined. Nevertheless I have laid it down as a rule that in every case where there was a defalcation we could not retain that person in the service. Now I will give you my word honestly that I have followed that rule out in cases where if the man had been in my own employ I would have kept him on and I will warrant you that having had his lesson he would have turned out honest and trusted from that time forward. You may not believe it but that is a fact. I am glad this matter came up, because I wanted to say what I have said. I daresay you will find a great many weaknesses in the Customs Department but if you know anything that is wrong there let me know it. If there is any one who is interested in having the department right it is the minister. Why, bless me, what is it after all. There is a salary attached to the portfolio, but what is that to a man who has a proper public spirit. Is not the best of all that when a man is administering an office, that after he leaves it the people can say : Well, he did not know everything but he tried to do what was right. That is about all the compensation there is for a public man.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know it would be possible to advise the minister as to any rule to prosecute or not to prosecute in every case. It must be left to the head of the department who is responsible to parliament for his action. The method of inspection however might be discussed. I do not know what your method of inspection is, but Mr. Fyshe who had a great deal of banking experience seems to think that the method of inspection is not very perfect He commented upon the fact that you do not take precautions to keep secret the time at which your inspector would visit a particular collector. In the case of a bank inspector, he comes like a thief in the night and the first thing he does is to count the cash. Has the minister anything to suggest to the committee in regard to the improvement of the system of inspecting. What is the system of inspection?

Mr. PATERSON. In the case we have been discussing the officer kept no records in the office and the information had to be got in the United States which would probably be the inspector's excuse for not detecting it at first. It is a point where a railway crosses the boundary and there were no records to aid the officers in their inspection. When we came in I found only one officer for the whole province of Ontario, namely, Mr. Alexander M. Mackay, who had been a member of the House and was appointed inspector. We found ports that had been three or four years without any inspection at all and in many cases where defalcations were found, it was pleaded that there had been no inspection for two or three years and that they did not know how to handle the business. There is nothing to prevent the inspectors going to any port when they see fit. Had you not better let me have this money now ? The men need their pay.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are you referring to the first item here ?

Mr. PATERSON. It will be of no use to give us that, as it is only part of the item. The cheques can perhaps be issued if the items are passed, even before the Supply Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we will compromise by letting you have the first one, amounting to $1,815,000.

Mr. PATERSON. I will take that, of course, if I cannot get more ; but I do not know whether the Auditor General will care to give a credit so that we can issue the cheques, unless the whole item passes. Besides, I want to go away next Tuesday, and it would oblige me if the item were passed.

Mr. FOSTER. There are lots of things you can do or have done before you go away.

Mr. PATERSON. I am afraid that if we have two days discussion in order to get into Supply I will have to go without it. Will you give me the next item, which is for the salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors, as well as the salaries and expenses of the statistical branch here in Ottawa?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a very easy way for you to get them their salaries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We will see about the others on Monday.

Mr. PATERSON. Will you let us get into Supply on Monday ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did you ever know us to fail ? A man who is not satisfied with a million and a half a day is very hard to please.

Mr. PATERSON. It is really making a discrimination between the officers. Those at the outside ports will be able to get their money while those in Ottawa will not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They will get their salaries as quickly as the outside officers if you get the other item on Monday.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 2.18 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 1, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. KENNEDY.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). As a question of privilege I wish to correct a statement made in the House by the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Friday last with respect to the case at Huntingdon in the Customs Department. The hon. the leader of the opposition, in quoting from a letter which he had in his possession, said :

I am informed, that Mr. J. B. Kennedy, a member of this House, insisted on full restitution and also that Fraser be prosecuted but that Mr. Kennedy was overruled by the Liberal machine which arranged a compromise by which Fraser was allowed to retain a large amount of public funds and go free. That information comes to me also.

I wish to give a most unqualified denial to that statement that I was overruled by the Liberal machine, because this matter never was referred to the Liberal committee in any shape or form that I know of. Later on in the debate the leader of the opposition said :

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may read again exactly what is said about it:

At the time of Fraser's dismissal, Mr. J. B. Kennedy, M.P., insisted on full restitution, and also that Fraser be prosecuted. Mr. Kennedy however was overruled by the Liberal machine, and arranged a compromise by which Fraser was allowed to retain a large amount of the public funds and go free.

There is quite a difference between these two statements, and I would like to know which was the correct quotation from the letter which the leader of the opposition had in his possession.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not observe that it was quoted in that way. The first one was correct. There was no suggestion that the hon. gentleman had arranged a compromise, nor did I say that. It is a mistake in 'Hansard.'

Mr. KENNEDY. We had no discussion of the matter whatever. It was left entirely with the government.

THE GOVERNMENT STEAMER 'CHAMPLAIN.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the government whether there is any further information as to the use of the government steamer 'Champlain' as to which I inquired on two or three previous occasions ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I informed my hon. friend some time ago that the government steamer 'Champlain' acts as a ferry between River Ouelle and Murray Bay. On May 22, I think it was, the following instructions were sent by Mr. Desbarats, the Acting Deputy Minister of the Department of Marine and Fisheries :

Instruct captain 'Champlain' to take people from River Ouelle to Malbaie and Baie St. Paul, next Sunday, making call at intermediate ports and to bring back party the same day, the rate of passage to be five cents per mile and Mr. L. A. Taschereau to deposit $40 with the department.

There was no complaint, as I understand, on that day but Mr. Forget complained that on a certain day he could not get admission to the 'Champlain.' I have received from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the following statement of the reason for this :

Our agent informed me that an excursion trip which was made on twenty-fourth May steamer 'Champlain' stopped at all stations between Murray bay and Baie St. Paul and no Conservative was refused admission; during last week boat did not stop at St. Irénée ac-

count of gale raging. The wharf at that place is almost impossible to make in rough weather, and our time-table provides that in such bad weather the boat would not stop.

There was no intention direct or remote to prevent Mr. Forget or anybody else to board the boat.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. FOSTER.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. On May 29 the Minister of Militia revised a statement made previously and published upon the 'Hansard.' His final statement, which I hope is correct as it appears, reads in this way :

I would like this House to consider whether at its worst it is to be compared for one moment with the position of a man who succeeds in placing himself in a position of trust in a company and then succeeds in placing himself in another position connected with another company, and then engages in the delightful occupation of buying lands for the company of which he was manager, and accepting a commission and putting it in his pocket in that connection——

I desire to say that the lands in question were not bought for the Union Trust Company, of which I was manager, they were not paid for by the moneys of the Union Trust Company ; not one dollar of commission was ever taken by me for lands purchased by me or by any one else for the Union Trust Company. The statement made by the hon. gentleman is entirely and absolutely untrue, and I ask him to retract it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not name any particular company. I gave my authority the other day for the statement I made but, Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) states that the statement I made was not correct and that he did not do what I thought he had done and said he had done, I am the last man in the world to wish to misrepresent an hon. member, I am not in the habit of doing that, and I cheerfully withdraw the statement on the affirmation made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that what I stated was not true.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

House in committee on Bill (No. 151) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Crawford.

On section 1, (on the amendment to the amendment being read),

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that proposed amendment makes it very much worse than it was, because it absolutely compels the government to take over such lines as the company desire to part with. The government without any such legislation, have the right to expropriate and to take over what lines they require, but that amendment absolutely compels the government to take over any lines the company desires to give up, no matter how unprofitable they may be or whether it would be unwise to operate them or not.

Mr. HAGGART. I certainly must object to this provision. It is in effect that parties coming here for a private Bill are granted a condition by this parliament compelling the government to take over the line of railway. I never heard of anything of the kind in a private Bill before. It is true that this is in reference to branch lines connected with the Transcontinental Railway, but here we have a private charter applied for by a company for the purpose of constructing a line and by this Bill we say to the company : You shall have the option at the end of a certain period, when the government take possession of the Grand Trunk Pacific section of the National Transcontinental Railway, of taking over these lines. It is compulsory on the government to take over these lines.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So far as the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company is concerned, I think they will be only too glad if all the amendments are dropped. I think it was a great mistake to introduce amendments to the Bill at this time. This whole thing was fought out two years ago; it was fought out in committee and in this House. For months the Bill was held up and again in committee this year, and I do not see why amendments should be introduced at this time. It seems to me that the whole thing is a matter of obstruction and hold up. We have been renewing charters to railway companies right along here, session after session ; and, this session, I suppose some fifty charters have been renewed and the time extended, and not one company in the whole lot has been held up for a minute except the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. SPROULE. Much better to have both withdrawn than to pass this one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only reason why the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) moved the amendment to the amendment, was that he thought the amendment was so unjust to the company, and that the amendment to the amendment would be an improvement. But as hon. members will recollect, he thought it better to have both amendments withdrawn. It seems to be that objection can be taken to both on the ground of justice. According to the amendment the government

could take over just what branches they liked, picking out the paying lines and leaving the others ; and, according to the amendment to the amendment, the company would have the choice of lines to be taken over by the government. It seems to me that, in the interest of justice, both should be withdrawn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose that the object of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was to make it possible for the government, in case it should operate the eastern division as a national enterprise, to control not only the main line but the feeders for that line. It does not require a great knowledge of railway operation to understand that that is an essential thing. The hon. member for South Simcoe was not inspired with any desire to hold up or obstruct this Bill; his wish, as I understand it, was to preserve what may be very important interests of the country in the future. It would be rather an anomalous condition to have the government operating the main line of the eastern division while all the feeders which bring business to that line were under the ownership and control of a private company. Of course an Act might be passed in the future to expropriate these branch lines, but it might not be very just to bring about that condition in future without notice in advance that it is, or might be the policy of the country. Whatever might be the merits or demerits of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe, it seems to have a great deal to commend it—although it might properly be amended in the respect referred to by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). So far as the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Minister of Railways is concerned, there cannot be two opinions in the House as to that. To have the government operate the main line of the eastern division subject to having imposed upon it such feeders as had proved unprofitable, and were not desired to be retained by the Branch Lines Company, would be an entirely unheard of proposition, if the interests of the country are to be considered at all in the matter. The contract itself—the contract between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific—looks to the possibility of the eastern division being operated, at some time or other, as a national enterprise. It is quite within the order of things that this should take place at the expiration of fifty years if I recollect the time correctly. We must look forward to that as a possibility, but must look forward also to the providing of feeders for that line, branch lines which the country will have the right to acquire. And, while it is not an immediate consideration, it is none the less a serious consideration as to what the rights of the country in that regard shall be. One would suppose that the interests of this Branch Lines Company might be properly preserved and full justice done to them consistently with the proposition that the country should at some future time operate not only the main line but the branches as well. It certainly would be a very incongruous condition, so far as that railway is concerned, if any other result should obtain in future.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) any information as to the intention of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company with regard to the branch line from Chipman to St. John ? During the recent election, in New Brunswick, Mr. Hays and Mr. Morse, of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, went over the property of the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company, and the Minister of Public Works, if I remember correctly, intimated in more than one public speech that he expected to be able to announce in a short time the completion of arrangements for the purchase by the Grand Trunk Pacific of the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company for the use of the transcontinental line. I may say also that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), in the course of the campaign, went so far as to state that announcement would be made of the close of the deal within a week from the date of his speech. I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works what position this matter is in. I observe a despatch in the Montreal 'Gazette' of to-day stating that the Grand Trunk Pacific had no intention whatever of using the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company in connection with the transcontinental line.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can only say that I have been informed upon several occasions by the principal officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific that they thought that the railway from Chipman to Norton, and thence either by a separate line, or by the Intercolonial, to St. John, would afford a very satisfactory means of reaching the harbour of St. John. They have stated to me more than once that they recognized the importance of getting a direct connection from the main line to St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it run near Chipman ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It passes through Chipman, and from the main line through St. John by way of Chipman is only 78 miles, and I think probably it is the shortest route they could take to St. John. They have suggested that they might branch off from the Chipman line a short distance from Norton and have a separate line to St. John, instead of using the Intercolonial. I know

also that they have been very much interested in the question of terminal facilities at the port of St. John and have considered the question of utilizing Courtenay Bay for their terminals. I think I was quite justified in making the statements I did in the past, because I had very positive assurance from the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific that they were favourable to making this connection with St. John. I was also given the assurance that their determination would largely rest with the Minister of Railways, and not only had statements been made to myself, but there was the positive statement made in a public way by the then Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson), that he would favour the making of that connection with St. John. As to whether or not the Grand Trunk Pacific has changed its views with regard to the matter, I am not in a position to say. I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) must not take too seriously statements which he sees in the newspapers, particularly if they appear in telegraphic despatches from the province of New Brunswick. I understand my hon. friend to say that he saw this statement in a despatch published in the Montreal 'Gazette'. I am inclined to think that the sources of inspiration of the Montreal 'Gazette' in the province of New Brunswick would be of a very partisan nature, and that, perhaps, statements might be made without most careful examination to see whether they rested upon a good foundation.

Mr. CROCKET. I understand that the minister (Mr. Pugsley) is yet quite hopeful that the Grand Trunk Pacific will take over the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company for the purpose of connecting that line with the city of St. John ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that, since the change of government in the province of New Brunswick, I do not know that the provincial government would desire to part with the road. I have no intimation to that effect, and, of course, there must be a seller as well as a buyer.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller). Shall the amendment to the amendment be adopted ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Railways has given the policy of the government in this matter, and has said that he will not press the amendment to the amendment. He stated also, however, that he could not agree to the amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe either. I move, therefore, that the amendment to the amendment be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to and amendment to the amendment withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller). The question is now upon the amendment of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does not the Prime Minister think that some provision should be made with reference to these branch lines having regard to the possibility of operation by the country ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say to my hon. friend that I do not agree with him. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) has given his best attention to this subject and I find that he is of opinion that there is no necessity for such an amendment. The matter has been debated again and again and it seems to me that the amendment is rather meaningless because the power of the government to expropriate is always there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The government has no power to expropriate without legislation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is provided that nothing can be done except with the consent of parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. But this amendment sets out the conditions under which they may take these lines over. For instance, it is provided that any subsidy may be deducted and then the value is ascertained by arbitration. If the government decided to take them over without any provision except that of expropriation I assume that the company would be likely to set up the claim that on account of the enhanced value of the railway by virtue of the government subsidies which it had got they would be entitled to receive an additional compensation, whereas if this amendment passed they could not receive the amount of the subsidies, but they, on the contrary would be deducted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.—No. The Bill reads that :

> Provided, however, that nothing in this Act contained shall authorize the government to take over the said lines of railway or any of them without the consent of parliament previously obtained, to the exercise of such right of taking over as aforesaid.

If that right is to be exercised with the consent of parliament, which goes without saying, it is difficult to see what the object of this amendment is. However, it has been debated a great many times.

Mr. SPROULE. What is meant by 'aforesaid' ? The aforesaid portion of the clause says that the amount of the subsidy the government has given to this company shall be deducted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do you think that fifty years from to-day parliament will not be at liberty to make any provision they

see fit ? At any rate, my hon. colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals has come to the conclusion that there is no necessity for the amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think there is a very great deal in that consideration. It would be necessary to obtain the consent of parliament whether that provision is inserted or not because parliament must make the necessary appropriation for the payment of the amount of the award. Mr. Gladstone, in 1849, I think it was, passed a statute in Great Britain which provided for the taking over of all the English railways and which still remains upon the statute-book as notice to every railway in the country that the government may take it over upon making the necessary parliamentary appropriation. The determination of the value was provided for in the statute, everything was done that was necessary except the parliamentary appropriation for the purpose and every railway in Great Britain to-day is under notice of that kind. The object of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was to have a provision in the charter of the company giving them notice that this might be done in a certain event and at a future period. It was, of course, necessary for him to provide, so that his amendment should be in order, that the right should not be exercised except with the consent of parliament. Parliament would require to make the necessary appropriation.

Amendment (Mr. Lennox) negatived.

On section 1. Extension of time for construction, commencement within two years after the passing of this Act and completion within five years.

Mr. SPROULE. How will this operate in connection with the original Bill ? The original Bill provided that the Transcontinental Railway was to be completed by 1911. Now we extend the time two years to commence these branch lines and then we give five years to finish them. That would make it 1913 at any rate, if not longer. We are giving power to extend the time for completing the branch lines two years beyond the time in which the Act provides the whole railway should be completed. I fancy that the government cannot expect that the railway will be completed within the time limit, or otherwise they would not be overriding their own Act in giving an extension of time to the subsidiary company for the commencement and completion of these branch lines after the time has expired for the completion of the whole line.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. There can be no connection between the extension of time given in this charter and the provision which is contained in the original agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The fact that the branch lines company's time is extended cannot in any way affect and has no relation whatever to the provision as to the time of construction contained in the original agreement.

Mr. SPROULE. That is rather a strange kind of logic in view of the addresses which have been made in regard to this question. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always spoken of the system as a whole, of a completed line, and they have contended as well that it was necessary that not only the main line should be completed but that the branch lines should be built at the same time so that they might handle the produce of the west as well as goods being shipped from the east to the west and so that the system might be placed in connection with the great cities of the country, such as Montreal and Toronto. When it answers the purpose of these hon. gentlemen to speak of this system as a whole and of the advantage that would accrue to the country for having this great and important system finish in a few years they include the branch lines with the Grand Trunk Pacific, but when it answers their purpose and when there appears to be an incongruity between the powers which are given to this branch lines company and those which are contained in the original Bill, then it is contended that there is no connection between them. That is not the kind of argument that they addressed to this House before, and it does seem to me that it would be important to have certain of these branch lines at least finished at the time that the main line is put in operation. If it is to be in operation by 1911 and if these branch lines are necessary to connect the system with such cities as Montreal and Toronto and places like these it would seem to me to be desirable that the branch lines should be completed at the same time that the main line is put in operation, whereas, under this Bill it is not likely to be done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the two branches that are named in the Act of 1906?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. There is a great number of them named.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought there were just two.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. No, there are ten or twelve.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As far as the branch lines are concerned the company are just as anxious as they can be to build them. They intend to go on with the construction of them as soon as the material and men can be got. Some of them are finally located now and are awaiting the approval of the department. Some of them will probably be started this season. There is no question as to the anxiety of the company to build new branch lines.

Mr. LAKE. In reference to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) has just said, there has been some considerable feeling throughout many parts of the Northwest owing to the failure of this branch lines company to commence the building of any of the branch lines which are included in this charter. The feeling is so great on this matter that petitions have been sent to the government asking them to refuse an extension of the charter. It is true this is a separate company from the Grand Trunk Pacific but, the two are undoubtedly very closely connected and the government in turn is very closely connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. There is therefore reason in the request made from the Northwest that the government shall bring pressure to bear upon this company to commence the construction of these lines at the earliest possible moment. Early in the session I brought to the attention of the government the fact that the directors of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company had promised that they would soon commence the construction of the Regina Yorkton branch and have it in operation at an early date. Representatives of the settlers living along the route of this branch went to Montreal and were promised by the railway directors that the line would be in operation in time to carry out the crop of the present year, and in return concessions were made by the settlers in the granting of the right of way. But that branch has not even been commenced at the present time. When the Bill was in the Railway Committee the representative of the company gave a very definite assurance that the Regina Yorkton branch would be the first branch to be constructed, that the plans were then before the commission and that he expected the work would be commenced in the early part of this summer. That is satisfactory but it would be still more satisfactory if we had a similar promise with regard to other branches. I again suggest to the government that they should bring pressure to bear on this company to commence work on these branches at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the hon. gentleman from Pictou says this Bill has no relation to the construction and operation of the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, his language is rather extreme. By the statute of 1906 there are 18 branch lines provided for: One a line from Montreal to a junction with the National Transcontinental Railway; another a branch line from Montreal, north westerly to a junction with the National Transcontinental Railway; another branch from Ottawa, another from Regina, another from Prince Albert, another from Calgary, all to junctions with the National Transcontinental Railway, and there is also a branch provided for from a point on the eastern division of the National Transcontinental to St. John or such other port on the Bay of Fundy as may be considered by the company more accessible and better adapted to the purpose of the company. If you look at these branches as being for the purpose of attracting business to and from important centres in the east and west to the National Transcontinental Railway, you will see at once the importance of these branch lines and the close relation between their construction and the construction and operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific itself.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend misapprehended my point. Every one knows these lines which are mentioned in the charter of 1906 are very important propositions involving connection between the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific and business centres in the Dominion. What I intended to say was that under the original charter of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the agreement made with the government certain lines were to be constructed on certain conditions and the company constructing them was to receive certain assistance from the government. The time limit within which these lines were to be completed is fixed in the contract. The point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) was, that the time limit fixed by this extension would mean that the undertakings in this Bill, which are entirely separate from the others, would not be completed until a time subsequent to that fixed by the original Act. I think I am correct in saying that the proposition to extend the time for completing the undertakings of the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company has very little relation to the completion of the undertakings mentioned in the original charter to which government assistance is to be given. I believe the country will regard the extensions proposed in this Bill as eminently reasonable. If the main line and the branches in the original charter are completed in 1910 the large and important branches contemplated in this Act, are completed in 1913, I think the country will be satisfied.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The extension of time asked for here is what is usually granted in ordinary cases and I am not arguing that it is unreasonable. It may be that there will be no detriment to the country if the important branches from Montreal, Ottawa, Regina, Calgary and Prince Albert, have no direct communication immediately with the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, for the reason that the main line may not be finished before 1913. It is desirable we should have some information on that point. At what date does the government anticipate that the whole line from Moncton to Prince Rupert will be completed and in operation? Has the government any information on the subject?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps the Minister of Railways may have information on this point but I have no recent information in regard to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the Minister of Railways be in soon ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think he will be here to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. Better let the Bill stand until he comes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, I think not.

Mr. SPROULE. Originally when we incorporated this company to build the branch lines, it is apparent from the wording of their Act that we had in view the fact that these branches were to be completed simultaneously with the completion of the main line. Now we extend the time for the building of these branch lines, but do not extend the time for the building of the main line. Surely this House ought to be informed by the government whether they anticipate that the main line will be finished within the time specified, and if so, what justification is there for extending the time for the building of the branch lines beyond the time when the main line will be completed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does not my hon. friend think that this is a matter that can safely be left to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company themselves, who are the most interested? For instance, it is of the greatest possible interest to the company to have immediate communication with the city of Montreal. In the same way it is of the greatest possible interest to the company that they should have immediate communication with the various towns in the prairie provinces. It seems to me that we can rest assured that the men in charge of that great enterprise will leave no stone unturned to secure communication with all these places in order to obtain traffic for the railway at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SPROULE. By the same reasoning you might say that we need not force the company to build branch lines at all, because it is to their interest to have communication with the great cities of the country; but, notwithstanding that, parliament steps in and says you must do so and so. Every company will hold off until it suits its own time and purpose to build, but that may not be for the best interest of the people, and we frequently compel these companies to go beyond what is their own judgment and desire. If the argument of the First Minister is correct, it would relieve this parliament of a great deal of the work we are in the habit of doing from year to year in the way of binding down these companies to do certain things in the interest of the people.

Bill reported without amendment, and read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 176) for the relief of Ada Keturah Stewart Paulding.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 177) for the relief of Mary Alexander.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 174) respecting certain patents of the General Chemical Company.— Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 175) for the relief of Catherine Ann Cannon.—Mr. Stewart.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ACTION FOR DAMAGES.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Was an action brought against the Intercolonial Railway by A. W. Belyea, of Moncton, in the Supreme court of New Brunswick, in May, 1907?
2. Was a verdict of $100 and costs rendered by the court against the Intercolonial Railway?
3. Has the amount been paid? If not, why not?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No, but action was brought against Wm. Perry, one of the Intercolonial constables.
2. No.
3. No.

LOGGIEVILLE PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Has the government employed a dredge belonging to A. & R. Loggie? If so, when, where and at what price?
2. What extensions have been added to the government wharf at Loggieville?
3. Have any private persons, firms or corporations been allowed to build extensions to the public wharf at Loggieville?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. No.
2. Cribwork face along the southwestern side of wharf, 150 feet long and consisting of four tiers of round timber, with stringers and cap. Work was performed by day's labour during August and September, 1907.
3. The department has no information to that effect.

LOBSTER FISHING LICENSES.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Have any persons or firms been refused licenses for lobster fishing during the seasons

of 1907 and 1908 in the counties of Restigouche, Gloucester and Northumberland, New Brunswick? If so, for what reasons?

2. Who are present holders of lobster fishing licenses for the county of Northumberland for 1908?

3. What precautions are taken to enforce the regulations as to size of lobsters taken by fishermen?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1 and 2. No. The department does not issue licenses for lobster fishing.

3. The policy of the department in this connection was explained in an answer given to a question in the House on the 10th February last as follows:

The difficulty which usually exists in the administration of the lobster regulations has recently been increased by a change in the United States law, which permits the importation of lobsters of smaller size than formerly, thus diminishing the supply available for the canneries. It is feared that the rigid enforcement of the size limit would prevent the canners receiving sufficient quantity of fish to carry on their business. The matter is now engaging the attention of the department and it is hoped that means may be found to harmonize the conflicting interests.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—MEDICAL FEES.

Mr. STAPLES—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. Was an order in council passed authorizing the contractors and subcontractors on the government section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to deduct a certain amount from the wages of each and all the workmen engaged upon such construction for medical fees?

2. If so, what was the date of such order and the amount each month to be deducted from the wages or salary of each man engaged upon such construction work?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. There has been no order in council passed with special reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The matter is governed by a general order in council made under the Public Works Health Act, chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

2. The third of March, 1906, 50 cents per month.

BRIER ISLAND FOG ALARM.

Mr. McLEAN (Queens) asked:

1. What system of fog alarm has recently been installed at Brier island, Westport, Nova Scotia, and what system did it displace?

2. Who was the contractor for construction of the works?

3. What is the total cost to date for the installation of said new system?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Compressed air diaphone replacing steam whistle.

2. The plant was purchased from the Canadian Fog Signal Company, Limited, of Toronto, and the work of installation was carried out by the department.

3. The price of the plant f.o.b. Toronto, was $13,040. To make the necessary changes in the building and instal machinery cost $5,000 including a new boiler at $1,200 which would have been required for the original plant if no change had been made.

PINETTE HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. McLEAN (Queens) asked:

1. Did the government receive petitions from the inhabitants of Pinette, Prince Edward Island, asking for the dredging of the harbour at that place?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to comply with the request of the people to dredge this important harbour this season?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. The matter is under consideration.

ST. MICHEL DES SAINTS POSTMASTER.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. Is Mr. Gaspard Denis postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, in the county of Berthier?

2. Is it true, as reported, that he neglects his official duties to work in elections?

3. Should not postmasters attend to their duty and serve the public irrespective of politics?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. No report to that effect and no complaint of any nature since the postmaster's appointment has reached the department.

3. Yes.

WESTVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. What is the total amount of contract for public building in course of construction at Westville, Nova Scotia?

2. Who were the tenderers for the work, and what was the amount of tender of each person tendering?

3. Is there any provision in contract for extras? If so, is there a specification for same, and what are the schedule of prices?

4. When is the work to be completed?

5. Who is the inspector of the work, and what was his usual occupation or business?

6. When was the inspector appointed, what is his rate of pay, how much has he been paid, and for what number of days has he been paid?

7. When was the work of construction commenced, and was it stopped or closed down during the winter? If so, for what length of time was it stopped or closed down?

8. Was the inspector paid for the time the work was stopped or closed down?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. $12,997.

2. E. F. Munro, New Glasgow, $12,997; Falconer and McDonald, Kentville, $17,300.

3. No.

4. Main contract for building, October 15, 1908.

5. (a) W. R. McKean. (b) carpenter and builder, and is engaged in that occupation at present.

6. (a) October 5, 1907. (b) $3.50 per day. (c) $721. (d) 206 days up to 30th of April last.

7. and 8. (a) Contract signed September 14. 1907. (b) and (c) No.

PATENTS FOR SECTIONS 10, 17, 17, WEST OF FOURTH MERIDIAN.

Mr. SCHAFFNER—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. When and to whom was patent granted for section 10, 17, 17 west of the fourth meridian?

2. How many applicants were there, what were the names of the applicants, and what was the date of each application?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Homestead entry has been granted for the four quarters of this section, but no patent has yet been given for the surface rights to any of the four homesteaders.

2. No patent has yet been granted for the mineral rights under the section in question, but there have been five applicants for these mineral rights as follows:

Sir A. T. Galt, February 24, 1902.
Frances Eyres, October 22, 1906, W. ½.
Maud M. Moore, October 22, 1906, E ½.
J. W. Knittel, January 18, 1907, E. ½.
W. J. Kennedy, January 18, 1907 W. ½.

SALE OF SECTIONS 22, 28 AND 32 WEST HALF 14, TOWNSHIP 13, RANGE 13, WEST SECOND MERIDIAN.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1 What were the reasons for the sale of sections 22, 28 and 32, west half 14, in township 13, range 13, west second meridian to Wm. G. Livingstone?

2. What were the considerations, conditions and prices obtained?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. In compensation for his claim for homestead and pre-emption entries for the S.W. ¼ of section 30 and the N.W. ¼ of section 19, township 6, range 4, west 1st meridan upon which he had made valuable improvements and which land was otherwise disposed of, as set forth in the order in council of the 4th June, 1902, copy of which is submitted

2. The lands in question were selected and sold under the order in council above referred to at the rate of $1 per acre on the usual terms of payment, namely, the whole of the purchase money at the time of the purchase, or one-quarter down and the balance in three equal annual instalments, with interest at 5 per cent per annum.

USE OF TRAP BAG NETS IN POKEMOUCHE RIVER.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. Is the government aware whether or not trap bag-nets are permitted on the Pokemouche river, Gloucester county, New Brunswick, in close season, contrary to the fishing regulations?

2. Is the government aware that those nets are said to catch smelts, bass, trout and other fish coming into the river?

3. How many bridges are there on the river and how many of them, if any, are blocked in this way with bag-nets in close season?

4. Is the government aware that it is asserted there are four such bridges, and that they are all blocked in this manner?

5. Is the government aware whether or not the overseer is cognizant of such reported infractions of the fishery law and regulations and whether or not he sanctions shipping fish so caught?

6. Is the government aware that complaints are said to have been made several times to the inspector of fisheries with regard to this matter, but without avail?

7. Who is the inspector of fisheries in charge of this district?

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

1. No.
2. No.
3. The department is not aware.
4. No.
5. Answered by No. 1.
6. No.
7. R. A. Chapman, Moncton, New Brunswick.

LIGHTING BUOYS ON RIDEAU CANAL.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. Has a contract been given to any person or persons for lighting buoys on Rideau canal between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids for season 1908? If so, to whom?

2. If contract is given, were tenders called for by public advertisement? If so, how many tenders were received, what are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender?

3. If no contract has been given, on what terms are buoys being lighted for season of 1908?

4. If no tenders were called for by public advertisement, why not?

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

1. Yes, to Byron McCaw of Smith's Falls, Ont.

2 and 3. Tenders were not invited this season. Tenders were publicly called for in 1907, and the tender of Byron McCaw being the lowest was accepted and a contract was entered into with him. The contract was renewed this season as the department had the option of continuing the contract for three years and the service given last year was satisfactory.

4. As the service was satisfactorily performed by Mr. McCaw last season and the department had the option of continuing contract, it was not considered necessary to invite new tenders this season.

MORNING SITTINGS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That from and after this date to the end of the session the rule of the House concerning the closing of the sitting on Wednesday at six o'clock, p.m., shall not apply; that from and after this date to the end of the session the House shall meet on every sitting day at eleven o'clock in the morning; that in addition to the usual intermission at six o'clock, p.m., there shall be also an intermission every day from one to three o'clock, p.m.; that government orders shall have precedence at all such sittings, members having still the right to ask questions on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays.

Mr. SPROULE. It sems to me that this is a little early for this motion, especially in view of the circumstances at present existing. We have been trying to go through the Order Paper to-day but how many answers have we had to these questions, how many ministers are in their seats? I presume the other ministers are away in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec to run the provincial elections, and there will necessarily be a large number of members out in the country during the present week, or until after the election, in both Ontario and Quebec. In view of that fact I think such a motion would have come very much better after this week because otherwise there will be a great deal of work under consideration of this House and perhaps much of it will be put through which many members who are absent would desire to discuss. It may facilitate the work a little, but there will be the disadvantage of having that work considered by very few members. Much of the work remaining to be done has not yet been placed before the House. The Civil Service Bill and some other Bills have not come down and if they are to be forced through the House in the absence of many members it is not doing justice to the members or to the people.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to observe that we are in the seventh month of the session. It is true that the House is not as full as it might be, but I have not observed of late that the House has taken advantage of the absence of members to rush the work, or to take any precipitate action and therefore I do not see that the complaints of my hon. friend come with any acceptance. If there are any matters that would be likely to suffer from the absence of members, of course they can be postponed until their return. I admit that there are more members absent than I would like but the circumstances are such that gentlemen on neither side of the House can quarrel with them or expect an early return. I hope that next week they will all be in their seats.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The motion is rather unusual in several respects; it proposes to practically abolish one of the rules of the House, that with regard to sittings on Wednesdays, for the remainder of this session. It does not seem to me that this is within the purview of a motion of this kind. We have a Committee on Standing Orders constituted early in the session. It is not proposed by this resolution to submit the change to the Committee on Standing Orders or any committee, it is simply proposed to abolish more than one of the rules of the House for the rest of the session. So far as morning sessions are concerned, that change has been made before and usually without objection. It is to be observed that the second rule of those which were adopted in 1907, provides as follows:

The time for the ordinary meeting of the House is at [illegible] o'clock in the afternoon of each sitting day, except Wednesday, when the time of meeting shall be 2 o'clock in the afternoon, and if at the time of meeting there be not a quorum, Mr. Speaker may take the Chair and adjourn.

There is express reference there to ordinary meetings of the House, leaving it open to inference at least that we may have an extraordinary sitting of the House at an earlier hour. But the remainder of that second rule is also significant.

When the House rises on Friday it stands adjourned, unless otherwise ordered, until the following Monday.

An express provision which enables it to be ordered that the House shall sit on Saturday and that Saturday shall be classed as one of the ordinary sitting days of the House.

But the rule in regard to Wednesday evening is couched in very different language. It is as follows:

If at the hour of six o'clock p.m., except on Wednesday, the business of the House be not concluded, Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair until eight o'clock.

At the hour of six o'clock on Wednesday, Mr. Speaker adjourns the House without question put. The House then stands adjourned until Thursday.

It does not seem to me to be a usual course and I doubt very much whether it is the proper constitutional course to undertake to repeal that rule simply on notice and by an ordinary resolution of the House. If that can be done, then almost anything in the way of variation of the rules can be done by such a motion. Take for example rule 21 :

(a) No member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood, but then he is not to introduce any new matter, and no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation.

It would be improper to provide by resolution of the House that this rule should not be applied or acted on for the remainder of any session, yet this would not be going any further than the Prime Minister goes in the motion now pending.

Subsection 2 of section 21 provides :

A reply shall be allowed to a member who has moved a substantive motion on the second reading of a Bill, but not to any member who has moved an order of the day, not being the second reading of a Bill, an amendment, the previous question, an adjournment during a debate, or an instruction to a committee.

Subsection 3 provides :

A reply shall be allowed to a mover of a substantive motion although the debate thereon, by being adjourned, becomes an order of the day

It would be a most unusual and, I should think, an impossible course to pass a resolution of the House that rules of that character should not apply during the remainder of any session, and looking at the remainder of these rules and the wording of rule 3, to which I have alluded it does not seem that this would be going further than is now proposed. Take rule 50 as another illustration :

Every Bill shall receive three several readings on different days, previously to being passed. On urgent or extraordinary occasions, a Bill may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in one day.

There is special provision for urgency for an extraordinary occasion and we, therefore, have the express provision for proceeding out of the usual course of the House which is not to be found in the rule which touches sitting on Wednesday evening. Rule 25 provides :

Every public Bill shall be read twice in the House before committal or amendment.

Would it be a proper, or even possible course to provide by motion that public Bills should be committed at once without a first or second reading? And yet, it would be going no further to do that than is now proposed by the Prime Minister.

Rule 54 provides that where a Bill is reported with amendments it is open to debate and amendment before it is ordered for third reading, but that if a Bill is ordered to be reported without amendments, it is forthwith ordered to be read the third time at such time as may be appointed by the House.

Then there is another consideration; there are several important committees of this House now dealing with questions which are of great interest to the public. There is the committee which is investigating the statements made by Major Hodgins with respect to the work of construction upon the Grand Trunk Pacific. There is the committee which is investigating the affairs of the Quebec Bridge Company. There are the ordinary committees of the House. For instance, there is the Public Accounts Committee—the Railway Committee, possibly, is about clear of its work—I do not know about that—but certainly the Public Accounts Committee, which is an important body, is engaged in work at the present time that is not likely to be completed before the end of the session. Hon. members of this House who are members of these committees or any of them will be obliged to attend to the work of these committees during the forenoon. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) reminds me that the Committee on Privileges and Elections also has some important matters before it, and it also meets in the forenoon. All of these committees must meet in the forenoon or on Wednesday evenings. The attendance in this House will be lessened by the number of gentlemen who are called upon to attend to their work in that connection or will have to abandon their work on the committee to come to this House. Then as the Prime Minister has pointed out, the attendance is not likely to be very large during the present week. Under these circumstances to ask the House to sit not only in the forenoon, but also on Wednesday evening as well, at a time like the present when there is so much work to be done outside the House, and when the attendance of members is likely to be small, seems to me very unreasonable and ought not to be persevered in at the present time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The objection raised by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that this is a motion to alter a rule seems to me, if I may say so, not absolutely serious. My hon. friend knows that this motion is not new; that it has been the practice of the House ever since the House began. The proceedings are set forth in the standing rules of the House, and these rules are made by authority of the House and can be repealed by the same authority. And some of them are repealed once or twice every session. Always the motion is made at this stage of the session to alter the rules so far as the sittings of the House are concerned. Take the rules mentioned by the hon. member—rules 50 and 52. Rule 50 provides :

Every Bill shall receive three several readings on different days previously to being passed. On urgent or extraordinary occasions, a Bill may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in one day.

That can be done without alteration of the rules.

Mr. FOSTER. It is provided for in the rule.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Therefore, a Bill can be advanced more than one stage in one day on urgent or extraordinary occasions. But if the occasion is not urgent or extraordinary a Bill cannot be advanced more than one stage in one day without a change of the rule. Rule 52 provides :

Every public Bill shall be read twice in the House before committal or amendment.

This is a standing rule of the House and can be amended the same as others, the same as the rule that the House shall sit at three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you amend this rule?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By resolution of this House. That has been done ever since the hon. gentleman came to this parliament, and before.

Mr. FOSTER. The rule as to the three readings?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The rule that provides that the House shall meet at three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. I am speaking particularly with reference to the rule providing for three separate readings of a Bill and the variation of the same. He says that that can be amended by the House. In what way?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By motion made in this House. Here is the rule :

The time for the ordinary meeting of the House is at three o'clock in the afternoon of each sitting day except Wednesday, when the time of meeting shall be at 2 o'clock in the afternoon——

This rule has neither more or less force than rule 52, for instance. Both are passed by the same authority. Yet ever since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) came to this House, and before either of us came here, this rule which provides for sitting at three o'clock has been amended by resolution of this House to provide that the meeting shall take place at eleven o'clock in the morning. Another rule provides that Saturday shall not be a sitting day. And yet, as my hon. friend knows, a resolution has been passed every session providing that the House shall sit on Saturday. These are all rules of the House for its guidance, and not one has more solemnity or force than any other. If one can be amended by resolution of this House any other can be amended in the same way. I need not quote precedents, for they are to be found in the records of every session since confederation, as we all know. And, with regard to the motion that I have now made, the same motion was moved by me last year in practically the same words, including a reference to Wednesday evening sittings. On April 2 last year I moved this motion as follows :

That commencing on Wednesday, the 3rd of April, to the end of the session, the rule of the House concerning the closing of the sitting on Wednesday at six o'clock, p.m., shall not apply, and that commencing with the same day, and until the end of the session, the House shall meet on that day and on each subsequent sitting day at eleven o'clock in the morning; that in addition to the usual intermission at six o'clock, p.m., there shall be also an intermission every day from one to three o'clock, p.m.; that government orders shall have precedence at all such sittings, members having still the right to ask questions on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays.

I do not know if my hon. friend has refreshed his memory by reference to the text-book. I have not done so for some time, but I am sure as I can be of anything that the text-books say that the rules of the House are made by the House and can be amended after ordinary notice. As to the propriety of making the motion at the present time, this is a motion to which the House has agreed every session when the business has reached a certain stage. We are now in the seventh month of the session, and I think that the time has come when we may reasonably ask the House to meet in the morning. The only point to be considered is whether it is convenient for the House to do so. The only inconvenience that I can see is in the fact that there is work yet to be done by the committees of the House. All the standing committees with the exception of the Public Accounts Committee have completed their business.

Mr. SPROULE. Three Bills were sent to the Private Bills Committee to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that they were Bills requiring much attention on the part of the members of this House. They are of a kind, I think, in which we are generally disposed to trust to the judgment of the House from which they come. The Public Accounts Committee has about completed its business.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, so I have been told, but I speak under correction; it may be that there is more business than I had thought. But let us say that the Public Accounts Committee may still require to sit. The Privileges and Elections Committee which is investigating the

matter of the disappearance of the Stanstead ballots cannot be called upon to do very heavy work in that connection; it cannot take up much time upon this question. The Quebec bridge investigation and the Hodgins investigation are matters on which I cannot give much information—these are special committees. We must do, as we have done in former sessions, give the committees the privilege of meeting during the sittings of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. The point raised by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) with reference to Wednesday night seems to me to be a new point, and the rule with reference to the recess on Wednesday night sees to be a special rule introduced in the regular manner after consideration by a committee of this House appointed to revise the rules. It seems to be rather an absolute rule. The purpose of it was to give an opportunity for members to have a break in the middle of the week's work which they could use for rest and recreation, or, if they chose—as I think most of the members have chosen—to get up work for the House.

The point is a fairly good one as to whether, if you propose to keep us here night and day to do that work there is not greater need for a break in the middle of the week than there is when you are doing the work in a more leisurely manner. After all the human machine can only do as much as it can do without suffering loss and hardship. The human machine can be tired out as well as any other. When we consider that when the committee which revised the rules thought that it would help the work of parliament to have a break on Wednesday night, so that members might have a chance to recuperate, or at any rate, be relieved from the driving work of the session, it seems to me that there is all the more necessity for a break when you attempt to apply more steam and to work for a greater number of hours per day. I make this plea simply because I am as anxious to get through the work of the House as any one else in the House, but I do not think we will help along the work and certainly not help the workers if we drive the machine unreasonably. I think the Prime Minister will find that he will get just as much work, when the added pressure is put on, by still allowing a break on Wednesday evening as he would if he attempted to keep the members here every day, day and night, two sessions in the day time and one in the evening with the attendant tiring and wearying. My right hon. friend knows what always happens when a deliberative, controversial assembly, besides having the objects of controversy before it, comes to them with tired brains, tired minds and tired tempers. I put that point before the Prime Minister and I would like to see him leave the Wednesday night out of the motion and still allow, for the present at least, that break. I believe that better business would be done in the House and that the motion would be more effective.

In reference to putting on the pressure at this time of the session, Mr. Speaker, if you take the government business alone, some of which we have before us and some of which we have not before us, the government business alone, if it is to be fairly met and fairly canvassed and if legislators are to do their duty, cannot be done in a week, or two weeks, or three weeks. See what there is. Take your Election Bill and, after June 8, when the Prime Minister comes to the conclusion that it is no longer necessary to push those obnoxious clauses and we go into the Bill as a whole, does not the Prime Minister see that if we are going to perform the promises that have been held out for five years with reference to a pure election Bill, there will be clauses to be enacted and certainly clauses to be discussed which will take time? It is impossible to put the Bill through with even the provisions that are anticipated in the Bill and the provisions in the Bill which were proposed by my hon. friend from Prince Edward county (Mr. Alcorn) and which are to be debated, without a great deal of discussion and a great deal of talk. Going to the country, as we are supposed to do under this new election Bill, we want the very best kind of a Bill and we want one which will promote the purity of elections and do away with the old abuses.

Then, you have not yet explained to the House probably a still more important Bill in its way than the Election Bill; that is the Civil Service Bill, I do not know what other members think of it, but for myself it seems to me that when we approach the making of a Civil Service Bill under the present conditions in Canada we are undertaking a great deal of labour which will not be well done if there is great haste, and if there is an inordinate pressure put upon the House. Yet here we are, as the Prime Minister says, in the seventh month of the session and we have not yet had the provisions of the Civil Service Bill explained to us. The Bill has not even been presented to the House. Some intimations have been received by members of the press as to what its provisions may be expected to be, but the House does not know and the country does not know. That is not the fault of the opposition at all and the Prime Minister must not put on his double and treble pressure with the idea of making the opposition foot up because of the long and inexcusable delay of the ministry in bringing down one of the most important Bills that has not yet been introduced in this the seventh month of the session. There is the Hudson's Bay railway; we have had an intimation in reference to it but we have no statement as to when this

measure will be brought down. It is not yet before the House. That will be an important Bill and the important question of ways and means, involving a great obligation on this country, has to be discussed. Then there is the Land Bill of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) which has just been introduced and which also is a fertile question of discussion. But, there is no use of mentioning others. Nearly all of the government legislation is as yet barely explained or unexplained in the seventh month of the session, and there is work to be done which requires better consideration than that which can be be given to it by jaded members working from 11 o'clock in the morning until midnight, as the right hon. Prime Minister proposes. Then, go to the work of the committees, which is just as important in its way as the work in the House. The Public Accounts Committee has business now before it to keep the members of the committee at work for a month or a month and a half, and it is almost impossible to do satisfactory work with committees and the House going on at the same time. There is the Committee on Banking and Commerce. That committee has had one wrestle with the Insurance Bill but that was only a preliminary wrestle. That committee does not yet know what the Bill is to be. It has simply heard the objections and heard the pleas, but it has not dealt with the Bill itself and everybody knows that the Insurance Bill is one of a controversial nature, and you cannot put it through in a day. The government saw fit to send it to the committee, but not a single clause of that Bill has as yet been put before that committee for discussion. We have simply had the hearings from the different societies and individuals who are interested in one or other of the phases of that Bill But, the Banking and Commerce Committee has not yet commenced the discussion of that Bill. It has to go through it clause by clause, the Bill has to be reported to the House and then it becomes government legislation coming before the House in the seventh or eight month of the session. That is an important committee and it is an important Bill which has to be threshed out. Taking all these things into consideration, taking into consideration the fact which was well put forth by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that, not of our own fault, we are in the throes of two provincial elections—one would have been enough, but the friends of the Prime Minister thought it would be better to have two going on at the same time and so they brought on the elections in the province of Quebec on the same date as those upon which the elections in Ontario are being held—I very much question the wisdom of the right hon. gentleman's motion. These elections take out the very strongest members from each side of the House. Do you propose this week to rush legislation of that important nature through the House when many hon. members are out of the House and when these contests are going on ? These are considerations which I thought would appeal to the Prime Minister and my suggestion would be that the Prime Minister do not put this into force for this week at any rate, and that if he does put it in force next week he should not cut out the Wednesday night recess. I am not objecting to trying to get through the work of the House just as quickly as possible; I want to do it. I would like to have a good long holiday before the elections come on and we cannot get that unless we can get through some time before the first of August.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite agree with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that there is a very considerable volume of legislation before the House, but I draw from that condition quite the opposite conclusion that my hon. friend has drawn. In a well organized factory, when the orders accumulate, the general rule is to work extra time and do the work.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not a well organized factory.

Mr. FIELDING. It is fairly well organized, except that it has always been assumed that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House would recognize their responsibilities and that the machinery would go on, but, it seems that there has been an erroneous impression in that respect. We cannot help that. But the rule in a well organized factory, when business increases, is to put on the hands for extra hours. They pay them extra. I do not suppose that we would expect an extra indemnity by reason of working extra hours, but I think the country will expect that if the factory at Ottawa is to do the business which is before it it should work extra hours.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The factory usually puts on extra hands.

Mr. FIELDING. It seems to me that if the number of hands were not sufficient that would be a good reason for working extra hours. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has alluded to the Wednesday evening meeting. I must say that the Wednesday evening adjournment is rather dear to my heart. I had the honour of proposing that to the committee ; I was the author of it. Early in the session we work along in a moderately easy way, but after we have passed the six months I think the public opinion of the country will say it is time that parliament may reasonably be called upon to work longer hours and finish its work. While I am a strong advocate of the Wednesday evening recess, still I would think that at this advanced stage of the session we

should relinquish it, and that we might work on Saturdays also close up to the hour when the Sabbath commences. It is true important Bills are yet to be brought forward, but that does not imply neglect on the part of the government, because there could be no object in bringing forward other legislation when no progress is being made with the volume of business already before the House. Important as these measures are to which reference has been made, the most important work of this House at present is the work of voting supplies for carrying on the King's government. In our judgment that is the most important work which this House requires to do now, and it is with the object of expediting this, and to prevent the embarrassment which will arise if there be delay in voting supplies, that we ask the House to put its utmost energy into the work before it. There has never been a moment from the first day of the session down to the present hour when there has not been an abundant programme of government business before the House, and if that programme has not been advanced more rapidly than some of us desired, we certainly believe it is not the fault of the government.

Mr. KEMP. There is yet a great deal of important work to be done in the Public Accounts Committee and the members of that committee cannot attend to it and to their duties in the House at the same time. To-day is nomination day for the provincial elections and there are a great many members absent who were they present would strongly protest against this proposal of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have said that we were near the end of this session.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that.

Mr. KEMP. The Prime Minister said that such a motion as this was customary when we came towards the end of the session, but there is an impression in my part of the country that we are not half through the session yet, and certainly if we do not make better progress than we have in the past that idea is perfectly correct. The Minister of Finance says it is important that the estimates be passed, but I am inclined to think it fortunate that these estimates have not been rushed through in view of the financial conditions which face the country. The revenue last month showed a decrease of one and three quarter million dollars as compared with the corresponding month of last year, and in my judgment that condition will continue for some time. I regret that the business of the country is bad and I hope it will improve, but my opinion is that there will not be very much improvement this year. I have great confidence in the future of the country, but still we must look forward to a decreasing revenue, and it is therefore necessary to carefully criticise these estimates. Indeed it may be advisable for the government to cut the expenditures down. Then there is the Insurance Bill and the Banking and Commerce Committee have not finished its work and cannot finish its work properly if there are to be morning sittings. I thought this session was to be a sort of Insurance Bill session, but we have treated it very lightly so far and justice cannot be done to it now. There is the Civil Service Bill and there is the Election Bill, and there are twenty-two other government measures on the Order Paper. All these matters must receive careful consideration. While it may be necessary to pass such a motion as this in the closing weeks of the session, this is not the proper time to present it. In view of the fact that so many members are absent to-day and will be absent during the coming week, the time is inopportune for the Prime Minister to propose this motion, and I would urge on him that he should leave it over for at least a week.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I think the Prime Minister is unfair to the members of this House and especially to the members of the opposition in trying to press this motion at this stage. Such a motion is usually made during the last two or three weeks of the session, but even if one or two of the most contentious measures proposed by the government were dropped entirely, there is sufficient on the Order Paper and sufficient work promised by the govment to take up the time of the House for at least six weeks longer. Suppose the Election Act were entirely withdrawn I do not see how it would be possible to finish the work of the session in less than six weeks from this date. Last year the Prime Minister made a similar motion on the 3rd of April and parliament prorogued on the 28th but I am quite sure there will be no prorogation this year within the next month. The Finance Minister has said that the most important thing for the House to do at present is to pass the estimates, which looks as if we would have supply every day this week. It is the members on this side of the House who most largely discuss the estimates.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman says 'hear, hear,' but are not the members supporting the government interested in seeing the expenditures of this country properly criticised? They ought to be interested but in practice they would vote $90,000,000 in two hours if they had their way, so long as it went to their own constituencies. It is rarely we hear adverse criticism of the estimates from members on the other side and as many hon. gentlemen will be absent during the coming week, any proposal to rush through legislation and es-

timates without proper criticism cannot be defended. It is not the fault of the opposition that the session has been long. The government promised several Bills in the speech from the Throne and these Bills have not yet seen the light of day. The Boundary Bill for the province of Manitoba was promised but it has not been submitted to the House yet. I do not know what the character of the Bill may be, but I do say that if it does not meet with the wishes of the people of the west it will prove to be a most contentious measure. Then there is the voluminous and contentious Land Bill of the Minister of the Interior which was left over last session and which was brought down only last week. That Bill will require a great deal of discussion. If we are to have morning sessions and if there is no guarantee that we will not have to sit until long after midnight as was the case during the last two weeks, then I say the proposal is unfair to the members of the opposition. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are engaged in the Ontario and Quebec provincial elections this week; they no doubt believe they are fighting the battle of their country in their respective constituencies, and I do not think we should be compelled to recall our forces from these provinces in order to properly criticise legislation. The Prime Minister is very unfair in bringing this resolution forward when so many members of the House are absent. I was not a very enthusiastic supporter of the Wednesday night holiday, but, after having had some experience of it, and knowing how beneficial it is to members who do not spend the time in social functions, as many of us do not, to have this opportunity to prepare their work for the balance of the week, I for one, think that if this motion passes, the Wednesday night sittings should be omitted. Personally I enter my earnest protest against this motion passing at the present time. I think we shall do as much work if the Prime Minister postpones it for another week, when all the members will be here, and supply and the various matters of legislation that are to come forward, will receive a fair amount of criticism.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. It is almost impossible to understand the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite; for they dwell on the large quantity of work that is to be done before this session's conclusion. and from that premiss they argue that we should stop working or do as little as we possibly can. They tell us that we should not sit in the mornings or on Wednesdays, or indeed at any time unless we cannot help it. We are informed that our constituents all over the country are getting up earlier in the morning and working later at night at this season of the year in their ordinary avocations, and they naturally believe that their representatives in parliament ought to be at least as assiduous in attending to the public business of this country. But when we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that there is a great deal of work to be done and that therefore we should stop working, one is rather at a loss to understand them. I am surprised that my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), who very rarely honours this House with his presence, and whose attendance on the committees is even more rare——

Mr. KEMP. Entirely mistaken.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD—should take that position. As one who comes from a distant province, and who has some business interests at home—and there are, I am sure, a great many members in the same position —I feel that the time has come in this session when every member of the House should apply himself with the greatest possible assiduity to the public business in order that the session should be brought to an end. After six or seven months absence from home, I think we have reached a stage when we should give up our Wednesday evenings, and get up earlier in the morning in order to get the public business attended to. Hon. gentlemen who can go home for a day or two at any period of the session, and whose business interests are not suffering by their attendance at parliament, can very easily talk about taking things easily; but members from distant provinces are not in that position, and it is by the greatest possible sacrifice of our business interests that we are kept here so long. The hon. member for East Toronto, in expressing his desire to scrutinize the estimates more closely, is at variance with the whip of the party, who said the other night that they would pass these estimates in a few minutes if certain things were done.

Mr. KEMP. What did he say?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. He was perfectly willing to pass all the estimates in a few minutes if something was done that suited him.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. No, he was not.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. This is what the whip of the party said, as you will find if you look at 'Hansard' on page 9529:

Mr. TAYLOR. They will not go through now. Let the government withdraw clauses 1 and 17 of the Election Bill, and they will get their estimates in a very few minutes.

Mr. BARR. Is not the hon. gentleman aware that it was only the estimates then before the House, not the whole of the estimates, that he referred to?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Dufferin has developed a great deal of wisdom and inscrutable knowledge since he has been in this House, and he seems to be able to tell us what the hon.

member for Leeds was thinking about. As a rule, we are accustomed to take words spoken in the House as meaning exactly what they say, and the words of the hon. member for Leeds indicated the most delightful willingness on the part of himself and his hon. friend to pass all the estimates of this government in a few minutes if something were done that suited him. I am surprised, therefore, that the hon. member for East Toronto, who does not honour the House with his genial presence very often, and who has manifested such a strong desire to scrutinize the estimates, should be at variance with the gentleman who whips him and the other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. In regard to the work still to be done, our hon. friends have somewhat exaggerated the work still before the committees. Hon. gentlemen who attend the Public Accounts Committee will agree with me, I think, that the work of that committee has been very long and laboured, and that to-day only the fag-end of it remains. Indeed, it has sat for two or three days dealing with matters that ought not to be before that committee at all. From the order paper and from the expressions of opinion given informally by hon. gentlemen opposite in the committee, there cannot be much work left for it to do. At any rate, there is no reason why hon. gentlemen should not apply themselves more assiduously at this season of the year and at this stage of the session to the public business of this country in order that it should be closed up as speedily as possible. The country expects it of us. The busy people of this country expect their representatives to attend to their business. It seems to me that the motion of the right hon. leader of the House is not made a moment too soon, and that the House should in its own interest and in the interest of the country adopt it.

Mr. BARR. My hon. friend says that he cannot understand the arguments of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. All I can say is that they are very clear and lucid, and if he cannot understand them, we cannot undertake to supply him with brains for that purpose. With reference to the statement of our whip, he distinctly stated that if hon. gentlemen opposite would do away with the obnoxious Election Bill, which I venture to say has shocked not only the members of this House, on both sides, but the country at large, we would pass these estimates. that is, the estimates then before the House.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Oh, no; read the words.

Mr. BARR. I have read them, and the hon. gentleman can read them at his leisure. As the discussion of the estimates is the only power we have in our hands, we are quite justified if we take longer time than is necessary under these circumstances; and I venture to say that nine-tenths of the free and independent electors of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, will say that the opposition are only doing their duty in fighting that obnoxious Bill by any power within their reach. With regard to the motion before the House, I venture to say that if you look over the history of the Dominion of Canada, you will not find any parallel case, either in the Dominion parliament or in any provincial parliament, in which the members are asked to double up their work, and work night and day at this stage of the business. It does not matter how long we have been here. If we have been six months, we cannot help that. The country demands that we as its representatives scrutinize not only the estimates, but every Bill that comes before the House, whether it takes six months or eight months or the rest of the year; and while we are all desirous of shortening the session as much as possible, we feel that we have a duty to our country and our constituents. Medical men at any rate know that we cannot scrutinize the estimates or the legislation that comes before this House as well if we spend twenty hours of the day at work, as we could if we took a reasonable rest; and in my opinion more progress would be made if we went on in the even tenor of our way, at least for the present, working reasonable hours. When we look at the amount of work still before us, we cannot come to any other conclusion than that the session has just commenced, because the work to be done is much more than the work we have accomplished during the past six months; and if we have to spend the rest of the year here, it is only our duty to do so, however anxious we may be to return to our homes. It is an utter impossibility to shorten the work by compelling the members to work under greater pressure for three or four months. In my opinion the present is not an opportune time for bringing in a motion of this kind, as the members from Ontario and Quebec are necessarily absent.

Many members from Ontario and Quebec are necessarily away, and so far as Quebec is concerned, the hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for their absence as we know that if the mandate had not gone down from here the elections in Quebec would not be on to-day. But, the government, knowing the defeat that stares them in the face in Ontario, the sweep that will be made there a week from to-day, felt that Quebec might and as we believe will follow suit, although probably not to the same extent. But still the government said: Let us have the downfall all together, and then the country will not have two opportunities of passing judgment upon us. Under these circumstances, the government may well move carefully until they see the result of the elections and probably they

may change their minds as far as that obnoxious Bill is concerned and become more reasonable in many things. I believe they are heartily ashamed of sections 1 and 17 of the Election Bill and are anxious to get out of it in some way. They could do this very easily if they waited until after the provincial elections. Then probably if they desire it we will work longer hours. Under these circumstances I think it would be in the interest of the House if at least the Wednesday night should not be taken away and also if one week respite should be given before starting the morning sessions.

Mr. LAKE. Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised at the speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald). He never rises without indulging in personalities and usually manages to place a very false construction on statements made. I shall not follow him in his personalities but I wish to correct his construction of statements of hon. gentlemen on this side. We have never suggested that there should be a stoppage of work altogether or additional holidays. All we have done is to protest against the proposal of the government being adopted at this moment, when there is such an enormous amount of work yet to be done. The hon. gentleman spoke of our constituents who are putting in very much longer hours of work than are members of this House. The hon. member could not have been quite serious in that suggestion or else he must have forgotten that there are committees of this House which meet practically every morning in the week, and that in addition there is a great deal of correspondence to which every member has to attend. The hours of work of members of parliament are far in excess of those of almost any other class of the population of Canada.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) puts some blame on the opposition for the delays which have taken place in connection with some legislation which has been brought before the House. But we must remember that the insurance legislation, which will require the very serious consideration of this House and previous to that the serious consideration of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, has not yet come before that committee for their consideration and report, and this surely is not the fault of the opposition but of the government. The Prime Minister has said that we are in the seventh month of the session. That carries with it the further thought that after we have been in session for six months the government has not yet brought down an important measure which was promised in the speech from the Throne, the Manitoba Boundaries Bill which is likely to cause a very large amount of discussion. Then again only within the last few days has that important and very contentious Bill the Dominion Lands Act been brought down. These and the Civil Service and other Bills which the government have promised, have not yet been brought down and they will have to be gone into very thoroughly by every member if we are to get the best legislation possible under the circumstances. I do not see how this will be possible if we are to attend to committee meetings in the mornings and also to our correspondence. If the Prime Minister had included a provision that the House should rise at midnight each night there might have been a better disposition on the part of members towards his proposal, but we know that members will be kept busy from 9.30 in the morning until perhaps 3 or 4 the next morning with the usual short intermissions for luncheon and dinner. It seems to me to be not quite fair to the members. I would point out that from the wording of the motion, taken in connection with the rules of the House, there would appear to be no intermission for dinner on Wednesday evening.

I hope that the Prime Minister will agree to an amendment which I propose to move as follows:

> That the said motion be amended by striking out the words "from and after this date" wherever they occur therein, and by substituting therefor in each case the words 'from and after Monday next.'

That, at any rate will give an additional week for the members of the House to come in from the various districts in Ontario and Quebec where so many of them are to-day performing what are after all very important duties.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire to endorse what has been said by members on this side, certainly with regard to the evening recess on Wednesday. If it is intended to force the work of the House morning, afternoon and evening, certainly the Wednesday evening recess is more important at this time in relation to the health of members alone than in the earlier part of the session when members are not so pressed and so much driven with work. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has given a clear statement of the number of government Bills that have not yet been presented. There are several Bills not yet introduced, government measures, which it is to be presumed, the government intend to press. It looks a good deal like coercion, like tyranny, for the Prime Minister and members on the government side, at such a time as this, especially, with so many members of the House absent, to force such a proposal as this upon members affecting their attendance in the House. Members will be expected to assemble at eleven o'clock in the morning and to remain here all day,—and at what time late at night or early in the morning the House will adjourn nobody can tell; if the practice is

continued which has held for some time in the past, it will be two, or three, or four o'clock in the morning before members leave this House. How can it be expected that we can give that attention to measures coming before the House, whether estimates or Bills, that we should give if we are kept at such high pressure of work as the Prime Minister proposes ? I think it ought only be necessary to bring these points to the attention of the leader of the House to have him forego his intention of pressing this motion at this time. The amendment to postpone this proposal for a week's time, I think, is asking little enough. At least, we may expect that, after this week more members will be in harness here and the work can be divided, thus relieving the pressure upon each member. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who is always interesting in his remarks though somewhat imaginative as to facts, referred to a remark made the other night by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). That hon. member is now in his place and will be able to explain what he really meant when he said that if certain action was taken with regard to the Elections Bill the estimates would be put through in two minutes. I am sure that he referred only to the item then before the committee. But, as he is here, he will be able to explain. I once more appeal to the Prime Minister and his supporters to allow this motion to be postponed for a week. If at that time it is considered necessary to bring it in again, the members on both sides will be in a better position to share the irksome work which long hours of attendance in this House will involve.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Whenever this motion is made, the intention of the government is to try to meet the wishes of members on both sides, and I do not approach the consideration of the matter in any other spirit to-day. I was impressed with the statements made by several hon. members, particularly by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as to the value of the recess on Wednesday evening. Therefore, if it be agreeable to my hon. friend on the other side, I will move an amendment to the amendment that the first words of the motion, relating to Wednesday evening, shall not apply. I do not say but that later on, if the work presses, we may be obliged to propose Wednesday evening sittings, but, for the present, we will give hon. gentlemen the advantage of the rest on Wednesday evenings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that is a fair proposition.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps, I misunderstood the Prime Minister. Does he propose to abandon the idea of Wednesday night sittings ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To leave the rule as to Wednesday as it is.

Mr. SPROULE. And to apply the rest of the motion ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I frankly confess that I do not feel like agreeing with that. So far as it goes, it is right enough, but I wish to make one or two observations on the proposition. The motion for morning sittings is generally made when practically all the committee work of the session is ended. So long as the commttees have work in hand, the forenoon is needed by hon. members to attend to that work and to correspondence. The First Minister says he made this motion last year at a certain time. But when he made it, practically all the committee work was over. Is that the position to-day ? I think there is scarcely a committee of this House which has finished its work. A number of important committees are engaged in their work as vigourously now as at any time during the session. The Public Accounts Committee has enough to do for three months, should the session last that long ; and the committee will have to work with greater expedition than hitherto if they are to get through by the time the session may be expected to close. As to the Private Bills Committe, we sent to-day four Bills to that committee to consider. The Prime Minister intimated that these are divorce Bills on which not much time is spent by the committee. But I can remember divorce Bills coming before that committee on which witnesses were called and a great deal of time spent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Invading the privileges of the Senate.

Mr. SPROULE. We have the same right to call witnesses as the Senate have. I remember that, in the case of one Bill that was before us some years ago we called witnesses some of whom had not been called before the Senate Committee. And the Private Bills Committee may decide to do the same in the case of some of these Bills which are now sent for their consideration. Then we have business before the Privileges and Elections Committee. I assume that it will not take them very long to dispose of that work. Still, it takes a week or ten days to deal with almost any cases that may come before the committee. There are still some Bills to go before the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, Then, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said, if the Banking and Commerce

Committee is to deal with the Insurance Bill at all every clause of that important measure must come under the consideration of the committee. The Banking and Commerce Committee has a large membership, and those who are members of it will desire to carefully consider the insurance Bill clause by clause. And we have had no intimation that that Bill is not to go on; the assumption is that it will go on. We have the committee on Agriculture and Colonization—that committee also has not finished its work. As to the Hodgins inquiry, I was told by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) the other day that it is likely to continue for a week or ten days, or two weeks, as far as he can judge, although the committee are hurrying the business on. The Quebec Bridge inquiry will take a considerable length of time if any thing like a proper investigation is made. With all these committees engaged in important work, it must be that a large number of members will be occupied in the forenoon. How is it possible for the House to go on with its regular work at eleven o'clock when so many members who ought to be here are engaged in committees? Sometimes the rule is suspended and committees are allowed to go on with their work while this House is sitting. That is an injustice to members of the House and to the country, as all members ought to be present when business is before us. Besides that, during the present week—during which it is proposed that this motion be left in abeyance—more than half the members are likely to be absent. I counted the attendance here a short time ago and, all told, only forty members were present. Is it reasonable that the business of this House should be carried on with less than one-fifth of the membership of the House in attendance? I contend that it would be much more reasonable to carry out the suggestion I made some time ago and have this House adjourn for a week until the pending elections are over.

A large number of members will be absent and the important work that ought to be considered by all the members cannot be considered when three-fourths of them are absent as they are during the present week. In addition to that, and in addition to the committee work, to force this on during this week when there will not be one-fifth of the members present, is an injustice to the country and it is performing the functions of parliament in a very improper way. The motion is a very improper one. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) intimated that the business of the House is not going on very actively, that it is rather retarded. I would like to ask him if there is any member of this House who has contributed more to retarding the proper and legitimate business of the House than the hon. gentleman himself? I have sat in the Public Accounts Committee day after day when we did not do as much work in a week as we ought to have done in a day. About three members obstruct the work of that committee, and he was one of the most active in doing it. Had the members of that committee been able to do their work as they ought to have been without any improper interference or obstruction, the work would not be, as it is to-day—only partially done. It would have been comparatively all done and we would have been in a position to abandon it and apply ourselves to the work of this House. Owing to the special situation to-day this motion should not be pushed. It is a fact that these committees have not their work done, they have a large amount of important work to be done and until that work is done the House cannot properly sit in the forenoon, or otherwise the committees cannot do their work. You are taking men away from the House who ought to be here for the consideration of important Bills and estimates. We ought to have a delay for at least one week. Then the Prime Minister ought to consider whether we would not be just as far on with the business in two or three weeks hence if we adjourned the House for one week until these elections are over. I do not believe it would be doing justice to the country to push this work through when so many members are away, and I do not think it would retard the progress of the session much if we were to adjourn. Members would then be present and be able to attend to their work. In view of these features of it I would respectfully urge upon the First Minister that it is not enough to abandon the proposal to take Wednesday night, but that it is eminently proper and desirable that this motion should be delayed for one week until the members have returned.

Mr. ALCORN. One point which is very material to be considered seems to me to have been almost lost sight of. It was possibly referred to in general terms at the beginning of the debate, but it has not been mentioned since, and that is whether the House has the right to pass a motion of this kind if it be objected to by a substantial number of members, if not by one member. Let me draw attention to the fact that the rules of the House contain no provision for the abrogation or even suspension of any of its rules, and if one rule may be suspended or abrogated the whole of them may be by the same motion. They contain no provision for the abrogation or suspension of any one rule except under certain circumstances with regard to private Bills. Clearly if, on a motion not unanimously assented to, any one standing order of the House may be sus-

pended or abrogated, we might wipe out the whole body of them by a bare majority. I think the Prime Minister will probably do well to carefully consider that point and withhold his motion until he is satisfied that upon a motion which is not unanimously agreed to, but which is seriously objected to, he can suspend a rule of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not present, but I have been informed since I came in that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) made the statement that I said a few nights ago that if the government would withdraw clauses 1 and 17 of the Election Act they would get their whole estimates through in two minutes. I certainly did not say that in the light in which the hon. gentleman puts it. We were then discussing the estimates of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and I made the suggestion that if these clauses were withdrawn he could have the pay for the men for whom he was making his appeal in a couple of minutes. I believe that the opposition have allowed since I have been absent from the House this amount to pass through. But I made no reference to the general estimates that are yet to come down. It was simply because of the appeals that have been made to us by the Minister of Customs. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), during the debate, threw the taunt across the floor of the House that the opposition had been obstructing business for the last six months. That cannot possibly be the fact, because if you take up 'Hansard' and measure it you will find that hon. members supporting the government have occupied more than half of the 'Hansard' from the commencement of the session up to the present time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What will you bet?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not a betting man, but I will make the statement that if my hon. friend takes the 'Hansard' and measures it he will find that the government and their supporters have occupied a greater number of pages than the opposition have done during the entire session. Therefore, we are not to be taunted with having obstructed because there have been many valuable speeches made from this side of the House to enlighten the country. Read these speeches made by members of the opposition and compare them with the balderdash we have heard from the other side of the House—nothing but trash, save and except a few speeches made by members of the government. But those speeches made by the back benchers bear no comparison with the brilliant speeches made upon this side of the House. Yet the hon. Minister of Finance gets up and taunts us with obstructing the House. All the speeches from this side have been made to educate the people of the country and the people of the country have been educated, but the speeches made from the opposite side of the House were simply to obstruct or kill time and to show that the Conservative government was as bad as the present government twelve or fifteen years ago. But we are not to be charged with having obstructed this House for six months or even one month. We have an objection and we are going to maintain our objection. I went back to my constituents and they told me to stay here until Christmas if it were necessary to have eliminated the inquity of clauses 1 and 17 of the Election Bill. My constituents are willing to raise a subscription to pay my board if necessary to keep me here until Christmas in order to see that the ballot shall not be tampered with and that the province of Manitoba shall not be singled out. Manitoba is peopled mostly by the sons of Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces, the men who opened up and developed that country, and now, because this government, through the North Atlantic Trading Company, have transported into that country a lot of Doukhobors and—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is wandering a little too far from the subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. I saw in the newspapers that the right hon. gentleman had given notice that he was going to take Wednesday night. I have no objection to take Wednesday night commencing at a reasonable hour in the day. I do not think that any one objects, if the rule can be broken. In order to expedite the business I would be willing that the government should take Wednesday with the condition that we commence at eleven o'clock in the day, as soon as the committee work is through, and continue until twelve o'clock at night and not be forced to sit until five o'clock in the morning as we were last week. I do not think our constituents expect us to remain here until five o'clock in the morning as it must be injurious to the health of every hon. member who is confined to this box of a chamber—it is nothing else—from three o'clock in the afternoon until five the next morning. I think it is dangerous to the health of every hon. member, but I would be willing, if my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agree to it, to give up Wednesday night provided we sit until twelve or one o'clock.

Mr. PATERSON. How do you feel on the customs estimates now?

Mr. TAYLOR. Just as I felt the other night.

Mr. PATERSON. In two minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, well, the Minister of Customs got a portion of his estimates with-

out dropping clauses 1 and 17 of the Election Bill, as I wanted him to do. He made such a strong appeal to our leader that I understand he consented to pay the boys in the outside service. But we have lots of more estimates to pass yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Lots of them.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not get all mine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just whenever the Prime Minister carries out the bargain there will be no obstruction of the estimates so far as I am concerned.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to correct the statement made by the hon. member for Leeds when he said that the greater part of the time of this House has been taken up by members supporting the government. I had the curiosity to figure up the number of columns of 'Hansard' which were occupied by the debate on the Election Bill and I find that the members of the opposition are eighty-two columns ahead. If they don't believe me they can count it up for themselves.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend cannot contradict me because I referred to the whole session and not to the debate on one Bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. And if you count it up you will get the same result for the entire session.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, do not contradict me until you do count.

Mr. KENNEDY. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) took sixty-three columns of 'Hansard' in that debate.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). And he did it in about half the time that some of your men took, so that no time was lost there.

Mr. KENNEDY. If some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House were in the position that I and other members from the far west are in they would be glad to adopt any means to bring the session to a close. We have been six months away from our homes and our business; we cannot run home every week and attend to our private affairs as can the hon. member for Leeds and others who live near Ottawa. We have to leave our business aside for months to attend to the business of the country and we would like to see the country's business disposed of in a businesslike way. I cannot for the life of me understand how it is that this House can be held up by a minority. That puzzles me. I always understood that one of the fundamental rules of our constitution was that we should have government by majority, government by the people and for the people. Each one of us here is returned by a majority of the votes in our constituencies and why the majority in this House cannot rule is something that I don't understand. So far as the Election Bill is concerned there is supposed to be a deadlock in connection with it——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be well to confine the discussion to the question before the House.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, I was a little afraid I would be out of order, but so many others have offended in that respect that I thought I would be quite safe in doing so too. However, I will give my views on that question at another time.

Mr. LEFURGEY. When the hon. member for Pictou complained about the long hours he is devoting to the interests of the country and the hardship of his being away from his home it reminded me of a statement made by the sitting member who was seeking re-election in a constituency in Prince Edward Island, and when he made the same complaint about long hours in parliament and the misfortune of his being absent from his private business, an elector at the back of the hall called out: You have done so much in that line that you had better stay at home altogether next time. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many important measures before the House and there is a great deal of important business to be transacted by the committees, and in view of this the motion of the Prime Minister is inopportune and unreasonable especially as only about one-fifth of the members of the House are present to-day. These gentlemen are in their constituencies in Ontario and Quebec attending to the interests of the country in the provincial elections and I believe the people of Canada will look upon it that the Prime Minister is unfair in taking advantage of the existing conditions, especially in view of the fact that there is to some extent a deadlock between the parties on account of the injustice which the government is trying to force on the province of Manitoba. I think the Prime Minister might very well accept the amendment of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister has been very reasonable with reference to the Wednesday night recess, and I have no doubt his decision in that respect will be helpful to the convenience of the House. If the right hon. gentleman would consent to allow this motion only to come into effect on Monday next I think it would contribute to the good nature and the good work of the whole House. It would also tend to facilitate the work of the committees and I think it would be a reasonable concession for the right hon. gentleman to make.

Mr. BRISTOL. The motion of the Prime Minister is inopportune and it is especially

inopportune if it is to come into effect before next week. There is a great deal of work to be done in the Public Accounts Committee and it is inexpedient that that committee should sit during the morning sittings of the House. I believe the right hon. gentleman would better serve the end he desires to achieve by not pressing this resolution at present. Am I right in assuming that the original motion is amended by striking out the words from the first word 'that' in the first line down to and including the word 'apply' in the third line ?

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that the amendment is still before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the amendment was to be dropped and the original motion amended.

Mr. SPROULE. The amendment to the amendment was that the original motion be amended in that direction.

Mr. SPEAKER. No amendment in amendment has been moved as yet, and I have been trying to get the sense of the House in regard to the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will move the amendment as an amendment to the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it would be possible for the right hon. gentleman to move an amendment to a motion originally made by him. I thought the sense of the House was that the amendment be dropped, and the original motion altered by striking out all the words from and including the first word down to and including the word 'apply' in the third line.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The motion says that the House shall sit on every sitting day at 11 o'clock and that there shall be an intermission from 1 to 3 o'clock. Does that include Wednesdays ?

Mr. FIELDING. There will be no reference to Wednesday if the words are stricken out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, but if the motion is left in that form we would rise at 1 o'clock on Wednesdays and then meet at 2 o'clock. If the motion is intended to include Wednesday, it should provide for an intermission every day, including Wednesday. We meet on Wednesday at 2 o'clock, and you are not abrogatng that rule.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It seems to me the amendment is not necessary, but I have no objection to add the words 'including Wednesday.'

Mr. SPROULE. The amendment to the motion is still before the House—to suspend this for a week.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it is withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER. By consent I understand the amendment is withdrawn and the original motion is altered by striking out the words from 'that' to 'apply,' inclusive, and by inserting the words 'inclusive of Wednesday.'

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended, agreed to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

On government orders being called :

MEETING OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

On government orders being called.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the government orders are called, I would draw the attention of the government to the fact that the Public Accounts Committee has been called for 11 o'clock to-morrow morning and will be unable to sit under the resolution which was passed to-day unless another resolution is adopted empowering them to sit during the sessions of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. The suggestion is one in which I quite concur, but I would prefer to have it come from the chairman of the committee who is not present. An hon. member suggests that a shorter way would be to have the notices sent out for ten o'clock, then the committee could have an hour and could apply to the House for permission to sit during the sittings of the House, which would be the regular mode of procedure. Perhaps in a later stage of the evening we could arrange the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very good, with that understanding ; but the motion will have to be made at some time or another.

Mr. FIELDING. It would have to be made before the House adjourns, with the Speaker in the chair.

SUPPLY—DUTY ON LUMBER.

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

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). I wish to bring before the attention of the House the question of the duty on lumber coming from the United States into Canada. It is not my intention to-night to propose a motion on the matter or to bring on a general discussion ; my object in bringing it up is to direct the attention of the government to the existing condition of affairs in the hope that they will see their way clear to remedy the existing grievance. If this is not done then we might feel in duty bound to take the matter up at a later stage of the session and to press it more closely upon the attention of the government. At the present time lumber

from the United States or any foreign country enters Canada free of duty. On rough lumber from Canada to the United States there is a duty of $2 a thousand feet which is a practical handicap upon the Canadian lumber entering that country. The industry in Canada to-day employs between 65,000 and 75,000 men, according to the season. represents a population of about 300,000 to 400,000 souls, depending upon the lumber industry in Canada for a livelihood. Not only are these directly concerned in the lumber industry, but indirectly the financial institutions of the country, the railways, the mercantile, manufacturing and farming communities all doing business with the lumbermen, are all very deeply interested in the success of that industry. In addition to those I have named as persons employed in the industry exclusively there are a great many farmers' sons and labouring men in all parts of the country who, when the winter approaches, having no work at home on the farms during the long period of winter, find employment in the lumber camps at the nearest point where there are lumbering operations, travelling sometimes hundreds of miles to obtain work. So these are employed indirectly for a period of six months or so every year in the lumber woods.

In order to show the growth of the import of lumber, I would point out that in 1908, the year just closed, there were imported into the Dominion of Canada lumber and lumber materials of the value of $12,730,000. The total product of the Dominion of Canada is estimated this year to be considerably less than $100,000,000. Therefore about one dollar's worth was imported to each eight dollars manufactured in Canada. The value of the imports of lumber from the United States increased from $2,904,000 in 1896 to the enormous sum of $12,730,000 in the present year. Of that $12,730,000, $2,800,000 was dutiable and $9,930,000 free.

The wages paid to lumbermen in the district which I have the honour to represent a year ago were $35 a month. They have now fallen to between $20 and $25 a month, and there is every reason to believe that in the very near future the wages will fall still lower. Therefore we have an army of about 70,000 able bodied men with their families who are entitled to live in decency in Canada on the verge of being reduced upwards of fifty per cent in their wages. More than that, very many of these men are being turned out of employment. It is a very serious matter in many parts of the country.

To show you the extent to which the lumber industry is affected by legislation I would remind the House that in Ontario until recent years there was nothing in the license granted to the lumberman requiring him to manufacture his lumber in the Dominion of Canada. He could put it into the rivers, float it down to the navigable waters and then tow it across to United States centres. That was done in the Midland and Lake districts and the logs were towed to Bay City, Saginaw and Tonawanda, there to be cut up into lumber, and Canada lost the benefit of the employment of that labour. This was the case all through the Georgian Bay and Midland districts of Ontario. Home after home was closed up, families had to move to the United States in order to obtain the wherewithal to live. The Hon. Mr. Whitney took the matter up and raised a very serious agitation, which forced the government of the day to place a clause in the contract requiring the lumberman to cut the lumber in the province of Ontario. Immediately, as if by magic, prosperity returned to the old towns along the Georgian Bay shores and through the Midland district of Ontario, wherever there was a lumbering centre, and our merchants, bankers, farmers, railways, every one in Canada has been more or less beneficially affected by that action in requiring these logs to be cut in Canada. I am satisfied that if a duty were placed upon lumber and timber coming from the United States into Canada it would have a similar effect throughout Canada. At the present time there is a great cry for Georgia pine in Canada. I know that a bridge was erected between Lindsay and Peterborough a few years ago by the Grand Trunk Railway of this imported pine. That bridge is to be replaced this year. Until recently our contractors and the constructors of bridges and those large works requiring heavy timber, thought that nothing could equal southern pine and it was brought in in immense quantities. The returns show that in some years $2,000,000 worth of this pine was brought in, but now they find that the British Columbia fir is superior in every respect and may be laid down more cheaply, other things being equal, than the southern pine is, that is if the southern pine is not sacrificed as it is to-day.

We are told that the imposition of the duty on lumber would be very detrimental to the interests of Manitoba and the Northwest. Sir, I cannot see it. Every part of Manitoba is convenient to some lumber camp. Hundreds of the boys from Manitoba farms go in the winter along the Rainy river, the Lake of the Woods district and all down that way and work in the camps. They are found all along the shores of Lake Winnipeg, Lake Winnipegosis and the lower Red Deer river. I know one gentleman alone who this winter employed 2,500 of these young men in the lumber camps in the northern part of Manitoba, and the eastern district of Saskatchewan. So, near the mountains, an enormous number of young men go to the mountain regions to work in the lumber camps during the winter months when they have nothing to do on the farms at home.

In that way it is a source of revenue, but this last winter the usual number of

men have not found employment, and in the coming year, I am informed on the best of authority by those engaged in the lumber business, that not only will wages be down but the employment of men will be very much reduced, almost entirely owing to the fact that we have no duty upon lumber coming from the United States or other lands into the Dominion of Canada. The trouble which has existed in Manitoba and the Northwest has not been due to the fact of a duty being on lumber because there has been free trade in lumber. The trouble has been owing to a combine existing among the retailers which controls the prices and controls those engaged in the business. The argument that a duty on lumber would raise the price materially in these regions, I would think, if it is examined into, will be found not to hold good. But, even supposing that the duty were paid by the consumer—which is not in this case—it would not be a dollar a head for the farmers of Manitoba and the Northwest a year and they would, in the splendid home markets they would thereby have for their farm products in British Columbia, the Lake of the Woods and Rainy river country, lake Winnipeg and lake Winnipegosis and along the Red Derr river, make much more than any loss they would sustain by reason of the duty on lumber. I shall not weary the House with figures as it is not my intention at the present time to do more than point out in general terms the enormous quantity of wood material that is being imported into Canada. At the present time there is a great depression in the lumber business in the United States. People engaged in that industry, as in all businesses, require to pay interest on their bonds and investments and they are prepared to sacrifice their lumber for cost, land it here as cheaply as they may and get what they can for it rather than keep it and store it. I shall take the liberty of reading a little extract from Frank Leslie's Weekly which illustrates the possibility of selling a certain portion of one's product at cost and still making considerable money, over what you might make by selling a smaller output at a higher figure. This article is taken from 'Leslie's Weekly.' It states:

A business man's plain talk on the tariff.

It is a well known economic principle that it pays to keep mills and men fully employed to the limit of capacity and time, even if part of the product has to be disposed of in foreign markets without profit or with slight sacrifice, rather than to curtail the facilities for production, and therefore reduce the earning capacity of the wage-workers. For, if every dollar so realized from foreign countries for surplus products, goes into the pockets of the wage-earners it increases the wealth of the country maintaining such policy. The following illustration taken from Josiah Strong's 'Expansion' will serve to substantiate this statement: 'In a certain industry the profits are well established, according to the tonnage put through. If the run is 600 tons per day, the profits are $5,000 dollars per month. If the run is 900 tons per day, the profits are $20,000 per month. That is, by increasing the output fifty per cent, the profits are, in this instance, increased 300 per cent. If the extra 300 tons are sold at cost, it would leave the profits for the month $13,000; so that the extra 300 tons per day could actually be sold for $3,000 less than cost and then the profits for the month would be twice as large as if only 600 tons had been run.

'This will sound to many very like the familiar old story of the peanut woman who, "always sold a little below cost and made her money by selling a great many." This statement, however, is capable of demonstration; 600 tons per day equals 18,000 tons per month; 900 tons per day equals 27,000 tons per month; market price of the product, $4.96 per ton, leaving a profit of 28 cents per ton. At 900 tons per day the cost is reduced to $4.22, leaving a profit of 74 cents per ton. Now, 18,000 x 28 equals $5,040, the profits per month when only 600 tons are run per day; and 27,000 x 74 equals $19,980, the profits per month when 900 tons are run per day. If the entire increase of 9,000 tons is sold at cost, the 18,000 tons remaining would, at 74 cents per ton, make $13,320 instead of $5,040. So that these 9,000 tons might be sold for $3,000 less than cost and leave profits of $10,320 instead of $5,040. Our laying hold of this principle was one of the reasons why we were able to enter European home markets, and it accounts for the fact that many articles of American manufacture can be bought cheaper in Europe than here.'

But, Sir, one of the worst features of the whole case is found in the fact that in the Southern States the pitch pine, which is exported to Canada in considerable quantity to-day, is all cut either by convict labour or coloured labour. Under the policy pursued by the government of Canada at the present time we are asking our men to live in this northern latitude to keep warm houses, purchase large quantities of fuel, dress warmly, educate their children —and the children of the Canadian lumbermen have just as good a right to an education as the children of any other class of people in the land—in competition with people living in a southern climate where a yard of calico is their usual uniform both summer and winter. They have to compete with coloured and with convict labour. I notice in 'Everybody's Magazine' for this month an article, not written along these lines, but intended to reform the abuses of the convict labour system in the southern and other States of the Union where convict labour is hired out or sold for whatever they can get per year for it, and that is the labour that is employed in the lumber mills and manufacturing establishments. That is the class of labour that

our men in this northern latitude have to compete with under free trade in lumber. This article describes the brutality in connection with the treatment of these convicts, not alone by the jail authorities, but by the men to whom they are sold, and gives an account of the way in which a negro is flogged. Then it continues :

But the man has done wrong; he has committed a fault.

Yes, from sunrise to noon he has wheeled fifty-seven loads of fresh brick; the regulations of this hell on earth require that in such a time he shall wheel sixty loads. So, having thus transgressed, power and law and justice as administered in the state of Georgia exact from him this penalty until he screams and cries and sobs—and bleeds.

Further on the writer describes the meals.

For dinner they have each a piece of boiled salt pork, a piece of greasy corn bread. Although he is nearly famished, having worked all morning in the open air, the convict looks upon the food before him, and at the recollection of his breakfast his stomach revolts upon him and he turns sick and faints. But he gulps down the corn bread and, at last, turning the salt pork to the light and shredding it with his fingers, he manages for sheer hunger's sake to swallow a little of it. The rest is begged by the hungry man next to him. For supper he has boiled salt pork and a piece of corn bread. He learns that the state of Georgia does not furnish these viands; they are provided at the sole charge and cost of the company to which his slave labour has been sold.

That is in the issue of 'Everybody's Magazine' for the present month of June, and it goes on to describe how the State government has been taking action to improve the condition of these people. The free men in the Dominion of Canada, the 70,000 heads of families who are engaged in the lumber industry, have to compete, under free trade in lumber, with the coloured and convict labour of the United States of America.

Mr. FIELDING. Not at all; my hon. friend is entirely mistaken.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am telling my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that it is a fact that they have to compete with negro labour.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not talking about negro labour; I am talking about convict labour.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They have to compete with convict labour.

Mr. FIELDING. No. You cannot bring into Canada any lumber that is produced by convict labour.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How is it known? Is there a brand of the blood of the slave placed on every board ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not talking about slave labour. I am not aware that there is any slavery in the United States now. I had the impression that slavery was abolished.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not care whether you call it slave or convict labour; they have the worst system of slavery that they ever had at the present time. It is absolutely impossible to tell what lumber comes from a slave or convict mill and what comes from a free mill. At any rate wages are reduced by the competition of these convicts. Why are the prisons in Ontario going out of the convict labour business ? Simply because it brings convict labour into competition with free labour, it reduces the price of the commodity and in that way reduces wages just as it has done in the lumber business. Therefore, in the interest of the 70,000 odd free men, heads of families, men who want to bring their children up in respectability, in the interest of the men who have millions and millions of dollars invested in these mills up and down this country I would most respectfully impress upon the government the necessity of taking hold of this lumber question. At the present time there is scarcely a wheel turning in the lumber business in the province of Ontario. Banks are carrying these loads almost to their utmost limit. There is no market for lumber; prices are down; wages are down; there is stagnation throughout the length and breadth of the province in the lumber business which calls for action by an up-to-date government. I trust that it will not be necessary that this matter should be brought to the attention of the House again, as it certainly will be if something is not done. I respectfully lay this information before the House and ask for it the attention of the government.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (West Assiniboia). The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) said he did not wish to provoke any discussion. I have no doubt that would be the universal desire on the part of every gentleman who brings matters up ex parte before the Chair. But, even at the risk of transgressing the hon. gentleman's wishes, I would say a word or two to present, in a humble way, the views of those who do not agree with my hon. friend. There are those who would profit if any such duty were placed on lumber as my hon. friend has spoken of. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that this matter has been brought before you by a private member and by one on the other side of the House; for I think I shall do no injury to these hon. gentlemen, I think I shall not be unjust to my hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames) if I say that if any hon. member on this side were to propose this increase in

duty it would be said by the opposition that he acted at the instance of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) and others in order to increase the value of their limits. Therefore, even at the risk of not increasing the value of these limits, I will go further than that and ask if it be as hon. gentlemen opposite say that there is a vast fortune in the timber limits of the Northwest Territories and that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows), for example, and others have been made millionaires by the assets of the country being handed over to them, what is this proposed increase of duty for but to enhance the value of the assets which they are supposed to have received?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) a question? Are the limits to which he has referred worked? Are there thousands of men employed on these limits?

Mr. KNOWLES. My answer, given without hesitation, is in the affirmative. I have no doubt that my hon. friend from St. Antoine will be able to explain why these limits of my hon. friend from Dauphin and other hon. gentlemen engaged in the lumber business are so valuable as the hon. gentleman says and yet require this protection to make it worth while to operate them at all. The fact is that the hon. member for Dauphin and these other persons who are charged with being favourites of the government are operating largely the limits that they received and that is a fact that cannot be gainsaid.

My hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has informed us as to the kinds of labour employed in the production of this lumber that is imported from the United States. He finds fault because negroes find employment in this work and because their product, the lumber from the south, is brought into Canada. I am sorry that the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Clements) is not present, for I have no doubt that he would rise to defend the rights of the people of that race and that class, that they might not in this House have themselves classed with convicts or persons of that kind. And I cannot help——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I must rise to a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) is putting words into my mouth that I did not utter. I was careful to point out the distinction between coloured labour and convict labour. 'Convict' labour might include both coloured and white, but 'coloured' refers to the negro.

Mr. KNOWLES. My hon. friend's explanation is quite in harmony with what I was saying. The hon. gentleman in his remarks classed them together. Not once, but half a dozen times, he said that he objected to this lumber coming in as having been produced by convicts and negroes —or negroes and convicts, I do not know to which he gave second place. His making a bugbear of the fact that these imports are the product of the labour of negroes and convicts which he objects to, reminds me of the attitude of the hon. gentleman when the labour interests were being heard and those who were familiar with the facts were setting forth the views of organized labour. On that occasion the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was careful to say that he would have the Asiatics, such as the Hindus, come into this country rather than the galvanized Americans—not coloured Americans or convict Americans, but what he called 'galvanized' Americans, but still the industrious, hard-working, law-abiding, Anglo-Saxon Americans who, as they come among us, make just as good citizens as any we have in this country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I must again correct the hon. gentleman. I referred to the anarchists from the United States. I hope he does not associate with that class.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am not sure that I understood the hon. gentleman's question. Did he ask me if I associated him with anarchists?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No. I asked the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) if he himself associated with anarchists; he seems ready to defend them.

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not associate with anarchists. I am only saying that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) made the statement that he would rather have the Hindu come into this country than the 'galvanized' Americans—that is the statement he made. There are several remarks which might be made, speaking especially from the standpoint of the consumer of lumber in the Northwest in regard to the views of my hon. friend. He has said that those engaged in the lumber industry must have warm houses, for instance, which is something that those engaged in lumbering in Georgia do not need. But for one person engaged in cutting timber who must have a warm house we have five hundred or a thousand people who take up homesteads in the Northwest, who must first build houses and who must have those houses warm. On their behalf I protest against an agitation to increase the price to them of what is a prime necessity when they make their home in the Northwest. The very first requirement of homestead regulations is that a man shall have a house built. He must have a habitable house built; and it is well known that for a habitable house in that country you need a large quantity of lumber. I remember that on one occasion the hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was careful to spread on the records of this House that he had a house on his large holding that he had built for

$80. I think he will admit it would have cost him much more if $2 a thousand had been added to the price of the lumber used. And I think he will not say that he could build a house of a warm kind for any such sum.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. gentleman point out how putting a duty on American lumber is going to increase the cost of lumber to the consumer? If he will break up the monopoly that he has in the west under free trade, he may be able to get the price of lumber reduced and this he can do by putting on a duty.

Mr. KNOWLES. This is not to be a long discussion, so the hon. gentleman will not expect me to go into a consideration of the great economic question of how protection increases prices. I will not go into that question further than to give my own statement that protection does increase prices. I can only say that I will give my vote and voice on this basis. I believe that the people in my part of the country are convinced as I am that protection does enhance prices. I may venture into the discussion so far as to ask the hon. member a question: If protection is not going to make a better market for his friends in the lumber business on whose behalf he speaks, what good will it do to them? There will not be more lumber consumed; there will not be a larger market; on the contrary there will be less consumed by reason of the increased price which I conted will be the result of the duty. One reason why we are always afraid of the men engaged in lumbering is that there is such danger that they will become combinsters, and I deliberately state that protection is the mother of trusts and combines. Tariffs breed trusts, and if there is one thing in which there should be no trust, that thing is lumber. For my part, I am against protection from start to finish, protection is to me an abomination. I support the Liberal party because of the two parties it is the one that favours the lower duties. But if a strong party decidedly devoted to free trade were to arise, I would be a supporter of that party, regarding its tariff policy. In this House, as representing my constituents, I believe I serve them best by supporting the party that goes the furthest in granting a low tariff. There can, therefore, in my humble opinion, be no reason for this increase of duty from the standpoint of the lumber industry, which is prosperous, whose men as a rule are wealthy men—you will find that in this city, where we are detained day after day and month after month, the wealthy men are those engaged in lumbering; the prosperous people of the Northwest, those spoken of as millionaires by hon. members opposite are lumbermen; the British Columbia lumbermen have been very prosperous for some years past. I think the time is very ill-advised in asking for this increase. Our friends opposite deliberately placed themselves on record some years ago as being in favour of a duty of $2 a thousand on lumber which the lumbermen and their associations agitated for so strongly, but I am glad to say so unsuccessfully when they approached the present government which has maintained the low tariff.

INFRACTIONS OF INLAND REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). I desire to bring to the attention of the House a matter which has already been partially discussed—the manner in which the Inland Revenue Department has conducted the business of inspecting tobacco factories. A few days ago, I brought to the attention of the House certain infractions of the regulations concerning the manufacture of tobacco. I wish to-night to take this matter up where I left off before. I was prevented from proceeding on that occasion because it was contended by members on the government side of the House that I was not in order in the discussion, as this is a matter relating to the inland revenue while the item then before us is related to the customs.

As this is a matter of some importance I think it my duty to bring the whole correspondence to the attention of the House. There is a duty on imported tobacco of 10 cents per pound; the excise duty is 25 cents per pound on imported; on combination tobacco manufactured 5 cents per pound, and on Canadian tobacco 5 cents per pound. The case I refer to was the alleged infraction of the Inland Revenue Act and of the regulations thereunder, by the firm of T. B. and D. J. Riley, of the city of Charlottetown. It was alleged that this firm had during the course of four years or longer—although they had two licenses, one for an imported leaf factory and one for a combination leaf factory—been in the habit of buying stamps for imported tobacco leaf alone and that they had been during all these four years committing frauds against the revenue of Canada by cutting stamps in two and putting half stamps upon the caddies of tobacco which they sold. It is clear that if a person commits this offence he is guilty of a criminal act, and if such an infraction of the law be drawn to the attention of the officers of the Crown it is the duty of the inland revenue officers to take such proceedings as the law provides to punish the guilty parties. It is laid down in the Criminal Code, section 479:

479. Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to 14 years' imprisonment who—

(e) fraudulently mutilates any such stamp with intent that any use should be made of any part of such stamp; or

(f) fraudulently fixes or places upon any material, or upon any stamp aforesaid, any stamp or part of a stamp which, whether fraudulently or not, has been cut, torn or in any other way removed from any other material or out of or from any other stamp; or

(g) fraudulently erases, or otherwise, either really or apparently, removes, from any stamped material any name, sum, date, or other matter or thing thereon written, with the intent that any use should be made of the stamp upon such material; or

(h) knowingly and without lawful excuse, the proof whereof shall lie upon him, has in his possession any stamp or part of a stamp which has been fraudulently cut, torn, or otherwise removed from any material, or any stamp which has been fraudulently mutilated, or any stamped material out of which any name, sum, date, or other matter or thing has been fraudulently erased or otherwise, either really or apparently, removed.

Now, the charge made against this firm is that the stamps they purchased from the Inland Revenue Department were by them cut in two, that they were consequently mutilated by these manufacturers of tobacco, and that one half stamp was placed upon one caddy and one half stamp placed upon another. The evidence produced to the officers of the department showed clearly and distinctly that such an infraction of the law as would come within section 479 of the Criminal Code was committed, and yet the inland revenue authorities condoned the offence. They condoned it by allowing the junior member of this firm to pay $200 as a condonation of the offence which they had committed against the Inland Revenue Act and also against the Criminal Code, and the Department of Inland Revenue, accepted that $200 in full requital of the offence which these men committed. In order to make this matter more clear I will read the regulations governing the manner in which officers of the Inland Revenue Department are required to conduct themselves in regard to the manufacture of tobacco and the inspection of the manufactories. Section 11 provides:

The officer in charge of each tobacco or cigar manufactory shall keep a record of the weight of all packages of raw leaf or other raw material received by the manufacturers. The entry shall be made in a book provided by the department for that purpose.

Not only is the officer in charge of the manufactory bound to keep a record of every brand of tobacco which goes into such manufactory, but the man who conducts the factory must keep a record also; and section 44 of the Inland Revenue Act provides:

Every distiller, compounder, malster, brewer, tobacco manufacturer, cigar manufacturer, bonded manufacturer or other manufacturer, who is required to take out a license under this Act, or who carries on any business subject to excise, shall, in addition to the books, accounts and papers hereinafter specially mentioned, keep on and within the premises covered by the license issued to such manufacturer or other person, such stock books and other books, in such form and manner as are prescribed and supplied by the department, in which books there shall be clearly recorded, day by day, and on the same day on which the circumstance, thing or act to be recorded is done or occurs, in the prescribed columns—

(a) a full and particular account of all grain, malt, spirits, raw and manufactured tobacco, cigars and other stock, material or commodity brought into the distillery, malt-house, brewery, tobacco manufactory, cigar manufactory, bonded manufactory, or other licensed premises, to which such stock books relate; and

(b) a full and particular account of all grain, spirits, malt, raw or manufactured tobacco, cigars or other stock, material or commodity, sold, removed or transferred from such distillery, malt-house, brewery, tobacco manufactory, cigar manufactory, bonded manufactory or other licensed premises; and

(c) such further particulars as are required by any departmental regulation in that behalf.

The departmental regulation goes on to say, in section 15:

All leaf and other materials are as soon as received and account taken of them to be placed in a warehouse provided for that purpose——

That is, that the officer of the department shall take an account of them and that account shall also be recorded as provided by section 44 of the Inland Revenue Act, in the books of the manufactory:

To be placed in a warehouse provided for that purpose and secured by Crown lock, the key thereof being in the possession of the officer in charge.

Then it goes on to show in section 36 of the regulations what the duties of the officers are. It is provided that every tobacco manufactory in this country must have an officer in charge who shall look after it and see that all the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act and the regulations made under it by the Governor in Council have been complied with. Section 36 of the regulations provide:

It is the duty of every officer in charge of any tobacco or cigar manufactory to see that no greater quantity of tobacco or cigars is contained in the packages to which the stamps are attached than the stamp is intended to cover and all the packages must in all cases be full, i.e., a ten pound stamp must not be placed on a package capable of holding from fifteen to twenty pounds even if the package only contains ten pounds of tobacco. Should any package containing tobacco or cigars at any time be discovered with stamps thereon for less than the package contains, it is the duty of every officer to detain such packages as forfeited and report the circumstances to this department through the collector of the division.

Now, the meaning of these regulations and of the law is that the officers shall see that the packages contain the proper

quantity of tobacco and shall also see that the proper stamps shall be placed on those packages. In this case a complaint was made to the collector of inland revenue in the city of Charlottetown. As was stated here on the 26th of May, in the discussion which then took place, and in the letters which were then read, the collector of inland revenue in the city of Charlottetown did not give the matter any consideration, or did not give it sufficient consideration, and the parties who are aggrieved in this matter, namely, the Hickey & Nicholson Tobacco Company, Limited, who are tobacco manufacturers in the city of Charlottetown, complain that they are not receiving justice at the hands of the officers of the Inland Revenue Department. After they had informed them that to their own knowledge many breaches of these regulations had been committed, they were compelled to go to the collector of customs of Charlottetown, Mr. W. B. Robertson. Mr. Robertson found that an infraction of the law had been committed by the firm of T. B. & D. J. Riley. He found the evidence of the breach of the law at the store of Mr. W. A. Poole, Lower Montague, in King's County. Mr. Robertson reported the fact to the commissioner of customs in the city of Ottawa, and asked him if he would have his permission to investigate the matter. The commissioner gave his permission, and Mr. Robertson then investigated the matter and reported to the commissioner of customs in Ottawa. He also sent the declarations of Mr. Donald Nicholson and of Mr. Harnett, which set out a large number of infractions of the law which had been committed, or which had been alleged to have been committed by this firm of T. B. & D. J. Riley—something like fifteen or sixteen. Notwithstanding this fact and the fact that Mr. Harnett had reported the matter to the officers of the Inland Revenue Department, he received no satisfaction from them, and he was compelled to go to the collector of customs, who was not the proper officer to report the matter to; but when the collector of customs received the sanction of the commissioner of customs to investigate, and did investigate, and found that these allegations were worthy of investigation, and so reported to his department, the commissioner of customs, after the declarations of Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Harnett had come to Ottawa, reported to Mr. Gerald, the deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, and Mr. Gerald sent one of his officers, Mr. Burke, who has supervision of the factories in the maritime provinces, to Charlottetown. He went there and found no infraction of the law. The next man sent there was Mr. Fitzgerald, who did not report that any infraction of the law had been committed. Still, these gentlemen, who knew that an infraction of the law had been committed, persisted in their efforts to obtain justice at the hands of the government, particularly the Inland Revenue Department, and they requested through the collector of customs at Charlottetown that another investigation be made. The Inland Revenue Department then sent Mr. Caven, of Montreal, an officer of the Inland Revenue Department, to the city of Charlottetown to see if there was any truth in the reports which had been declared by Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Harnett with reference to these alleged infractions of the law. Before Mr. Caven went down, I presume that Messrs. Riley found out that an investigation was to take place, one perhaps more severe than the two previous ones, and they saw fit to send up to the department the sum of $200. This is the letter which Mr. D. J. Riley, the junior member of that firm, sent to the department at Ottawa with the $200:

> I hereby abandon the sum of $200, deposited with Mr. S. C. Nash, collector of inland revenue, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. This abandonment is made under section 136 of the Inland Revenue Act.

That letter is dated Charlottetown, October 10, 1907. Before this document was signed by D. J. Riley, and before the money was paid to Mr. Nash, it was positively declared, under the Act relating to extra judicial oaths, before Mr. Robertson, the collector of customs in Charlottetown, that these men had committed not only an infraction of the Inland Revenue Act in not having placed stamps upon some of the tobacco they sold, but also an infraction of the Criminal Code, in having mutilated the stamp, that offence coming under section 479 for which they were liable to imprisonment for 14 years in the penitentiary. Nothwithstanding that fact, the Inland Revenue Department accepted this $200 in full condonation of the offence of these gentlemen. After this money had been paid and had been accepted by the department, Mr. Caven sent in his report. The money was paid on the 10th of October, and Mr. Caven made his report on the 17th of October. His letter containing that report is as follows:

> Sir,—I beg to report that in accordance with instructions I visited Charlottetown and inquired into the irregularities complained of in stamping tobacco in factory of D. J. Riley. Mr. Nash the collector informed me that Mr. Burke, the inspector, had been on the island, but was unable to find any goods improperly stamped and later he sent one of his officers from St. John who went over to the island and examined the tobacco in stores. He, I was told, found the stamping had all been done in a regular manner.

Here is a misstatement on the face of this letter, because there is no factory of D. J. Riley. The factory was the factory of T. B. & D. J. Riley. Why he put in

the name of D. J Riley alone I do not know. The Inland Revenue Department knew that the two men were partners in this business, that a license had been issued to them both, that stamps had been issued to them both. Mr. Caven goes on to say :

I saw Mr. D. Nicholson, who complained of the irregularities and he told me his attention was drawn to it by the fact that Mr. D. J. Riley was selling at a very low rate. Mr. Moore the officer in charge of Riley's factory was in Souris on July 30, and visited the store of Messrs. Mathew & McLean. There he found fifteen caddies of Riley's tobacco nailed up in crates of five caddies each which he had opened and found five caddies with half stamp on each. He asked the store man to place them aside and keep them but the storeman shipped them and ten others back to Riley on Aug. 5. Those caddies were not brought into the factory but to a store kept by Riley's father, and when I visited the store no trace of them could be found.

Here is a direct notice to Mr. Caven, here is a direct notice to the officers who had previously visited the establishments where tobacco was found, and still the department and the officials give no credence to the first report, the department received D. Nicholson and Harnett and the statement of Mr. Caven is partially incorrect in this that he does not mention the full name of the firm but only the name of the junior partner.

I visited Riley's factory and asked him if he would take his ledger and check off the items with stock book No. 2. He said he kept no ledger——

He said he kept no ledger.

—day book or order.

He kept no ledger, day book or order book, and here is the law laid down distinctly, not only in the Act but in the regulations as well, that every manufacturer of tobacco must keep a full and particular account of all tobacco that he uses and all stock which he has in his factory. Notwithstanding this fact the Department of Inland Revenue lets the matter rest at that point and accept $200 in condonation of all the offences which these men have committed.

I visited Riley's factory and asked him if he would take his ledger and check off the items with stock book No. 2. He said he kept no ledger, day book or letter book. All his sales were cash or draft and he relied solely on stock book No. 2. I then asked him to show me entries for one or two items which were in stock book No. 2, but no trace of them appeared in either of his books. On the afternoon of the day this took place I visited Souris and called upon Messrs. Mathew & McLean and Stern Brothers. They gave me a memo. of the dates, packages and pounds of tobacco bought from Riley. Messrs. Stern Brothers told me that they bought from Riley on open account and that Riley would draw upon them at various times. On returning to Charlottetown I with Mr. Moore, checked over stock book No. 2 with memo. of invoices and found that a shipment to Mathew & McLean on May 11, 1907, of ten caddies, 200 pounds, did not appear in the stock book.

Ten caddies, 200 pounds did not appear in the stock book.

Also, a shipment of June 5, 1907, to Stern Brothers, 5 packages, 100 pounds, did not appear in factory books. These shipments might have been made from store kept by Riley's father. Before leaving the factory, Mr. D. J. Riley said he would like to speak to me privately. He asked if I thought the department would be willing to let matters go if he gave up his license, that for some time they had been losing money in bad debts and as all this trouble would come on his uncle, Mr. T. B. Riley, he, D. J. Riley, would be willing to go away from the business. He asked me if I would call and see Mr. T. B. Riley who was sick and unable to come out. I called and saw him. He showed me two drafts for leaf which he had not accepted, for, if the department were going to seize his factory and sell him out he would countermand the leaf order. I told him that the department could impose a fine for any offences D. J. Riley had been guilty of. I have no doubt that D. J. Riley has been guilty of infractions of the Act, but so long had elapsed between the time of the tobacco being placed upon the market and my visit that Riley was able to go around the country and get any stock that remained upon the merchants' hands.

Here is a statement made to the Department of Inland Revenue in Ottawa, but still no action was taken upon it. Notwithstanding the fact that it was reported to the department that these men had committed these infractions of the law and had had time through the blundering of their own officers to go around and take back the tobacco no action had been taken by the department.

The three caddies referred to by Mr. Moore in store of Mathew & McLean were likely covered by half stamps and Mr. Moore now sees he was in error in not taking the tobacco to the excise office in Charlottetown.

I am of the opinion that no further trouble will be caused by Riley as, acting upon instructions from Inspector Burke, Mr. Nash or Mr. Moore see that all the stamps are properly affixed to caddies.

Was it not the duty of some officer to to see that these stamps were affixed to the caddies? How is the public to be guarded against infractions of the law if the officials appointed to see that the law is enforced do not perform that duty?

On my return to Montreal I consulted with Mr. Lawlor, who advised me that in the absence of any proof other than Riley's admission it would be well to write Collector Nash and ask that Riley deposit the sum of $200 as a penalty under section 36 of the Inland Revenue Act. This I did and attach hereto abandonment for amount stated. Mr. Lawlor is

absent on a trip of inspection and for this reason I am sending my report direct to you.

I remain, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) W. CAVEN,

Deputy Collector.

To the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, Ottawa.

I have no doubt that Mr. Caven did his duty to the best of his ability, that he is a man who knows how to do his duty, but that he was duped by these men in this way, that he agreed to accept, or to report to the department that they should accept, $200 in condonation of these previous offences against the law.

They refer in this abandonment to section 136 of the law, and they say, in effect: This department says that if a manufacturer of tobacco buys $1,000 or $2,000 or $3,000 or $4,000 or $10,000 worth of stamps, cuts them in two and cheats and defrauds the public in this way, he can abandon $200 and cheat the revenue out of $60,000 or $70,000 or $80,000 or $100,000. Is that the law? It is not the law, it is not the meaning of the law. Under the section referred to the government had no right to accept it at all. What is the meaning of this section? It reads:

If any article or thing is voluntarily given up or abandoned by the owner to any collector or superior officer as forfeited under this Act, or if any sum of money is voluntarily paid to any such collector or officer as the amount of a penalty under this Act, such article or thing may be dealt with as if lawfully condemned and such sum of money as if lawfully recovered.

Supposing the government did their duty strictly according to the letter of the law, they could have confiscated his factory. Suppose it had been shown that Riley had committed one infraction of the law, suppose that he had not (under the provision of the law), used the proper die to cancel the stamp, which he had bought from the government, perhaps he could in the case of one infraction abandon the sum of $200. But where there were many infractions, where it was known to the government that for a period of at least three or four years these infractions of the law had been committed by these men, that seventeen or eighteen infractions had been brought home to them, was it then the duty of the government to accept $200 as full satisfaction for all these offences? I do not think it was. I do not think the government were justified, or that the public will say that the government did right in accepting this sum of $200. I think that when men commit many infractions of the law as these men had done, proceedings should have been taken by the Department of Inland Revenue to punish them. They were just as guilty under the law as if they had forged my name or that of the Minister of Inland Revenue, the same penalty would apply to a forgery as to the mutilation of a stamp. Why then, were these men not punished? I think I can tell you, because the senior member of this firm was the vice-president of the Liberal association of the county of Queens, that is why the name of T. B. Riley was left out of the proceedings which were taken by the officers of the Inland Revenue Department. That is the reason why, notwithstanding the fact that the government had issued a license to T. B. Riley, they accepted the abandonment of $200 from his partner D. J. Riley. That is the reason, there is no other reason. Politics entered into all these proceedings, even into matters which concerned the condonation of offences which are punishable by imprisonment for fourteen years in the penitentiary.

Notwithstanding that these men were guilty of these infractions of the law, notwithstanding the fact that the deputy Minister of Inland Revenue was acquainted with the circumstances of the case, he allows the matter to go, not a word said, but accepting this paltry sum of $200 in satisfaction. That is not the way it would have been if Hickey, Nicholson Co., Limited, had committed an infraction of the law, for they happen to be on the other side of politics. These men had been greatly handicapped by the way the government had allowed the Rileys to do their business for years, paying only half the amount of duty, or, in many cases, no duties at all, on the tobacco they manufactured. This is one of the most glaring cases that has ever been known. I do not think the time has elapsed in which action can be taken against these men who committed this offence against the government.

The government took this cheque. The cheque was sent to the assistant commissioner of customs, and, in a letter dated January 10, 1908, addressed to Mr. Gerald by Mr. Farrow, he said:

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th instant inclosing departmental cheque No. 1859 in favour of the commissioner for the sum of $50 covering an award made for information furnished by our collector of customs at Charlottetown respecting the irregular stamping of packages of tobacco by a manufacturer in Charlottetown.

The cheque has this day been forwarded to the collector of customs at Charlottetown and he has been requested to send proper receipts to this department for transmission to you.

Why did the Minister of Inland Revenue accept this cheque? There were many infractions of the law, besides the criminal one to which I referred, the highest penalty for which would be $500 and the lowest $100? Eighteen cases were presented to him which would amount to something like $9,000, and still he allows these men off for

$200. When I am through, I hope the minister will answer me and state why he allowed these infractions of the law of which he is the especial administrator, and also this offence against the criminal law to go unpunished except for this paltry $200. A good deal of correspondence took place with regard to payment. It seems that the sum of $50 was due to somebody for giving information against these people. It was offered to Mr. Robertson, but he did not think he was entitled to it. Evidently it was thought that Mr. Harnett, of the Hickey-Nicholson Co., Ltd., who had given the information, was entitled to it. Mr. Gerald wrote to Mr. Robertson requesting that the $50 be paid over to Mr. Harnett, but Mr. Harnett informed Mr. Robertson that he would not accept any sum of money from the government of Canada for giving the information. And he informs me that he does not consider the punishment accorded to these men was sufficient for the serious offences they had committed. He informed the department through Mr. Robertson, the collector of customs in Charlottetown, that he would have nothing to do with the $50 and also informed him that he thought that, in giving this information against these men, he was only doing his duty to himself and to the public as a citizen of Canada, that he desired his action to be gratis and not for remuneration, and also that the punishment meted out to these men was not sufficient. The letter that Mr. Robertson wrote on this subject is set out in the return laid on the table. It is not necessary for me to read it. In my opinion, this case from first to last is a most glaring injustice committed against the firm of Hickey-Nicholson, of Charlottetown, tobacco manufacturers, who were competing with the Rileys and that the punishment meted out to these offenders was not at all commensurate with the crimes they had committed.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister Inland Revenue). It is much to be regretted that my hon. friend (A. A. McLean) did not send me an intimation that he proposed bringing up this matter this evening. While this pertains to the Inland Revenue Department, the matter is one which arose some six months ago, it is one concerning which there was a considerable correspondence, and all the facts are not at this moment very clear in my recollection. My hon. friend read most of the correspondence the other evening when the House was in Supply. I assume that he was more concerned then—and is more concerned now—in placing the facts before the public of Prince Edward Island for political purposes than in any other phase of the question. For there is politics in this, as the two manufactures of tobacco in Charlottetown are politicians, one on one side and the other on the other side. I believe that this man

Riley, guilty of contravention of the Inland Revenue Act, is not of the same political persuasion as my hon. friend.

Now, this is not a matter to take up very much time. Mr. Riley is a tobacco manufacturer. It was discovered—I think the information first came from a rival manufacturer—by an inland revenue officer that the tobacco manufactured by Riley Bros. was not sufficiently stamped. The officer of the Inland Revenue Department named Moore, made an investigation, and found in some of the country stores caddies of tobacco that were insufficiently stamped—half the quantity of stamps being placed on these caddies. This officer of the Inland Revenue Department, Moore, certainly failed in the discharge of his duty right at that point. When he found the tobacco insufficiently stamped, he went away leaving the tobacco in the possession of the parties who owned it, requesting the parties, I believe, to keep it in a safe place or not to dispose of it, and he would return. Now, that tobacco was never seen again. It had been returned to another Riley who was a retail dealer—there are two firms of Riley, one manufacturers and the other storekeepers. Mr. Burke, the inspector from St. John, N. B., went there to investigate the case under instructions from the deputy Minister of Inland Revenue. Mr. Caven also was sent and his report has been read by my hon. friend. Mr. Caven found that three, or four, or probably, half a dozen caddies of tobacco had been sent out with insufficient inland revenue stamps upon them. These caddies having disappeared, it was absolutely impossible to prove anything against Riley the manufacturer. Mr. Caven, the deputy collector from Montreal who was sent down by Mr. Lawlor, our inspector, reports as follows :

I have no doubt but that D. J. Riley has been guilty of infractions of the Act, but so long had elapsed between the time of the tobacco being placed upon the market and my visit that Riley was able to go round the country and get any stock that remained upon the merchants' hands.

That is precisely what happened.

The three caddies referred to by Mr. Moore in store of Matthew & McLean were likely covered by half stamp and Mr. Moore now sees that he was in error in not taking the tobacco to the excise office in Charlottetown.

The evidence of the guilt of Riley the manufacturer had disappeared. Mr. Caven said :

On my return to Montreal I consulted with Mr. Lawlor——

Our head inspector and a very excellent official.

—who advised me that in the absence of any proof other than Riley's admission it would be well to write Collector Nash and ask that Riley deposit the sum of $200 as a penalty under section 136 of Inland Revenue Act.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Could the hon. gentleman not get evidence from Mr Harnett and also from Mr. Moore? They had the evidence of Mr. Harnett, Mr. Moore, Mr. Nicholson, Mr. Burke and Matthew and McLean.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Their evidence would not have been sufficient.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You had the evidence of Mr. Harnett before this letter was written and signed by Mr. Robertson, the collector of customs at Charlottetown.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. There was the evidence of eighteen men that you could have got.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. These are the facts of the case. The goods had disappeared and if we had undertaken a prosecution against Riley it would have failed as we were advised. He was asked to deposit $200 and that amount he forfeited.

Mr. BERGERON. Did you not want that advice ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot say. The whole matter transpired before I had any knowledge of the events at all ; so that I cannot say that I wanted advice one way or the other. The $200 were accepted and further proceedings were dropped. These are the whole facts of the case. I admit frankly that the officers of the Inland Revenue Department at Charlottetown did not do their duty. When they found that there was a contravention of the law, or an infringement of the Inland Revenue Act, or a fraud on the part of Mr. Riley, they ought to have taken possession of the goods and obtained the evidence that would have convicted him of fraud. They did not do so. In several other cases of the same kind where there have been infractions of the Inland Revenue law and where it has been impossible to convict the party guilty of these infractions, deposits have been received and they have been forfeited to the department under the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act. There is a lot of correspondence between the customs officials and the Inland Revenue officials, but, boiled down, the simple explanation is as I have stated. There was no violation, whatever, of the Customs Act. There was no fraud upon the customs. The fraud was upon the Inland Revenue. We have no reason to know to what extent, but we have been assured that these frauds were very limited indeed. We have no positive information that they involved more than three or four caddies. There may have been more but it would have been impossible to have continued frauds of that kind for any length of time. My officers advised me that they do not think the frauds were very extensive. In so far as I am advised, I think the ends of justice have been served by fining this manufacturer $200. My hon. friend who raised this question cannot say that the frauds were long continued or that they amounted to very much. If we had had sufficient evidence of course, we might have seized or confiscated the manufacturer's factory, but we did not think, with the very poor evidence we had, that it would be wise to do so. We pursued this course and we think we pursued the right one.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). I will not attempt to take up very much of the time of the House on this question as I have not gone into it so fully as my hon. friend (Mr. A. A. McLean), but after looking over the evidence that my hon. friend brought before the House the other evening and his statement of the case to-day I think that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) treats the matter in a very light and easy fashion. As in many other cases which have been brought before the House and the country, they are trying to cover up the abuses in the different departments of the government which have occurred possibly through the fault of their own officials. They are not, in going after a situation of this kind, getting down to the root of the matter, but they are approaching it from the point of view of protecting their own political friends as my hon. friend from Queens has pointed out. To my mind this case shows an obvious abuse, an evasion of the law and the Department of Inland Revenue have not gone after it in a proper manner to discover these people and find out how many infringements of the Act have taken place. The Minister of Inland Revenue says to my hon. friend : You did not say there were a great many infractions of the law. I find in the evidence of Mr. Harnett, taken by the collector of customs, that these cases ran from May, 1906, to August, 1907. I do not think that the department used the means at their disposal to find out how many infractions of the law there were. I believe that while the minister treats it in a very light manner there were thousands upon thousands of dollars taken out of the revenue of this country and put into the pockets of these manufacturers of Charlottetown, and that not only were they stealing the money of the country, but they were robbing other people of the trade to which they were fairly entitled by selling their tobacco at a cheaper rate than the manufacturers who were complying with the law could sell it at and compete against them at a profit. I have heard it stated by parties who have figured it up that these transactions extended over four years and ran into from $40,00 to $60,000, of which amount the revenue of the country was defrauded. You can easily understand that when it amounts to $5 a caddy it will not take long to run up to $60,000. The minister acknowledges

that he is not very familiar with the situation. I can very readily understand from his remarks that he was not familiar with it I have only had an opportunity of reading over the papers during the last hour and I can see that there is some conclusive evidence in the documents that there was an absolute case of wrong-doing. From the evidence produced it seems clear that there was at least collusion with those in high places, and that the government of the country has condoned this wrong-doing and shielded the perpetrators. Under section 479 of the Criminal Code it is the duty of the officials of the Inland Revenue Department to take criminal proceedings against those who mutilate or fraudulently use Inland Revenue stamps. It was shown that, in a number of instances, these parties, T. B. and D. J. Riley, did mutilate these stamps that they cut them in two and put half of one on a caddy instead of the regulation stamp. The evidence showed this fraud to have been committed and the government condoned this wrong by the acceptance of a $200 fine when they had the evidence in their hands that fraud had been committed. The minister has tried to make this House believe that there was no evidence to prove these parties guilty. There were affidavits before this letter from Mr. Caven came to hand of a number of reputable merchants of Prince Edward Island and there were fifteen or eighteen cases sworn to by Mr. Harnett before the commissioner of customs. Surely this was sufficient evidence to prove that these people had been guilty of a fraudulent act under the Criminal Code. Yet the minister thinks there was nothing proved. It seems to me that the business of the Inland Revenue Department, in the different parts of the Dominion, must be carried on very carelessly. Section 11 of the regulations regarding the manufacture of tobacco requires the officials to keep records, ledgers and other accounts of the amount of leaf received and of the amount that is used in the manufacture of tobacco. Section 44 of these regulations requires that the manufacturer shall also keep books and it is provided that the books of the officers of the department and the manufacturer shall correspond. There must have been an obvious neglect of duty on the part of the minister's officers to enable these people to get up and testify that they kept no books and could show no record. The regulations require that an officer of the Inland Revenue Department shall take account of all the leaf that is in the possession of the manufacturer and that he shall keep it under lock and key.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no doubt at all that the manufacturing firm of Rileys kept books according to the requirements of the department. It is the other firm of Rileys, local traders, the father or brother of the manufacturer, who it is said kept no books.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That is not correct. It is the firm of T. B. & D. J. Riley who kept no books. As we understand——

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know what is understood, but I say that the manufacturing firm of Rileys kept all the books and made all the entries required by the department.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Mr. Caven writes :

I visited Riley's factory and asked him if he would take his ledger and check off the items with his stock book No. 2. He said he kept no ledger, day book or order book, all his sales were cash or draft and he relied wholly on stock book No. 2.

He was asked to produce his books and he said he kept no books and, therefore, according to the evidence of Mr. Caven he did not comply with the law. The Department of Inland Revenue should not have dealt with one of the Rileys individually and accepted a fine of $200 from him, but they should have punished the firm of T. B. & D. J. Riley who were the offenders. The statement of the minister that there was no evidence to prosecute these men under the criminal code is not borne out by the facts which he had before him, but which he acknowledges he did not consider very carefully. On August 5, 1907, Mr. Nash, collector of inland revenue, wrote to the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue as follows :

Inland Revenue Division No. 1, Charlottetown,
Prince Edward Island,
August 5, 1907.

W. J. Gerald, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to state that rumours of tobacco being sold 'out of packages' have reached this office. Kings county seems to be the habitat. I have requested Inspector Burke to come over sooner than usual, although he is due some time this month when we might make some arrangements to make seizures. In the meantime I have sent Officer Moore to one or two places to investigate and have also instructed him on his collecting tours to visit shops where tobacco is sold and seize in every case illictly exposed tobacco. I have made requisition to-day for forms.

Question—Is it necessary to remove tobacco seized? I mean to take possession.

I am your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) SAMUEL C. NASH,
Collector Inland Revenue.

This is the answer :

Ottawa, August 8, 1907.

S. C. Nash, Esq.,
Collector of Inland Revenue, Charlottetown,
Prince Edward Island.

Sir,—I am in receipt of your communication of the 5th instant respecting the rumoured sale of unstamped tobacco within your division and requesting to be advised as to the necessity for taking possession of such tobacco in case of seizure

In reply thereto I beg to state that if tobacco is so seized it becomes the property of

the Crown and if the facts warrant its seizure they certainly necessitate taking possession of the goods seized.

In connection of the matter of seizure of tobacco, out of stamped packages, great care should be used by our officials to endeavour to ascertain if it is a case of fraud or of simple ignorance of the law. While it is true that the latter is no justification for the wrong-doing it is a factor that should have some weight with our officials.

In any case whether tobacco is so found or not our officer should explain to dealers visited the provisions of the law respecting the sale of tobacco and, if these dealers have not been supplied with circular G—155, a copy thereof should be delivered to each person visited and should be mailed to persons who are not so personally called upon.

I remain, sir,
Your obedient servant
Deputy Minister.

The firm of Hickey & Nicholson were of course subject to unfair competition on account of this defrauding of the revenue by a rival firm and they suspected the officers of the department were not moving fast enough, and so on August 9 this letter was written :

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,
August 9, 1907.

W. B. Robertson, Esq.,
Collector of Customs.

Sir,—Our Mr. Harnett has drawn my attention to gross violations of the Excise and Customs Act and I have reported the same to other officers some time ago, but up to the present no action has been taken or likely to. I therefore report same to you now and demand that you take immediate action and our Mr. Harnett will accompany you to the identical goods.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) HENRY NICHOLSON TOBACCO COMPANY, Limited.
D. NICHOLSON.

Mr. Robertson, in pursuance of the information which he had received, went to Lower Montague and discovered that irregularities in some of the tobacco of T. B. & D. J. Riley had been perpetrated, and fraud committed against the people and government of this country. He reported it to the Commissioner of Customs. Would not that be proof enough to the Minister of Inland Revenue that fraud was being perpetrated when he had it on his own officer's report? The next letter is written on the 10th of August and it is as follows:

Department of Customs, port of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,
August 10, 1907.

Sir,—I beg to report that acting on the inclosed letter from the Hickey & Nicholson Company, Limited, I drove to Lower Montague, and called on the firm of W. A. Poole & Company, and while they have no tobacco on hand at the present moment irregularly stamped, I gleaned enough evidence from Mr. George Poole, a member of the firm, to satisfy me that things are not straight so far as the stamping of the tobacco sent out by the firm of T. B. & D. J. Riley, of this city, are concerned, and I am confident that the circumstances are such as would justify a searching investigation and trust that all may meet with your honourable approval.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. B. ROBERTSON.

The Commissioner of Customs on August 7 wrote to the collector of customs at Charlottetown, P.E.I., as follows :

August 7.

To the Collector of Customs,
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, respecting the irregular stamping of tobacco at your port. You may inquire into and report such irregularities as you find in the tobacco sent out by T. B. and D. J. Riley.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
Commissioner of Customs.

Mr. Robertson took the trouble to investigate and the result is contained in a report marked schedule A, and declaration A and declaration B ; and I want the minister, who apparently is not familiar with the correspondence, to listen to the declarations signed by the commissioner of Customs, who was authorized by the deputy minister of Customs to make the investigation. The first is as follows :

I, Donald Nicholson, of Charlottetown, a member of the Hickey & Nicholson Tobacco Company, Limited, do hereby declare that during the early spring I called officer Theop. Moore's attention to the fact that insufficiently stamped tobacco was sold throughout the country, and he promised me to keep a sharp lookout for it.

About the last of July, on his return from Souris, I inquired if he had discovered any such tobacco, and he replied that 'he saw more than he wanted to see.' Viz., 3 caddies of Riley tobacco at Messrs. Mathew & McLeans' and had ordered the clerk to lay them aside as he might require them. He then accompanied me to Mr. Nash and we fully discussed the matter and Mr. Nash agreed to send for the inspector.

On August 7 our salesman, Mr. Harnett, telephoned me from Georgetown that Messrs. W. A. Poole & Company, Lower Montague, had such tobacco on hand and suggested that I see the Inland Revenue officer at once, and I informed Mr. Moore of it on that date. Mr. Harnett returned home on the 8th, and on the 9th he and I called on Mr. Nash urging that they take immediate action and offering to drive the officer to where it was sold, but Mr. Moore being out of town and Mr Nash, who treated the matter somewhat lightly, was too busy, so we called on the collector of customs and demanded that he take immediate action. On Mr. Harnett's agreeing to accompany him they left on the morning of the 10th for Lower Montague.

Inspector Burke arrived here on the 12th and on the 14th sent for me, after a short interview we parted, and he, I am told, left

for home on the 15th, and so far we have not heard if anything has been done.

(Sgd.) DONALD NICHOLSON,
President of Company.

Signed and declared before me at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, this 22nd day of August, A.D. 1907.

(Sgd.) W. B. ROBERTSON,
Collector.

I would like to know why this man Moore was not called to give evidence. He saw more than he wanted to see, and I presume that the department knew more than they wanted to make public. The Mr. Burke who is referred to in this declaration was the inspector for the maritime provinces. The next declaration that I would call to the attention of the hon. Minister is declaration B which is made by Mr. Harnett:

I, Evelyn B. Harnett, a member of the firm of Hickey and Nicholson Tobacco Company, Limited, acting as travelling salesman for the Lower provinces do hereby solemnly affirm that I examined tobacco sent out by the firm of Messrs. T. B. and D. J. Riley of Charlottetown on the dates and at the places memtioned below and found it insufficiently stamped and noted same in my memorandum book, viz.:

There are cases here running from August, 1906, to August, 1907, during which this abuse was going on. In the early spring of 1907 Mr. Nicholson, of the firm of Hickey & Nicholson, drew this to the attention of the officers of the department; but no action was taken upon it until August, 1907. There are here some twenty or twenty-five cases of conclusive evidence that the Department of Inland Revenue was being defrauded. Mr. Harnett, after going over a number of these cases, says:

About May 15, last I met Mr. Moore, of the Inland Revenue Department at our factory and in the presence of Mr. D. Nicholson informed him that I had seen insufficiently stamped tobacco and urged them to look into the matter.

On August 7 I visited Lower Montague and found at the store of Messrs. W. A. Poole & Company, 5 caddies of Riley's tobacco, 1 full stamped, 3 half stamped and one without stamps and I reported this to Mr. Nicholson by telephone from Georgetown and suggested that he see the inland revenue officer at once, I returned to Charlottetown on the evening of the 8th instant, and on the 9th I called on Mr. Nash to discuss the matter, and as he treated it so lightly, I in company with Mr. Nicholson called on the collector of customs and I demanded that he give it immediate attention, and I volunteered to show where it was exposed for sale. On the 10th the collector and I drove to Lower Montague and called on Messrs. W. A. Poole & Company and was told that George Riley, of Charlottetown, a brother to T. W. Riley and father to D. J. Riley, drove to their store on the 8th of August and of his own free will and without being requested by W. A. Poole took possession and carried away two caddies without stamps, promising to return fresh stock instead, and left one caddie with half stamps on partly used on the shelf.

On the 9th Mr. Moore who was out collecting samples of food called at Messrs. Poole's store and inquired if Mr. Riley had been there lately, and when told he was there on the 8th he looked over the stock of tobacco on hand. One caddie with stamps and one with half stamps partly used on the shelf, which was opened in the end, he, Mr. Moore, took the hatchet and opened it on the side, remarking that was the proper way to open it, and after the collector held a conversation with Mr. Poole, one of the firm, we returned to town.

On the evening of the 13th I, in company with Robert W. D. M. Rattery, foreman of our factory, called on Inspector Burke at the Queen's Hotel, and after discussing the matter Mr. Burke informed us that he had no idea of the seriousness of the offence and promised to see Mr. Nicholson in the morning. Mr. Burke returned home on the morning of the 15th and so far as I am aware nothing has been done.

(Sgd.) EVELYN B. HARNETT.

Signed and declared before me at Charlottetown, in Prince Edward Island, this the 22nd day of August, A.D. 1907.

(Sgd.) W. B. ROBERTSON,
Collector.

The next letter is as follows:

September 18, 1907.

R. R. Farrow, Esq.,
Assistant Commissioner of Customs, Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 16th instant transmitting for the perusal of this department, customs file No. 69548 respecting the alleged improper manner of stamping of packages of tobacco by a manufacturer in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. I thank you for bringing this matter under the notice of this department.

Copies have been made of the correspondence and the case will be referred to the proper officer for investigation. Your file is returned herewith.

I remain, sir,
Your obedient servant,
Deputy Minister.

The next letter is as follows:

Ottawa, September 16, 1907.

W. J. Gerald, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, Ottawa.

Sir,—I send you the above noted file for perusal *re* stamping of tobacco sent out by T. B. & D. J. Riley, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) R. R. FARROW,
Assistant Commissioner of Customs.

The next letter is as follows:

September 23, 1907.

H. Lawlor, Esq.,
Inspector of Tobacco Factories, Inland Revenue, Montreal, Quebec.

Sir,—I beg to forward herewith copies of correspondence transmitted to this department by the customs, representing irregularities in connection with the stamping of packages of tobacco.

This question should receive immediate at-

tention and if you are, at the present time, unable to go east, would it not be well to place the papers in the hands of Deputy Collector Caven, who is thoroughly conversant with tobacco factory work, and allow him to investigate the report.

I remain, sir,
Your obedient servant,
Deputy Minister,
Department of Customs.

The next letter is from Mr. Nash of the Inland Revenue Department to Mr. Burke, the officer at St. John, N.B. :

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,
September 23, 1907.

T. Burke, Esq.,
St. John, New Brunswick.

Dear Sir,—I am forwarding you my contingent, including Officer Moore's account for the past year, in all $49.80.

I think your motion in sending Officer Fitzpatrick (a gentleman, officially and civilly) an exceedingly wise one; and I am quite positive that the educative work he has executed, in all the places of business, in town and country, and they are many that he has visited, will be of real and lasting benefit to the department and result in making matters go with less friction even than heretofore. There is no doubt that a strange officer whose official knowledge like Mr. Fitzpatrick's is thorough, added to his pleasant manner, has greater effect on dealers than the duties of a home officer, however well needed.

Hoping you are well,
I am yours truly,
(Sgd.) SAMUEL C. NASH.

The next letter is from Mr. T. Burke to the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue :

Inland Revenue Inspection, Canada,
District A. N.B., N.S. and P.E.I.,
St. John, New Brunswick, October 2, 1907.

W. J. Gerald, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, Ottawa, Ontario.

Sir,—In view of rumours I heard when in Charlottetown in August last with reference to tobacco stamping, &c., I decided to send Officer Fitzpatrick over to make a thorough investigation. I beg to inclose herewith his report, also Collector Nash's letter to me *re* his visit.

Preventive Officer Kelly went over the ground years ago at the request of the late Inspector Borradaile and the local officer Mr. Moore has been frequently over the territory.

Mr. Fitzpatrick being thoroughly up in the business and absolutely unknown on the island was my reason for entrusting him with the case.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) T. BURKE, D.J.

Mr. Fitzpatrick now writes to Mr. Burke as follows :

Inland Revenue, Canada, Division No. 6, St. John.

St. John, New Brunswick, October 2, 1907.

T. Burke, Esq.,
District inspector of Inland Revenue, St. John, New Brunswick.

Sir,—In compliance with your instructions 'to proceed to Prince Edward Island and see how the requirements of the law and of G—155 were being observed as to the stamping and opening of packages of tobacco and cigars, &c.'

I beg leave to report that I left St. John, New Brunswick, at noon on Thursday, September 12, and proceeded to Charlottetown. Next day I called on Collector Nash and Deputy Collector Moore who advised me how best to carry out your orders. I travelled over the whole island from Charlottetown east to Souris and Georgetown, and west to Summerside and Tignish. In all I visited nineteen towns as follows: Charlottetown, Mount Stewart, Morrell's, St. Peter's Bay, Souris, Souris West, Cardigan, Georgetown, Montague, Lower Montague, Hunter river, Bredalbane, Emerald Junction, Kensington, Malpeque, Summerside, O'Leary, Alberton, Tignish.

I called on 129 dealers, wholesale and retail, and did not find a single instance where I felt that I would be justified in making a seizure. I found several cases of tobacco out of boxes and of boxes improperly opened, but in all cases satisfactory explanations were made.

This officer goes around about six months after a case has been brought before the department in which they have conclusive evidence, collecting additional evidence. Of course this man Fitzpatrick, while he might be an excellent officer, writes a letter that can easily be understood, he visits these places six months afterwards and finds that the tobacco had been either used up or taken out of the caddies.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Order.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is the point of order ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The point must have occurred to my hon. friend some time ago, as it did to everybody else, that he is referring to a past debate and the very best evidence of that is that for the last half hour he has been quoting from 'Hansard' of a few days ago.

Mr. LEFURGEY. No, I have not. I am reading this because it is more convenient to read from, but I have the documents here.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I was about to ask my hon. friend what good purpose could be served by again reading this long list of correspondence ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. The minister said he was not familiar with the subject.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The correspondence was placed in 'Hansard' a few nights ago.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Some of it was and some was not.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. 'Hansard' will have page after page of duplication.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is not 'Hansard' that we are discussing now ; we are trying to impress on the minister that a wrong

has been committed and that he and his department are responsible for not punishing the wrong-doers. Mr. Fitzpatrick goes on :

Mr. JOHNSTON. Order, order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller). If the hon. gentleman is reading from a past debate, I suppose he is out of order.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If the hon. gentleman is so particular about reading from a past debate, I shall continue the present debate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If my hon. friend had been here a few evenings ago and had heard the long and dreary reading of these documents by the member for Queens' he would not inflict a second reading of them in order to waste the money of the people.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Such interruptions as this are certainly wasting the time of the country, but we all know my hon. friend and do not mind them.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I stay here, unfortunately for myself, but you do not.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I shall continue the reading of the letter from Mr. Fitzpatrick :

At the store of P. McNutt & Sons, Malpeque, I found a box of Empire Company's tobacco (unopened) from which the corner bearing the stamp was missing and reported same to Mr. Collector Nash. Deputy Collector Moore stated that he had found the same package and was satisfied that the damage was done in opening the crate in which the tobacco was shipped, and I fully agree with Mr. Moore in his finding. This was the only case where I found the stamp missing and I examined wherever possible the wholesale as well as the retail stock of dealers.

At Souris I felt suspicious of a Frenchman named Chiasson whose place of business is a rendezvous for fishermen. Chiasson had considerable twist and other tobaccos out of boxes and claimed not to know the law. I reported the matter to the collector at Charlottetown. In the evening I drove over to Souris West to the store of Thomas Kickham who I am told has considerable dealings with St. Pierre and Miquelon. I found that he had tobacco out of boxes and used this as an excuse to get up stairs in the warehouse to show the clerk how to open packages and incidentally see if there was anything irregular. I did not find anything wrong and left a copy of the regulations. Mr. Moore will give both these people particular attention on his next visit.

After making a very thorough and careful survey of the island I can only report that outside of these little irregularities to be found in every place in Canada, the law is well observed, particularly in Charlottetown and in the places visited by Mr. Moore on his food inspection trips.

Collector Nash and Deputy Moore were very kind in giving information as to routes and best places to visit. Trusting that my work has been satisfactorily performed and that a better compliance with the law and regulations will result therefrom,

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. J. FITZPATRICK,
Excise officer.

At the very time that this inspector was going around, the officers of this government, both Nash and Moore, had been around and had sent a report of these irregularities and they had the affidavits of these men in the department. They had sufficient evidence to secure convictions. Instead of going on with that evidence in his department, the minister sent this man around with these same officers who knew all about it and whose evidence the minister had in his hand. The letter, of course, contains nothing and looks to be an inspired article to fit the situation.

As stated by my hon. colleague (Mr. A. A. McLean), it is clear that the officers of the department had in their hands evidence of irregularities to justify them in taking very stringent measures to suppress the wrong, which was not only a wrong against the country in depriving it of its revenues, but a wrong against people who were manufacturing tobacco in the same city, and who were compelled to sell at reduced rates and make no profit, while these people were profiting at the expense of the country. Mr. Harnett, who gave the information, was certainly justified in refusing what might almost be said to have been a bribe to hush up the matter. In fact, there were rumours going about Charlottetown that not only Mr. Harnett, but the members of the Nicholson firm were approached by people who were mixed up with the situation, and who wished to have the case go further. I have no doubt at all which should have been pressed, and that political influence had a great deal to do with the matter, he was very near the mark. I think a case had been made out which should have been pressed, and that the officers of the Department of Inland Revenue were not justified in letting the guilty parties go unpunished.

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

Customs—salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and of other officers on inspection and preventive service, including salaries and expenditure in connection with the Board of Customs and for the compiling of statistical returns of imports and exports, $239,500.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Was all said that hon. gentlemen opposite wished to say on this section ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think any thing was said about it. Did the hon. gentleman explain the increase of $10,000 in this item ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, I think not. This vote covers a variety of services. There is the statistical staff, the special staff, and the preventive staff. On the staff of inspectors of ports there are 17 officers. In the Board of Customs there are 40 officers. In the special branch under Chief Inspector McMichael there are fifteen. There are five officers in the United States inspecting the value of goods for duty purposes. In the complain of statistics there are sixty-eight officers; of preventive officers there are thirteen, and in the laboratory there are three, a total of 161 officers under this item.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These are all officers having headquarters at Ottawa?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, except the chief inspector, who, for convenience, is located at the Customs in Toronto. Now, as to the increase of $10,000: of this $6,700 is on account of a staff of inspectors of ports. There is one chief inspector, 14 inspectors and 2 assistant inspectors. The salaries of these officers amount to $39,400, and their estimated travelling expenses to $13,000. Some changes have taken place that will increase the expenditure by $6,750 on account of this staff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that on account of increases in the salaries of inspectors and assistant inspectors, or is it in travelling expenses or both?

Mr. PATERSON. Increases in salaries and the appointment of one or two new officers. The following changes have been made in the inspection staff: Mr. John Kenny, formerly collector of Customs at Lethbridge, has been appointed inspector for Alberta and Saskatchewan at a salary of $2,400. Mr. Young was formerly inspector for Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, but the work has increased to such an extent that it has been found necessary for him to devote his time to the inspection of ports in Manitoba and for a new inspector to be appointed for Saskatchewan and Alberta. I think that, possibly, during the coming year, we may have to subdivide again and appoint an inspector for each of these provinces, but that has not yet been determined upon. As I said the other night, we aim, if possible, to have an inspection of every port once a year. Mr. Kenny, who was found to be a very capable officer, was created inspector for Alberta and Saskatchewan. Mr. Wyatt S. Wood, formerly Dominion appraiser in the department at Ottawa, has been added to the inspector's staff in central Ontario at a salary of $2,200 per annum. Counting Mr. McMichael, inspector, we had five in Ontario; now we shall have six. Mr. Marchant, formerly appraiser in Victoria, has been made inspector for part of British Columbia at a salary of $2,500, taking the place of Mr. Clute who was placed on the retired list in July last on account of age and to promote efficiency. Ten inspectors and one assistant receive increases of $150 each. Mr. Wood, transferred from the Board of Customs, is increased $200. The increased salaries under inspection amount to $1,850. With $2,400 salary for Mr. Kenny and $2,500 increases in travelling expenses, we have a total of $6,750.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under the reorganization, how many will there be in the inspection staff altogether?

Mr. PATERSON. Seventeen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is, a chief inspector, and— ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, first a chief inspector. Then in Ontario we have five; also there are Inspectors O'Meara and Lemieux in Quebec; inspectors Macdonnell and Bremner in Nova Scotia, and Inspector McLaren in New Brunswick. Then there is Mr. Kenny in Alberta and Saskatchewan, Mr. Young in Manitoba, and Messrs. Marchant and Busby in British Columbia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there only two inspectors for the whole province of Quebec?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have you not a good many ports in that province?

Mr. PATERSON. We have very important ports there—Montreal and Quebec, of course. Then there are some other frontier ports—outports of Sherbrooke. But we have been able to cover all these ports with the two officers. Inspector O'Meara spends most of his time at Montreal.

Mr. AMES. What ports are there in Brome, Stanstead and Missisquoi?

Mr. PATERSON. At Stanstead there are four and under that port there is a sub-collector at Georgeville, one at Magog and one at Stanstead Junction. At Sherbrooke we have a collector and six officers. We have a sub-collector at Richmond, another at Thetford Mines and another at Windsor Mills.

Mr. AMES. Have you one at Rock Island and one at Stanhope?

Mr. PATERSON. We have one at Stanhope under the port of Coaticook?

Mr. AMES. How many at Rock Island?

Mr. PATERSON. We call Rock Island Stanstead Junction.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand there are four officers at Stanstead Junction and vicinity?

Mr. PATERSON. At Stanstead there are four, one at Georgeville, one at Magog and one at Stanstead Junction.

Mr. AMES. What is the revenue of Stanstead?

Mr. PATERSON. The revenue is $6,229.72, Magog $24,657 and Stanstead Junction $13,123. The reason why there are so many officers at Stanstead is that it is a railway transfer point.

Mr. AMES. What are the salaries of the four officers at Stanstead?

Mr. PATERSON. There is the collector at $1,400, one at $500, one at $550 and one at $500, and then they get over time that we discussed the other night.

Mr. AMES. In other words, the salaries of these officers are half the entire revenue of the ports?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. We have to do a great deal of work with the Customs staff from which we get no revenue at all.

Mr. AMES. If the customs officers in Stanstead, Brome and Missisquoi would take less time in working at elections for the government perhaps they would find that a less number of officers could do the work.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. AMES. I know it; I have been there.

Mr. PATERSON. These are very busy men.

Mr. AMES. Very busy men at election times.

Mr. PATERSON. We do not allow that.

Mr. AMES. But they do it all the same. I suppose they have to make themselves useful in some way, but it does seem strange that four officers are employed and that their salaries are equal to half the revenue of the port.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the actual fact, and if the hon. gentleman were cognizant of the work that they do he would know the reason of it. We do not keep them there to engage in elections once in four years. I am not aware that they take part in elections.

Mr. AMES. I think that if the ministers will make inquiries as to the customs officers along the border of the eastern townships we will probably learn something of their special activity at election time.

Mr. PATERSON. Does it come out about even? Are there some on one side and some on the other? We do not want them to engage in elections at all, but I suppose if one is doing it another is. I do not know.

Mr. AMES. How many are there at Mansonville in the county of the Minister of Agriculture? How many are there in Brome?

Mr. PATERSON. At Mansonville we have three and at Mansonville station we have two. They are all at Mansonville station, I am told.

Mr. AMES. What is the income of Mansonville station?

Mr. PATERSON. The receipts at Mansonville are $236.73 and at Mansonville station $306.18.

Mr. AMES. What are the salaries of these five officers?

Mr. PATERSON. At Mansonville there is a collector at $800 and two others at $500 each and they get over time. Two at Mansonville station get $700 each and they get the same overtime.

Mr. AMES. It costs $3,000 to collect $500 of revenue.

Mr. PATERSON. As far as the collection goes that is right, but they are not engaged in collecting that $236.

Mr. AMES. To give you a little personal experience. I remember one morning standing at the Mansonville station when a deer came down from the hillside and three of your officers immediately took after it and that is the last they were seen.

Mr. PATERSON. You know about that being a manifesting point?

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the work that takes so many officers to do—manifesting?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. They have a great deal of that to do. There is no revenue from it, but it must be done.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many were there there in 1896?

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose the same number.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let us know and we will find out.

Mr. PATERSON. The commissioner tells me that we have not increased the number. We have a preventive service as well as a collection of revenue.

Mr. AMES. What is the staff at Abercorn?

Mr. PATERSON. A collector and two preventive officers. The revenue is $3,500.58.

Mr. AMES. I think that if the minister would issue most imperative instructions to his officers not to take any part in elections he would find that they would be able to overtake all the work with probably a smaller number than he has at present.

Mr. PATERSON. There was the same number there years ago. It is well known

it is against the rules of the department to take part in elections.

Mr. AMES. The information has not yet reached that section of the country.

Mr. PATERSON. I think it has.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand that the department requires that a customs official in one of these border towns shall give his entire time to the service of the government?

Mr. PATERSON. If the salary is under $1,000, the officer is allowed to engage in other things which must not conflict with his customs duties. These particular officers are engaged in nothing else so far as we know.

Mr. AMES. Would the minister regard owning or operating a general store at Mansonville as interfering with the duties of his official.

Mr. PATERSON. I would be disposed to. Who is the officer?

Mr. AMES. I understand complaints were sent in to the department to that effect.

Mr. PATERSON. The commissioner informs me it has been charged against him, but he denies it.

Mr. AMES. Does the officer deny that he is in reality the owner of the store, although it is carried on in another name.

Mr. PATERSON. I am told he denies.

Mr. DANIEL. What are the duties of officers employed to detect smuggling across the border? How are they remunerated? Are there female detectives in the service? I understand that these special customs detectives get some kind of a percentage on the value of seizures.

Mr. PATERSON. When information is given to them they institute inquiries and if irregularities are discovered, seizures are made. A portion of the penalty may be paid to the informers and a portion to the seizing officers, who in some cases receive more than their salaries in this way. I have tried the experiment of more than doubling the regular salaries of some of these men, and in future while the informers will participate in the seizures the seizing officers will not. I am told by my predecessors in the department and by others that this experiment will not be a success as the stimulus of receiving part of the seizures will be removed, and the officers will not be so diligent, but I think an officer should do his duty any way and I am in hope that the experiment will be a success. I will be able to tell at the end of the year whether or not as many seizures have been made as before. These are very good officers, and while I have full confidence that an officer has truthfully reported to me what he has discovered, yet when I come to adjudicate I cannot get it out of my mind that he is pecuniary interested in the seizure. A merchant may have gone on for some years, perhaps in ignorance of the law, importing an article on which duty is properly chargeable, and these things are traced back, and the special officers often discover a large amount due to the revenue. That is the work that the special officers are engaged in.

Mr. DANIEL. I think the plan which the minister says he intends to pursue will commend itself to a good many people. It does seem a little harsh that a man should be paid for what he can get out of people who may have been innocent in the methods by which goods were brought in undervalued, and I hope that under the new system the officials will be just as urgent in carrying on their business as they were before. I notice that in the allowances made to these various inspectors an amount is put down in all cases for board and lodging. I suppose that is not for ordinary board and lodging in the cities in which they live, but for travelling around?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, that is it.

Mr. DANIEL. Because I notice a great difference. For instance, a Windsor, Ontario, man gets for board and lodging, $257.50. The next is Mr. Bremner, of Halifax, who gets for board and lodging, feed and stabling, $271.53; also. for cabs, $20.15, and for livery stable, $115.90.

Mr. PATERSON. That would be for driving to the smaller ports where there is no railway connection, I suppose.

Mr. DANIEL. The next item is: Mr. Busby of Vancouver, board and lodging, $422.25.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Busby's district takes in Whitehorse and Dawson.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Clute of New Westminster is down for $381. I notice that the British Columbia men are paid larger amounts. I presume that is because their distances are longer.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, and the hotel bills are higher, I suppose.

Mr. DANIEL. Here is an inspector of Quebec who gets a larger salary than the others and charges $482 for board and lodging. In addition to that he has another amount for cabs.

Mr. PATERSON. These are actual expenses, and they produce vouchers for them all.

Mr. LANCASTER. Might I ask the minister what would be a fair average salary for any of the officers who do this seizing and share in the penalty imposed?

Mr. PATERSON. Three of them were getting $1,000, and their salaries were increased to $1,800; but they were making more than that by the seizures.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who are the men who make the seizures? Would the collector of customs, say at Niagara Falls or at St. Catharines, make a seizure and share in the penalty?

Mr. PATERSON. If his salary is less than $2,000, he would. I do not think there are many seizures made at the ports. They are generally made by a separate officer.

Mr. LANCASTER. Suppose there were at St. Catharines any goods which the collector of customs thought were smuggled in. Would he make the seizure or would he have to report to the Inspector?

Mr. PATERSON. He would do it himself, or one of his officers would do it. If an error were discovered at a city office, the seizure would probably be made by the appraiser of the goods, who has that power; but it must be reported.

Mr. LANCASTER. If he did seize and report, it would be his statement, I suppose, upon which the minister would rely in adjudicating?

Mr. PATERSON. That is one side.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister said that as a rule he had faith in the statements of these men being true. Does he not think that the fact that a man has a financial interest in the decision going one way. would have the effect of tainting his evidence, and that in that respect it is a bad policy?

Mr. PATERSON. I can only say that if I thought for a moment that an officer would make a seizure for the sole purpose of getting the money, I would not keep him in the service a minute. But while I have confidence in the officers, a feeling against the system has been growing in my mind. We had a special officer, Mr. McLean, before whom seizures came. Mr. McLean died very suddenly the other day. He was a lawyer and would go carefully through each case. The officer did not act judicially at all, he simply reported to Ottawa and when the case came here the party from whom the seizure was made would be notified that he had thirty days in which to put in his defence. At the end of the thirty days the seizures officer would examine the whole case and in his report recite the facts so that the commissioner could get a grasp of the subject without going minutely into the papers.

Mr. LANCASTER. What would the penalty be?

Mr. PATERSON. That would depend on the circumstances of the case. If we thought there were mitigating circumstances a recommendation would be made for a minimum penalty. It will be a relief to my mind to have the suggested change made, as men against whom seizures are made have the feeling that they are penalized on the evidence of men who benefit by the seizure. Of course it must be remembered that if a man thinks the action of the department is not just our decisions are not final. Many think we have extraordinary powers, we have in some respects, but we have not power to levy fines on a man without appeal. After he had been notified of the decision of the department as to the penalty imposed upon him, the man has thirty days in which he can appeal to the Exchequer Court. I would like to send every blessed case to the Exchequer Court without dealing with it, but that could not be done on account of the expense to the parties interested.

Mr. LANCASTER. In an ordinary case what would the penalty be? Is it fixed by statute? That is the penalty in which the officer shares.

Mr. PATERSON. We go the length of one-half the penalty divided between the seizing officer and the informant. If it were undervaluation, it would depend on the amount of undervaluation. Under the Customs Act, after the report has gone through the process I have described, the minister may either confirm or modify the decision. It has been found necessary for many years to discriminate in some cases owing to special circumstances. In very bad cases we send the matter direct to the courts. The penalties that may be imposed are terrific; we can fine a man the value of the goods and double the duty and $200 for every offence.

Mr. LANCASTER. In ordinary cases what is the penalty imposed?

Mr. PATERSON. What I might term the minimum penalty would be double duty. Then in some cases we know that is not sufficient. Where there has been undervaluation we take the undervaluation and the duty added. The officer seizing would get one-quarter of the amount and the informer one-quarter, the seizing officer making a declaration that he has paid it to the informant.

Mr. LANCASTER. What remedy has the informant against the seizing officer in case of non-payment?

Mr. PATERSON. He can appeal to the department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have known a case where an informant brought an action against an officer to recover his share.

Mr. PATERSON. Then he gives the name, but gives it voluntarily. He would

do the same thing if he appealed to the department. It is well known that every officer of customs is sworn to secrecy and if the informant was kept out of his money he would write to the commissioner. I should correct my statement by saying that in the case of a seizure at a port the informant is paid by the collector.

Mr. LANCASTER. In the Niagara district there is an impression among the merchants that the seizing officers make a lot of money. Some people think they make two or three times their salaries by penalties in cases which they work up. It is not well that this impression should prevail if it is not well founded. Another reason why the system should be changed is that the people have the idea that the seizing officer has the ear of the government—I am not saying that this opinion as held by these people is justified—and that, other things equal, the government will decide with the seizing officer and to secure the revenue for the country. They consider this a heavier imposition than should be made. If the minister could give the facts——

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. If the hon. member will consult page F—53 of the Auditor General's Report for 1907, he will find the figures. For instance, at Bridgeburg, where there are a good many seizures, one officer got $74.67 and others different amounts, as $110.30, $2.92, $28.44, $29.03, $18.55, $18.54. Then, take the hon. gentleman's own town, St. Catharines——

Mr. LANCASTER. Not much smuggling there.

Mr. PATERSON——one officer got $4.50, another $17.25, another $11.56, another $4.66, and so on.

Mr. LANCASTER. You will not find much in St. Catharines. They are very law-abiding.

Mr. PATERSON. I see that at Niagara Falls, the collector got $167.50, and other officers $1.08, $2.50, $10.50, $4.23. The amounts for the informers are found here too. In one case the officer appears to have received nothing and the informer $167.50.

Mr. DANIEL. At page F—55 it is shown that the sum of $562.50 went to the informer and there was nothing for the seizing officer.

Mr. PATERSON. That was in St. John ?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes. In other cases there are amounts of $143.13, $57.10, $12.50, $12.69, $140.63 going to the seizing officer when nothing goes to the informer. I notice that another column is headed 'Collector's Commission.' Do the collectors get commission on these seizures ?

Mr. PATERSON. Under an old rule, 5 per cent of the seizure amount goes to the collector where the salary is not more than $2,000. In these port seizures, the fines were not so much. The cases where the fines were large, and in which I am now making a change, were those covered by the officers of this special branch, the transactions of large firms, running back two or three years would call for investigation by one of the special officers, who are clever men, and who would sometimes work for months unravelling accounts. The result would be a fine and maybe a very heavy one. It was in these cases that the officers would make more than double—sometimes treble—their salary. As I have said, I am doubling their salary and am going to try and get along with giving a share to the informer and nothing to the seizing officer.

Mr. McLENNAN. Do I understand the minister to say that the increases of salaries to these special customs officials are uniform ?

Mr. PATERSON. I know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) refers to. There is one officer whose salary has not yet been increased. He is a little differently placed from the others. His duty was more particularly to prevent smuggling on the coast. He was a very active officer and has taken part in some of these seizures for undervaluation. We have not increased his salary as yet, but when I get this money, as I expect to do in a few minutes, I am going to try to give him an advance too.

Mr. McLENNAN. Will not the minister consent to put him on the same plane as his colleagues in the service ? Will he not acknowledge that he is as clever a man as they are ?

Mr. PATERSON. He is a clever man.

Mr. McLENNAN. I know he is. I have that from the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. There is a distinction; his duties are on the coast——

Mr. McLENNAN. And therefore he is not to get an increase ?

Mr. PATERSON. Where there is direct smuggling, the officer who makes the seizure will share.

Mr. LANCASTER. In every case?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, except in the case of these three or four officers whose salaries are increased. And, if the salary of this other officer is increased, he will have to come under the same rule.

Mr. McLENNAN. That is exactly what Mr. Bourinot wants—to be placed on the same footing as his colleagues. For years past, he has been engaged in the same

service and has had the same instructions as others to go all over Canada in this service. He feels very much humiliated that his four colleagues are increased from $1,000 to $1,800 while his salary is not increased. I may say that Mr. Bourinot is such a terror to smugglers along our coast that there is scarcely any smuggling done, and, if he is confined to what he can collect from seizures on account of smuggling, what he receives will amount to very little. But what he feels most keenly is not being kept on the same plane as his colleagues of this service.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said that he expected to get this money in a few minutes and to be able to distribute it. Am I to understand that as soon as the item is passed he can use the money ? He must wait for a Supply Bill, must he not ? He said the other day that as soon as he got the vote passed he would issue the cheques.

Mr. PATERSON. No, I said we would consider the increases.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, when the minister was begging for this vote, he said that tomorrow the cheques would go out—that was his argument as I can prove by 'Hansard.' But I understand that he agrees with me now that he cannot do that, that he must wait for the Supply Bill to be passed. He said that there were vouchers for all these expenditures. Does he still say that that is correct—that for the expenditures in connection with this preventive service he has vouchers ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not say that concerning the secret service fund, which is expended under the direction of the Department of Justice.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Lemieux, inspector at Montreal, receives for nine months a salary of $1,687.50 and for board and lodging $222.50. There are vouchers supplied for the latter payment, I presume? The minister says there are vouchers for all the items of expenditure.

Mr. PATERSON. I understand so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Cabs, busses and ferries, $45.75 ; fares, $67.83 ; leather bag, $20. What kind of a bag would that be and why was it supplied to this officer?

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose it was a travelling bag for his books and papers.

Mr. TAYLOR. There will be a voucher for that?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes; the accountant tells me there is a voucher for everything.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an item, pullmans and porters, $34.25. Does he get a voucher from a porter when he tips him?

Mr. McLENNAN.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the minister must withdraw a portion of the statement that he made that there is a voucher for everything. We find these officers throwing out the people's money in pullmans and tips to porters. Hundreds of dollars are expended in this way. The minister says there are vouchers and now he admits there are no vouchers for these expenditures.

Mr. PATERSON. You must take things in the broad and not get down to quibbles.

Mr. TAYLOR. I find that Mr. Jones, inspector, received a salary of $1,500 for nine months; that would, I presume, be $2,000 for the year. He received for board and lodging, $600; cabs and cartage, $83.80; livery, $25.50; pullman and porters, $53.45; telephone rent, $27.40; petty expenses, $16.85, making $2,351. There were paid $851 for expenses, made up of board and lodging and tips to porters. So it is with every one of these officers. There is a large amount going out for travelling expenses, pullmans, tips to porters. The minister said that there was a voucher for every item and now he admits there are no vouchers for a portion of these expenses. I would like to see the vouchers for the petty expenditures.

Mr. PATERSON. We do not get vouchers for tips. When you ask the question I can quite understand that there are vouchers for these items and that the Auditor General is satisfied when he sees that there are some charges for tips and pullmans. Inspector McMichael has to come down here and in order to save time we ask him to come down by night. We pay his pullman berth.

Mr. TAYLOR. If his account is certified by one of the officers of the department the Auditor will pay it without vouchers?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. All the Auditor asks for is that the account shall be certified by some officer in the department.

Mr. PATERSON. The vouchers go to the auditor when there are vouchers. But there is not a voucher for a tip. When they give a pullman porter a tip they do not take a voucher for it?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, but an officer of the department certifies that it is correct and the Auditor accepts that without knowing whether it is correct or not.

Mr. PATERSON. What are you going to do about it?

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister says that there is a voucher for every expenditure. Now he has to admit that there are no vouchers for a great many expenditures.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member said that if we withdrew one clause of a certain Bill he would allow the estimates to go through in two minutes. Now he will not stand by that and he tries to make out that I made a statement that I will not stand by.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister has attributed to me a statement that I never made. I did not say that the hon. gentleman should withdraw one clause of the Bill, but I said two clauses.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the minister if he has taken into consideration the report of the Civil Service Commission with respect to the blue-books emanating from his department and from the Department of Trade and Commerce? The remarks to which I allude are as follows:

In the preparation of the blue-books presented to parliament there seems to be a certain amount of overlapping and duplication. It is difficult, for instance, to know in what respect the blue-books emanating from the Customs and Trade and Commerce Departments differ. The gist of the blue-books is finally put together by the director of Census and Statistics in the Statistical Year-book of Canada, and it would seem to the commissioners desirable to ascertain whether the blue-books issued by the several departments could not be reviewed by some authoritative body with a view to their simplification and co-ordination, thereby increasing their value without increasing their cost. Your commissioners believe that this might be done by, possibly, a joint committee of the two houses of parliament entrusted with the printing of parliamentary documents.

I would be inclined to suggest to the commissioners that while the reports of two departments cover the same ground they are not always precisely alike. I have had the good or bad fortune sometimes to examine the returns of the Department of Trade and Commerce and the corresponding returns of the Department of Customs, and I have found that they do not exactly correspond.

Mr. PATERSON. When in doubt take the customs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I might say to the hon. minister that I have been advised by the Department of Trade and Commerce, whenever in doubt, to take their returns.

Mr. LANCASTER. Sir Richard Cartwright when he was in this House and when he was in doubt quoted from the Year Book, which was different from the report of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could we not have one system of returns upon which we could absolutely rely instead of having two systems of returns upon practically the same matters which returns are not exactly the same?

Mr. PATERSON. They are all based upon the customs. The others are compiled from the customs reports. The basis of the whole is the entries of the Department of Customs and we are in a position to have them correct. The Department of Trade and Commerce, I think, arrange the figures in a different way, perhaps using a different table, but their figures are taken from our reports. As to the Year Book, I think it deals with more than mere statistics, but whatever statistics it has appertaining to the trade and commerce of the country must come from us. We are in a position to get the actual facts, no other department is, and we have the statistical staff here in order to compile the statistics and get out a monthly report. At the end of August we can give you the trade for July. We have, I think, the most accurate and up to date statistics of any nation in the world.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The reports of the Trade and Commerce Department are not of much use as far as I can gather from the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. I would not say that, but we must be right.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are the sub-collectors in Manitoba paid by salary or commission or both?

Mr. PATERSON. By salary in most of the cases, but in some cases where we have postmasters with power to collect on postal packages they are paid by commission.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the minister received any complaints as to the methods pursued by these sub-collectors in Manitoba in dealing with the public?

Mr. PATERSON. Occasionally there are complaints, but they are not due to the fault of the officers. In some cases we attend to them. Some of our friends from other countries, especially from the old country where they are not accustomed to customs troubles, do not know how to make the entry for articles which come out to them, a broker does it for them and then there is a broker's fee charged on the bill and they want to know how it is that the duty is so much and the fee is so much more. We have to write and find out the facts.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is it absolutely necessary to have a broker?

Mr. PATERSON. With the view of doing away with this annoyance we have instructed our collectors to make out entries if the parties themselves do not know how to make them out for settlers' effects. We do not allow the officers to make entries out for the public. That is our rule, and we think it is a safe one. In the case of

settlers' effects we allow the officers to make out the entries when the settlers do not know how to make them out themselves.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I have been informed that a sub-collector has asked a citizen to allow his name to be used as an agent and then the fee would be retained if not directly by the sub-collector, through another member of his family. I do not say this occurs now, but I am informed by a gentleman who allowed his name to be utilized for that purpose that it has occurred. I wish to state to the minister that with regard to the sub-collector at Neepawa there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction not only among the old country people, but among our own Canadian citizens. I do not know whether the Minister of Customs agrees with the ex-Minister of Railways that education is a disadvantage in the Civil Service, but the education of some of these officials, in civility, will stand a good deal of improvement. This particular sub-collector has been to my own knowledge very arrogant in his dealings with the public ; if not to the people in his own town, certainly with the outside public. There has been a great deal of delay in customs mail coming through the post office, and I am told people have received invoices three or four weeks before the material would get to the post office. The postmaster has told me that the reason is that the sub-collector will retain in his office the dutiable mail until he has sufficient gathered to fill a mail bag. This is a great hardship to many people who want their goods immediately. Ladies and gentlemen have made complaints to me with regard to this. In some instances the correspondence has been replied to in anything but a civil manner by the sub-collector, and in many instances he has not replied to the correspondence at all. When I was home at Easter I was particularly asked to bring this matter to the attention of the minister. The complaint does not come from one or two sore heads but is universal. I do not know that I have ever heard an officer so complained of as this officer at Neepawa is in regard to his dealings with the public. The complainants cannot be all wrong and the officer right. I will give one illustration : A Canadian boy graduated in medicine, went to New York, took with him an overcoat of splendid material and in good repair, which was an heirloom in the family ; he put in a year or two in the New York hospitals and he returned to enter into partnership with me in Manitoba. When he was leaving New York he left his overcoat behind and sent for it afterwards. It came to Neepawa through the customs and he was informed that a certain amount of duty would be levied on it. He explained it was Canadian made, that it had been in the family for years, that he had not room in his trunk for it when he was leaving New York, but the sub-collector at Neepawa said he would have to pay so much duty. Again the sub-collector was written to but he insisted in holding up the article for quite a large amount of duty. I brought the matter to the attention of the minister and he overruled the sub-collector, as he has in several instances which I have brought to his notice. I do not think any officer who is intelligent would make such a mistake as this sub-collector made, and it is only one of many instances of that sort. If the minister reads a curtain lecture to this gentleman it will, I believe, make him more civil in his dealings with the public. The complaints against him are loud and numerous.

Mr. PATERSON. We are all servants of the public and the department strives in every way to impress on the officers the necessity for civility and courtesy even though sometimes their temper may be pretty well tried by some peculiar people they occasionally have to deal with. Let me tell my hon. friend that under the circumstances he has mentioned the sub-collector at Neepawa was not at liberty to do anything else than he did. When the hon. gentleman says we overruled the sub-collector, I wish to point out that we have the power to do so, but we do not give the power to the officer to act on his own discretion. If we allowed officers to take this discretion the door would be left open to serious abuses, as the hon. gentleman will see on reflection. These cases have been reported to us, and if we satisfy ourselves as to the correctness of the representations made we act accordingly. We don't want any delay in the customs service or any want of courtesy on the part of the officers, and we will have this matter looked into.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). A declaration was ready to be submitted to the sub-collector, that the overcoat was Canadian made and he should not have held it up to duty.

Mr. PATERSON. I would like to have some of these rules relaxed, but if my hon. friend were administering the customs he would see the danger of any relaxation. When the first tariff was introduced, I persuaded the Minister of Finance to put in a provision that any article less than 50 cents in value should come in free of duty and this would save us a great deal of trouble, but my predecessor in the office, Mr. Clarke Wallace, denounced that provision and pointed out that a man in Ottawa could simply write to Ogdensburg and order 50 cents worth of cigarettes every morning and thus evade the payment of duty. We saw the danger of opening the door in that way, because we saw abuses would follow. Some of these regulations may ap-

pear absurd and vexatious, but they are necessary and cannot be relaxed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to ask something further about the system of inspection. In the report of the Civil Service Commission one of the commissioners referred to the tendency in the English outside service to give smaller salaries and higher travelling expenses so as to induce the inspectors to keep out constantly on the road and I quote from the evidence on that point:

Q. In the English outside service the tendency rather is to give smaller salaries and higher travelling expenses so as to induce the inspectors to go out constantly on the road?—A. The inspectors are expected to make an examination once a year of each port in their district. That you see it requires them to make an inspection and to be around a good deal.

Q. Take Mr. Bremner, for instance, he would not have any inducement to go to Barrington, or an outside outport, in Nova Scotia in the middle of the winter?—A. Not in the middle of the winter. He would select his seasons for the difficult points.

Q. And the consequence is that by selecting his seasons for the difficult points the collectors would know almost to a certainty when the inspectors would come around?—A. I think so.

Q. If the collectors knew when the inspector is coming around they can always, if there is anything suspicious, cover up their tracks?—A. It would give them a better opportunity but it is difficult for them to cover up their tracks under the system we have in operation.

Q. What are the inspectors' duties. When Mr. Bremner goes to Weymouth, for example, what does he do?—A. The first thing is to count the cash. He then looks over the work of the port, and compares the entries with the manifest. The manifests are not filed in the department, they remain at the port as a record of the goods coming in.

By Mr. Fyshe:

Q. The manifests are kept at the port?—A. Kept at the port. That is the manifest of goods received.

Q. What check has the department at Ottawa that the full duties are being received?—A. We have the entries. The entries are sent to Ottawa when they are passed by the importer.

Q. And these correspond with the manifest?—A. They are supposed to, and the inspector checks them to see that they do.

Q. Would the inspector go over all the manifests that have accumulated since the last inspection?—A. At small ports he would, but not at large ports, it would be impracticable.

Q. You say that in most cases the collector would know that the inspector was coming around?—A. I think he would.

Q. The inspector would surely not notify him?—A. No.

Q. Why should he know then?—A. He may know that he is at a neighbouring port, and that he will likely take the ports in their turn.

Q. Under the system of bank inspection the inspector drops down when he is utterly unexpected, and when there are two or three branches together he does not take them all at once, but goes away and returns again?—A. At the large ports there is a system of check that tends to prevent any fraud by the officers. The danger is at the small ports where there is only one officer. At the other ports one officer is a check upon the other.

Then there are some illustrations given of the results at small ports. For example, there is some evidence given with regard to the defalcation at Drummondville:

Q. How long did that defalcation go on?—A. I suppose some months.

Q. That office was inspected, I presume?—A. Yes.

Q. Did the inspector discover the defalcation?—A. Not at first, for the reason that the manifest was destroyed. It was a manifest from Montreal and he took the last number for the year.

Further on:

Q. It is strange that one of the questions asked by the commission in 1892 was what was to hinder a collector at a small port from suppressing an invoice and putting it into the fire? That is really what happened at Drummondville?—A. He suppressed the last manifest of the series for the year. I think that can be checked, but our work of late has been so hard that it is difficult to keep pace with it.

Then there is a large amount of evidence, which I will not quote, with respect to some frauds practised in Montreal by a man of the name of Hobbs. It seems that he was enabled, by a certain system which he invented, to entirely circumvent the inspector, Mr. Meunier, who was suspended, and the collector at Montreal says he has been under suspension ever since. It would seem to me, from these and a number of other quotations which I might make from the evidence, but with which I will not weary the committee, that something might be done to increase the efficiency of the system of inspection. So far as I am concerned, I would be glad to support the minister even in increasing the staff if it were necessary to make a thorough and effective inspection of every port at least once a year. It does strike me, from what the minister himself has stated, that two inspectors for the entire province of Quebec would be regarded by any large institution of the country as entirely inadequate for the purpose which they are supposed to serve. There must be a very large number of ports in the province of Quebec, and I suppose a much larger business is done at Montreal than at any other port in Canada. I would think that the attention of the department might be very well directed not only to the system of inspection, but possibly to the putting into practice of some better system of check than seems to be in vogue at the present time. The inspection to which we had reference the other even-

ing at the port of Huntington in British Columbia seems to have been singularly inefficient on two occasions. On the first occasion, shortly before the defalcation was discovered an inspection took place, which did not result in ascertaining that the public moneys were being misappropriated. Then, the inspection which did result in discovering the defalcation was not a very effective one, as the minister very candidly acknowledged, because it was not discovered at that time that some $6,000 additional had been misappropriated, and that remained undiscovered for three or four years. Has the minister taken the suggestions in the evidence in this regard into consideration?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot say that I have in the sense of utilizing them. The report of the commissioners, so far as the customs is concerned, helps us very little. I do not say that in disparagement of the commissioners, but in commendation of my officers, who have introduced such checks and safeguards as to leave very little that is valuable to us in the suggestions of the commission. There is that difficulty of one officer alone at a port. At a large port like Montreal, if we made as thorough an inspection there through our inspectors as we make at the smaller ports, it would never be finished, if he worked at it all the time. With 178,000 entries in nine months, and with all the way-bills and transfers and manifests and the checking of the cash, it would be impossible. We have to depend largely upon the checks which the officers have upon one another in the office. In Montreal, while the inspector is there a good deal, and watches how things go on from day to day, we have a very thorough collector there besides. With reference to the defalcation mentioned by the commissioners our officer neglected his plain instructions. or it could not have happened. That is not settled yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr White, in dealing with that, says: 'If the cashier had obeyed orders, a portion at least of the defalcation would not have happened.'

Mr. PATERSON. The instruction was that when a cheque was handed in for a larger amount than the duty came to, the refund was to be made by cheque. The officer in question knew that, and it was his duty to have returned the money by cheque; but he returned it in cash. We have now instituted a check which will make it perfectly safe so that this could not happen again. But, as Mr. White says, even the banks, with much smaller staffs than we have, and with managers and directors sharp business men, are defeated from time to time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think he says something more to the point than that—that you cannot by any possible system guard against flagrant dishonesty.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. leader of the opposition alluded to the fact that he had information that instead of $4,200 that we got as the result of the first examination, it was $5,800. Inspector Busby is here now, and I inquired about that. It appears that when Mr. Clute made the first examination, he found entries that had not been made, the duties of which amounted to $800. He had the collector have those entries made, and the duties paid by the parties for whom they were made. The goods had gone out of his possession but the entries were there and he made him get the entries from the merchants and get the duty from them. The $800 collected went to the credit of the Receiver General in the usual way, being sent to New Westminster, but Mr. Clute in his report to us did not mention that the $800 was here in that way and so that would be $800 more than the amount mentioned.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What was the customs revenue for the last month and how does it compare with the same month of last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. It has fallen off. In round numbers, for the two months of the present financial year, the customs revenue is two millions and nearly three-quarters less than for the corresponding two months of last year.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. A falling off in any particular line ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, it seems to be general and at all the ports. Winnipeg and perhaps Vancouver are keeping up, but in Montreal, Toronto and all the others there is a falling off.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the hon. gentleman decreased his staff ? When the revenue increases he increases his staff ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think we can do that, we have been working the men too hard.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What particular experience had Mr. Charles McNellen, assistant appraiser at Halifax, which resulted in his appointment.

Mr. PATERSON. He passed the requir-ed examination.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was he engaged in any particular line of buisness which qualified him for that particular line of business?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not remember, he has been in the customs for some years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There has been some criticism of the fact that he was appointed over the heads of a great many capable officers receiving only $700 or $800 after many years' service, and has now a

salary of $1,000. The information which comes to me is that he had no particular qualification except that he had some pretty strong political backing.

Mr. PATERSON. He has qualifications we believe or he would not be there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know what they are.

Mr. PATERSON. We try to make these appointments by merit. But, as I said, if a man is recommended to me as being capable and worthy for a position, I have never considered the fact of his being a Liberal a barrier to his appointment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not suggesting that it should be, but I am suggesting that it should not be the sole consideration.

Mr. PATERSON. He has been on since 1901.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I took the Civil Service List of 1907.

Mr. PATERSON. He has been permanent since 1904, but he was in the service before that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am afraid he has no qualification beyond what I mention.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you know him ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have heard a good deal about him but I do not know him personally.

Mr. PATERSON. As not being able to discharge his duties or what ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I cannot say I have heard anything more about it than what I have stated. I have a memorandum on the subject from a responsible person in which reference is made to other officers in the department who have been there a long time, some of them for ten, or fifteen years or twenty years and who would be fully as capable, if not more capable, than the gentleman who has received the appointment. The statement is also made that he is pretty closely connected to a prominent gentleman in public life, and that circumstance is supposed to account for the passing over of officers of long service in favour of this gentleman. One would hardly imagine the Minister of Customs would be influenced by any considerations of that kind, and thus it is only fair to give him an opportunity of explaining the matter.

Mr. PATERSON. The Minister of Customs is human. From what I understand he discharges his duty well. As to the passing over of those older in the service, it is difficult in handling a large body of men to avoid matters of this kind. You cannot get any man to think that his services are not as valuable as those of another man. In a mercantile house the head of the firm has to determine such matters. You cannot follow the rule but promotions must go by length of service. In public life the same conditions must prevail. Other things being equal, I like to see promotion of the men longest in the service. The hon. member (Mr. R. L. Borden) I think perhaps knows as much as I do about this man and with the general confidence he has in me he will recognize that there must be reasons why this is right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it would perhaps be a fair statement to say that I know more about him than the hon. gentleman is disposed to admit. The minister has not given us many proofs as to this gentleman's special aptitude. There are many officers at Halifax who were worthy of promotion. I do not think that the circumstances of this case as detailed to me are such as to increase the discipline or the honesty of the men in the service.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you not think he has special aptitude for his duties now ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am informed that there are many officers in the service who have displayed more aptitude than this gentleman has displayed.

Mr. PATERSON. My impression is that he discharges his duties very well.

Mr. AMES. As the minister is probably aware there has been and still is great dissatisfaction in Montreal, especially among importers in the dry goods trade, dissatisfaction which has been expressed on more than one occasion, regarding the settlement of customs frauds by compromise. There has been even more of that in the last two or three months than previously. It is a matter that while doubtless familiar to the minister is well well worth the attention of the House for a few minutes, and I think we should have from the minister a statement of the policy of the department in cases where fraud has actually occurred in connection with the importation of goods. Where a man or a firm is caught in the act of committing a fraud, I understand the regular method is to charge double duty and a fine. If the law was enforced when cases of this kind were discovered, the importing public would know where they stood in connection with the custom service of the country. The ordinary importer who tries to do his duty by his fellow men, who is careful about his importations and invoicing and costs, who may once in a long time happen to have a bale of goods inadvertently placed in another bale of goods and so falsely or incorrectly entered, such a merchant is generally fined the whole penalty that attaches to the offence. But where, as in this case, there is a deliberate falsification that goes on for a period of years and involves a very large sum, it almost always results in a private settlement in which the full penalty of

the law is not inflicted and in which the punishment is not sufficient to act as a deterrent or as a sufficient protection to the men who are really trying to do their duty by the Customs. Now, the minister knows that this has been complained of frequently. He knows also that, in his kind manner, he receives and hears, and dismisses the deputations that wait upon him, but the deputations do not find any change in the policy of the department as a result of their visits. In the kindness of his heart he finds it hard to inflict the maximum penalty, even when grievous cases are brought to the attention of the department. So, I risk the bringing to his attention of something with which he is quite familiar, and am going to lay before the House some of the resolutions that have been passed in this connection by the wholesale dry goods people of Montreal and some of the articles that have appeared in responsible journals in Montreal protesting against this particular abuse. I wish first to read, and again bring to the attention of the minister, this resolution passed by the Wholesale Dry Goods Association of Montreal, on June 25, 1906 :

Resolved, that the Wholesale Dry Goods Association of the Montreal Board of Trade hereby places itself on record as opposing in the strongest possible manner the system of secret settlement of customs irregularities as now carried on by the customs, such a method of settlement being a gross injustice to the importer who faithfully complies with the requirements of the Customs Act, and at the same time a strong inducement to those dishonestly inclined to violate the law ;

That this association therefore calls upon the customs authorities to give the fullest possible publicity to the results of all investigations as honest importers are entitled to protection and such publicity is a right which should not be withheld.

This resolution was presented to the minister by a deputation on June 28, 1906. That was followed up, if I am rightly informed—as the representations contained in the resolution did not seem to have all the effect expected by the gentlemen who presented them—in February, 1907, when a deputation of the Dry Goods Association of Montreal visited Ottawa and called on the Minister of Customs. Their grievance was practically the same as had been expressed a year and a half before—that where there were small errors, a bale of goods improperly invoiced, the importer was compelled to pay the full extent of the fine, but where large amounts were involved the matter was compromised by the government. About that time, in further endorsement of the deputation, several articles were published in the 'Shareholder' of Montreal, a journal which is not generally regarded as being unfriendly to this government, but which certainly speaks out independently when the trade interests of the great city of Montreal are affected. I think it is worth while to read these two editorials in order that they may be reported in full, and in order that we may have from the minister a more definite statement regarding the allegations contained therein than has yet been given. Here is an article from the 'Shareholder' of Friday, March 13, 1908 :

Customs fraud.

From time to time we have urged upon the Dominion government, when frauds upon the revenue of the country are detected and brought home to the offenders, that publicity should be given to the fact, in order that honest importers may be encouraged to respect the law. Reference was made not long since, in these columns, to the importation through a resident agent by a number of Zurich silk manufacturers. The charge was pooh-poohed at the time as being wholly unfounded——

Probably, the minister will remember that when the case was first presented it was pooh-poohed by the department——

—the truth of which contention is seen in the fact that the matter has since been compromised by the payment of a sum of $32,000.

The contention of these manufacturers at the time was that they thought they had a right to invoice goods at cost price. This, of course, is the usual excuse set up by parties charged with infringement of the Customs Act. Had such a contention any foundation in law, and were those setting it up honest men, they would defend themselves before a court of justice rather than be branded as smugglers or attempted smugglers. These compromises are a gross injustice to wholesale importers who respect the law, for the latter are thereby compelled to compete at a disadvantage with those who, by defrauding the revenue, can undersell them. But the worst feature is that the government is virtually supporting and encouraging the violators of the law to continue their operations, inasmuch as the fines collected are considerably less in amount than would be the full duty imposed. At the time that the charges against the Zurich silk manufacturers were being investigated, an influential delegation of merchants from Montreal and Toronto waited upon Hon. Mr. Paterson, Minister of Customs, to protest against any compromise being made in the event of the charges being sustained. The promise was given them, at the time, that these representations and protests should have the fullest consideration. Now the charges have been fully proved and a compromise entered into which showed the amount of consideration given by the minister to the representations and protests referred to. This can only be characterized as intolerable injustice, and as such cannot be too strongly denounced. The government should not overlook the fact, as they have hitherto done, that the honest, law-abiding merchants of the Dominion are entitled to more consideration than those who treat it with contempt. Thes fines are not contribu-

tions to the revenue. They do not replace the duties of which the government has been defrauded, but are disposed of in some other manner. Now, we ask, how are they disposed of, and who gets the benefit of them?—for, unless some one gets the benefit, directly or indirectly, it seems to us that there would be less disposition to entertain or make proposals for a compromise of any kind. We may mention in this connection that the customs authorities are now engaged in conducting investigations in two important charges of undervaluation, in other words, of customs infraction. In the event of the charges being sustained, are we to expect the continued adherence to the disgraceful system of compromise which has become so frequent and so odious? The fullest penalty provided by the law should be imposed, and with it a wide publication of the fact. The new council of the Montreal Board of Trade have an excellent opportunity to benefit the mercantile community by taking up the question with a determination to put themselves on record and to impress upon the government that what the merchants ask for is not by any means a favour, but in every respect one of right and simple justice.

That was followed, a week later, by another editorial, still more explicit. The following is from the 'Shareholder' of Montreal, March 20, 1908:

Customs frauds.

In last week's issue of the 'Shareholder' reference was made to the settlement, by the Customs Department, of charges of defrauding the revenue made against a number of Zurich silk manufacturers. The settlement refered to consisted of releasing the seized imports on the manufacturers paying to the government a sum of $36,000——

Evidently the figures were a little higher than at first stated.

—which were far from being equal to the amount which the customs law calls for under such conditions. The law distinctly lays down the penalties to be enforced against those infringing it, and when condemnation takes place there should be no hesitation in punishing the guilty parties. Compromises have been entered into again and again, and offenders have been dealt leniently with, on the ground that to enforce the full penalty would drive them out of business. This is misplaced sympathy, for such men should never have been in business. Any sympathy should be extended to the honest importers who comply with the law and have to compete with their dishonest competitors. The merchants deprecate in the strongest possible manner any compromise under such circumstances, contending that such is a gross injustice to them. They have again and again sent deputations to Ottawa to protest against them, but this without avail. What course they should now adopt is under consideration, and we would suggest that the matter should be brought up in the House of Commons, under the guise of a motion for the production of all documents relating to every violation of the Customs Act.

Were this done, the public would be greatly surprised at the information they would receive. At the present time the Customs Department has under consideration two very serious charges. One of these is against John B. Ellison & Sons, wholesale woollen importers of this city, with headquarters at Philadelphia. The other is against Jacob Rohner, of Rebstein, Switzerland, manufacturer of Swiss embroideries. The commercial standing of these two houses, which have been doing a large business in this country for a number of years, is such that it is highly essential that the public should know whether the charges are true. If they are untrue they should be relieved from the stigma which the charges involve, and that release should be publicly proclaimed. In these two cases, as is frequently done, the goods were seized and were only released when the deposit called for by the customs authorities was put up. This being done, it becomes the duty of the customs authorities to file an information before our courts, and thus afford the accused an opportunity to defend themselves and establish their innocence. In that case, should failure on the part of the incriminated to set aside the grounds of complaint result, the commercial community would be put in possession of the actual facts. In giving, as we have done, the names of those who are charged, as above stated, we are actuated solely by the desire to avert from others the suspicions that might attach to them, and also to afford the accused occasion to take the community into their confidence and relieve them of the stigma which a seizure for infraction of the revenue involves. In conclusion, we may say that we will gladly open our columns to any who desire to enter into explanations relating to the action of the customs authorities.

These editorials make it apparent that there has existed a feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of the importing trade of the city of Montreal. The dry goods association, especially, through their president and secretary, have repeatedly put themselves on record with the department protesting against these compromises which are made in secret, and which hang firms up, as it were, between heaven and earth, where they are not guilty or innocent, but whose cases are, in the language of the Scotch verdict, not proven. It is felt that a firm which gets into trouble with the customs officials have a right to vindication or they should be punished. When a seizure has been made without proper evidence and the firm is not guilty of what it is charged with, that firm is entitled to the fullest vindication and it is entitled to have every business man know that the charge was not sustained. If, on the other hand, it has been found guilty of a serious infraction of the customs law which has been going on year after year and by which it had profited to the disadvantage of its competitors it ought to be punished and punished severely, and these facts ought all to be absolutely apparent. But, to have it compromised, nobody knowing whether the firm was guilty or innocent, is neither fair to the firm nor to the community as a whole. Honest importers,

men who are careful not to engage in anything of this kind, are fully entitled to protection. When a business firm is most scrupulous in all its dealings with the customs, it is a very serious thing for that firm to be undersold by other firms which are less scrupulous, and nineteen-twentieths or our trade being strictly honest, the competition of the twentieth-twentieth which reduces the price is unfair and unjust. I would like to ask the minister to give us a statement of the policy of the government in this respect, to tell us whether there has been a reform and an improvement in this system or whether the system of compromise is going on just the same. We would like also to know what are the actual facts with respect to these Zurich silk manufacturers, John B. Ellison & Sons and Jacob Rohner, of Rebstein, Switzerland. What has been done, what was the offence, have they been convicted or acquitted ? If they have been convicted, what has been the extent of the punishment ? What were the extenuating circumstances, if any ? I think there can be no doubt that the sentiment is pretty generally spread abroad that there is a lack of severity in the punishments inflicted which will simply lead to a repetition of these offences on the part of the less scrupulous portion of the business community. I can assure the minister that the matter has been, to the merchants of Montreal, a source of very great dissatisfaction, and they would, I think, read with considerable interest what the minister might say in reply to what has been said to-night.

Mr. PATERSON. You have opened up rather a large question, and one which I have already dealt with. The seizing officer would make an investigation. We do not want to do any injury to any one, and if a sufficient amount is deposited to the credit of the receiver general, the party against whom a seizure has been made is allowed to conduct his business. The case is reported to Ottawa and then it goes through the process I have already described. The party is allowed thirty days to put in his defence. The evidence is then gone into by an examining officer who is generally, although not always, a lawyer. Mr. McLean, who died the other day, discharged this duty. The evidence is gone over and set forth in as plain and concise a manner as may be for the commissioner to peruse. He looks over the report and if he approves of the report which has been made by the officer he sends his recommendation based upon that report to myself where it is finally dealt with. Under a clause of the Act the head of the department may confirm or vary the recommendations or he may refer it to the courts. You will have to trust in a large measure to the department in administering this matter, to have confidence in them or have no confidence in them. The disclosure of the names of the parties from whom seizures had been made might result in injustice to a great many men. Some parties have called for stringent measures in dealing with these cases, but when I have had interviews with them and when I have asked them if they thought it desirable that we should make public every seizure and the name of the firm from whom the seizure was made and the decision given, I understood them to say that they did not propose that. I agreed with them because a grievous wrong might be done. A merchant in Montreal or Toronto, or some other place, in whose integrity I would have as much confidence as I have in my own, might perhaps have a shipment of goods and in that shipment, coming from a packer, perhaps there might be a small parcel purchased at another place and sent forward to the packer to pack it in the case. It has come out to this country without it being noted on the invoice that there is a package included in the case. The person sending the case does not mention that that parcel has been sent. It comes to the custom house, one package in ten is selected at random and goes to the examining warehouse. The other nine do not. It happens that the very case in which the inclosure is goes to the examinining warehouse. The examiner opens it, there is the parcel of goods, not appearing on the entry, no invoice filed, no entry made, the goods having come into the country illegally.

Mr. AMES. In that case you put on the maximum penalty.

Mr. PATERSON. No. These gentlemen bring letters from the exporters explaining it was their error. My predecessor in office told me that enclosures ought to be forfeited every time because it was only one case in ten that went to the examining warehouse. But where we are satisfied there is no fraud we impose double duty. Now, as to publicity, it might be very unjust and very unfair to a concern to give publicity, and the member for Brantford recognized, when in asking for the seizures and the penalties he forebore to ask for the names. The best houses in this country have been seized and fined for customs infraction, and if that bare fact were to go out without the explanation it would be very injurious to the firm. In many cases the exporters admitted it was their fault and that the importer knew nothing about it. If the House took the responsibility of asking that the name should be divulged, in fairness to these firms it would be necessary to bring down

all the facts of each case. To state the bare fact that a firm was fined without giving the explanation would be very unjust and would involve its reputation and standing or perhaps its fortune. I do not see how the 'Shareholder' gets hold of these things. Our officers are sworn to secrecy. The hon. gentleman says the party was fined $32,000 with reference to these silks, and if that be so it is a pretty heavy penalty.

Mr. AMES. The undervaluation had been going on for a number of years and large quantities had been brought in.

Mr. PATERSON. It extended over three years. It is a pretty heavy penalty but there was no compromise in that case.

Mr. AMES. They were not fined the maximum penalty.

Mr. PATERSON. No. But we did not compromise. We had three times that amount of cash in hand deposited by that house and we could have forfeited it if we had wanted to.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was it not a compromise when you had the money in your hand and could take it ?

Mr. PATERSON. No. We adjudicated on the case and came to the conclusion that the penalty exacted was sufficient and there is no compromise about it. We did what we considered to be just.

Mr. AMES. How did you arrive at the amount of the penalty ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is a very difficult matter to determine what these silk goods are worth. I believe one of our appraisers estimated that some of these goods were as much as 30 per cent under value but we have to ascertain the cost of these goods in the country whence they are exported and that is a very difficult matter to determine. We had deputations from Montreal and Toronto about this and one gentleman from Toronto was very severe and wanted the last pound of flesh. Now, we sent samples to this gentleman who had first class knowledge of the business and we asked him to put a valuation on these different lines of silk. The fact is that in some of the lines we sent up he put a value lower than the man entered the silk for. and on which the seizure was made. That will show you the difficulty of valuation in such a case. I understand that the undervaluation ran from 6 per cent to 25 per cent.

Mr. AMES. What is the total for the three years ?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot say. The case is not settled yet. This firm wants its deposit back and they are going to the courts to try and get it back.

Mr. AMES. Would it not be better to allow all these cases to go to the courts and have a judicial decision between the government and the merchant. Then there would be no charge of favoritism.

Mr. PATERSON. Every case can go to the court on appeal from our judgment.

Mr. AMES. The fact that few go shows that they are let off lightly.

Mr. PATERSON. Not at all. Very severe penalties are provided by the law and the Customs Act is very severe and often people will not go to the courts even though they feel they are wronged. They practically have to bring their whole business into court and great delay and loss would be entailed by that procedure. We had a Montreal case which I did not want to deal with and we sent it to the courts and it took weeks to dispose of it. I would be glad if we could send every one of these cases to the courts, but I suppose it would take twenty years in the courts to do the work we do in the department in one year. It may be said that we do it in a rough and ready way, but I believe equity and justice are served. In one case which went to the courts where there was undervaluation charged, the judge heard the whole case and he hesitated greatly at my putting on the full penalty. This might occur by parties making consignments to themselves at the wholesale price ; but a year or two ago we made the law very explicit. We said that where parties consign to themselves, not having made a sale prior to receiving the goods, they may come in, not at the cost price, but at the wholesale price; but if through an agent they have sold these goods to different customers throughout the country, and then bring the goods in at the wholesale price, that is a violation of the law, because where the goods have been sold prior to their being received on consignment, we require the value for duty to be the value at which the goods were sold.

Mr. AMES. Is it not a fact that this species of crime is on the increase owing to the leniency of the department in dealing with it ?

Mr. PATERSON. No. If the hon. gentlemen were administering the law, he would think that we were anything but lenient. We have very few repetitions by the same house.

Mr. AMES. I quite agree with the minister in making a distinction between an involuntary infraction of the law through ignorance and a deliberate attempt year after year to defraud the customs. In the

first case, it would be in order for the minimum penalty to be imposed; but in the second case, I do not think the government are justified in compromising. It seems to me that it would be better to allow the matter to go to the courts and have such a penalty imposed as would deter others from doing the same thing.

Mr. PATERSON. If we thought there was a deliberate attempt to defraud the revenue, especially if it were repeated after a warning, we would not hesitate to take that course. But in many cases the goods have passed our appraisers and have been accepted by us, and the parties plead that fact. They say: Your officers saw the goods; they opened and examined them; if the valuation was wrong, why didn't you tell us at the time? If commissions are dutiable, we did not know it; why didn't you tell us? Why did you let us go on year after year? and now your officers come and seize our goods and the man who seizes them gets part of the fine.' I wish I could throw the cases into court; but ten courts could not carry through all the cases and hear all the pros and cons.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Could the hon. minister give us any information regarding the importation of uniforms from England by officers of the militia force? I understand that practically a prohibitive duty is put on uniforms, but that if a claim is made to the department the duty will be refunded. Has that been settled yet?

Mr. PATERSON. That rests wholly with the Minister of Militia. Whatever he does in the matter I have no objection to; but if the goods come in, they have to pay the duty.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What is the duty on uniforms?

Mr. PATERSON. Thirty per cent for British since last year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have had some representations on this subject from officers of the militia, who thought it was a little hard and unjust, when they spend a good deal of time and money in qualifying themselves to serve their country, to be obliged to pay a heavy duty on their uniforms. What was the object of the change in the law in that respect?

Mr. PATERSON. Up to last year all articles imported by every branch of the government came in free; but all along I have contended that the better plan was to let each department look after iself. I did not think it right that a department of the government should buy goods outside, where there was no duty against them, when the same goods could be got in this country. In other words, the clothing could be bought in England and brought in free of duty when it might be got from our own manufacturers. Uniforms come in under that.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. In what position would an officer be who had ordered his uniform before the passage of this rule?

Mr. PATERSON. He will have to pay the duty and get it out of the Militia Department.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What form has the application to take? Has he to get a certificate from the Customs Department that the duty has been paid, and then make an application to the Department of Militia for a refund?

Mr. PATERSON. The Militia Department will either take an extra vote out of which to pay the duty on the uniform and give it back to the officer; otherwise the officer will have to bear the expense himself.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. In spite of this practically prohibitive duty, many officers are in the habit of buying uniforms in England and paying excessive duties upon them, for the reason that they cannot get them here.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Yes, they can.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Can an officer get an artillery or hussar uniform here and have the lace and braid put on it as well as in England?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Quite as well.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I very much doubt it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If an officer pays the duty on his uniform and gets it back from the Militia Department, how can there be any protection to the Canadian manufacturer?

Mr. FIELDING. He cannot get it back.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Customs suggests that he does.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the only way it could be done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the minister said there was to be a fund established.

Mr. PATERSON. I said that was the only way it could be done.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Has not a refund been made by the Militia Department?

Mr. PATERSON. I could not say. I would rather the minister answered for himself. Possibly for goods ordered before he may have done something, but he must answer for that. I cannot say.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Was it not looked upon as a custom that he paid the duty

and got a refund from the Militia Department?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. In regard to officers' uniforms is not all the cloth that enters into the officers' clothing imported from the old country?

Mr. PATERSON. No, I think not.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The scarlet and blue cloth for the tunics?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There is considerable cloth made in Canada at the present time for the tunics. The cloth for the men's tunics is made here.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I am talking about the officers' uniforms.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If the officers look around they can get as well made military clothing in this country as in Great Britain, it can be trimmed as well and made as well. This I think is one of the wisest provisions in the new tariff, doing away with the granting of government work to outside tailors and manufacturers of all kinds. Formerly all classes of machinery and everything required by the government came in competition with our own manufacturers. This item in regard to military uniforms was put in the tariff with all the other departments, they are all placed on the same footing. Our manufacturers are delighted that the government have taken that stand, which is only a reasonable one. You cannot sell a dollar's worth of goods to the United States government that is made outside of their own country, and I would like our government to go further and take that same stand. One of the great troubles we have had in Canada in the past in certain manufacturing industries has been the large purchases made by the government from the United States, England and other places that came in competition with our own products. In regard to uniforms I can tell the officers that they can get as good uniforms and just as cheaply here as anywhere in the world.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I must congratulate my hon. friend on his protectionist principles. I agree that it is an excellent thing to patronize home industries and to have the uniforms made in Canada as much as possible. But I am right in saying that a refund was given from the Militia Department for duty paid to the Customs Department. The minister may recollect my going to him on one occasion with a question that came up in connection with the Lennoxville grammar school. A number of uniforms had been ordered by the cadet corps there previous to the passing of this regulation. The duty was levied and I think they were instructed to apply to the Militia Department for a refund. So I cannot see how this regulation is helping the manufacturer of uniforms at home.

Mr. FIELDING. There certainly is no general policy of refund. There may have been some circumstances arising out of the change which led the minister to make an exception, but there certainly is no general refund. The argument for imposing duty on government importations generally, in addition to what the Minister of Customs has mentioned, is this: It is convenient for comparison in the cases of tenders; for example one party would tender for goods knowing it was the practice to import goods for the government free and would make a lower tender, placing the Canadian manufacturer at a disadvantage. Then there would be disputes. A man would say: I always assumed we would have the goods free. The whole thing was left in an uncertain condition. Difficulties would arise. I do not think the system was abused as much as some gentlemen thought, but it led to abuse, misunderstanding and sometimes inequalities in the matter of competition, so we thought it better to say that any one competing for the sale of goods to the government must quote a duty-paid price.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do the government import the uniforms?

Mr. FIELDING. I am speaking of the importation of goods generally. The old Act read: Articles imported for the use of the several departments. We found that people who imported goods which they intended to sell to the government claimed that they always expected to get them in free. That led to misunderstanding.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The militia uniforms could not come under that.

Mr. FIELDING. They could under a general importation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They are an individual importation not for the government at all.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I understand that in some cases where parties expected to sell to the government they claimed that they expected to get them in free, although not specially mentioned.

Mr. DANIEL. I was present at the State Ball given at Government House. I saw a great variety of uniforms there but among the most striking there were two. One of these was worn by the hon. Minister of Finance and the other by the hon. Minister of Public Works. They were both very fine, there was a very large amount of gold lace on them and they both looked very new.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They could not touch that uniform you used to wear as Mayor of St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. Since this matter came up to-night, I was wondering whether or not those uniforms paid duty, whether they ranked as militia uniforms or under what heading in the tariff they would be placed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we tell you, you will let the item go through ?

Mr. DANIEL. The item is bound to go through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Upon the suit which I wore, I paid the full duty.

Mr. DANIEL. What was the amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 35 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. I am going to make a confession. I did not pay any. I bought my suit in England, I used it for official functions in England. It was a part of my not too extensive wardrobe.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did you wear it across the Atlantic ?

Mr. FIELDING. I brought it back across the Atlantic. I had it made there for use officially there, some years ago, and I brought it back to Canada as part of my wardrobe.

Mr. PATERSON. Did you notice mine that night ? I was not there.

Mr. DANIEL. Who had it on ?

Mr. PATERSON. But it is a nicer looking uniform than either of these. Whether it is a better shape inside or not, than the others, I do not know, but it was made in accordance with my patriotic desire that what can be bought in Canada ought to be bought in Canada and it was made here. If I can get a coat made here with all that gilding on surely a militia officer can.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we should let the item pass now and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works will please retire.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the policy of the government in regard to the establishment of the various customs officers especially throughout the western country ? Is it done at the request of some particular member of parliament representing a constituency or have they any definite policy or system ? Take for instance Manitoba.

Mr. PATERSON. There are a great many requests and I am sorry to say we cannot meet them all. We have them from all parts of the country, from members, from boards of trade and it is simply impossible to meet them all. We write them as nice letters as we can pointing out the difficulties in the way. Sometimes it strikes us that owing to the position of a certain town it is desirable that we should make it a customs port. But we write to the ports of which the parties in that town enter their goods to ascertain the duty paid, and if the revenue amounts to over $5,000 we have felt ourselves sometimes able to grant the request. And prior to that, where there are so many applications, the question would arise how the point is situated. It may be 200 mles from the nearest port, but if it is on the direct line from the port, power of attorney can be sent to some one in that port to pass the goods and send them on. It is a fact that the people of Canada are better served in this matter than the people of any other country. We have more customs ports in Canada than they have in the United States—not proportionately merely, but more in number than they have for the eighty millions of the United States.

Mr. STAPLES. I suppose the minister, in locating a customs office, considers whether the port is a railroad centre and its distance from the international boundary. I have urged in this House, and have called the minister's attention personally, to the town of Carman, in the constituency I have the honour to represent. It is one of the largest constituencies in Manitoba, and yet there is not a single customs office within its boundaries. Carman is a large town, the centre of three lines of railway—the Canadian Northern, the Jim Hill system, and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The minister knows that the board of trade have repeatedly made requests for the establishment of a port of entry. They have written nice letters—I have read some of them. If he will look at the files, he will see that great difficulty has been experienced through want of a customs officer there. Goods have been delayed for months, going away around by Winnipeg and even as far as Neepawa, I believe. I think he should make a statement that Carman is entitled to a custom port.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is its population ?

Mr. STAPLES. It is 2,000—a much larger population than that of other towns in Manitoba that are ports of entry. It is a town that has spent a great deal in its local development. Recently it has spent $125,000 in installing a modern water system and electric light. Everybody who has travelled in Manitoba says that Carman is one of the best towns in the province.

Mr. PATERSON. Where is the nearest customs port ?

Mr. STAPLES. I should think it would be Winnipeg of Emerson.

Mr. PATERSON. At what distance ?

Mr. STAPLES. By rail, I should think about seventy miles from Emerson and about fifty miles from Winnipeg.

Mr. PATERSON. Imports would largely come in that way, would they not ?

Mr. STAPLES. I do not know that they do. I suppose that now the Great Northern Railway is there the imports would come in that way.

Mr. PATERSON. Where does it cross ?

Mr. STAPLES. Cross the boundary ? I believe at Gretna.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not wish to say that the port cannot be granted, but I will point out some of the difficulties we have. Here is a thriving town, but it is on the direct line, we will say, from Emerson——

Mr. STAPLES. Not on the direct line, except on one road, that runs to Portage la Prairie. It is not on the direct line of the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern.

Mr. PATERSON. I was going to say that goods would likely come in on one of these roads, and if the merchants would give some one power of attorney at Emerson, Gretna or Winnipeg, to pass any goods for them, they could be passed and sent right on. I am not arguing now against establishing the port, but this is what we have to ask people to do sometimes because I cannot grant all the ports that are asked for. There are towns that have been at me for years, and I know I am in bad favour with many members because I am not able to concede what they ask in these matters.

Mr. STAPLES. But the minister should give it to towns that have merit in preference to other towns that have not equal claims on public grounds.

Mr. PATERSON. We do. Minnedosa is larger than Carman ?

Mr. STAPLES. No.

Mr. PATERSON. How about Neepawa ?

Mr. STAPLES. It is not as large. It is not as old a town nor as good or enterprising a town.

Mr. PATERSON. Portage la Prairie is larger ?

Mr. STAPLES. Yes. The request of this town has been before the minister—

Mr. PATERSON. It is only one of the twenty or thirty.

Mr. STAPLES. I am going to speak plainly here. I think the minister ought to give the citizens of Carman more attention than he has given them. I consider that before this item passes he should make a definite statement that he will grant the request of the petition long ago presented to his department. I would be quite willing, if the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is willing, to let this item pass providing he will state that he will grant this request.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When I suggested that the item should pass I did not know of the scandalous default of the minister in respect to Carman.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I think the plea of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) is quite justified. What we complain of is unjust discrimination. In the neighbouring constituency of Portage la Prairie there are three ports, two on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Carberry has a much smaller population than Carman or Minnedosa, and it is about midway between Brandon and Portage la Prairie, yet they have a sub-collectorship there. Portage la Prairie has two sub-ports, Neepawa and Carberry. But there is no customs port at all in either Marquette or Macdonald. Minnedosa is the centre of a new judicial district and is a divisional point on the Yorkton branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway. And there is no port between Yorkton and Neepawa. The minister is aware that the board of trade has recently petitioned for a port. We feel that it is the same in the case of these customs ports as it is in the case of public buildings—we claim that there is unjust discrimination; some constituencies have three or four and others equally deserving have none at all.

Mr. PATERSON. I will look it up on the map.

Mr. STAPLES. Let us figure this out and see what towns have got customs offices.

Mr. PATERSON. Carberry, I am told, was a port of entry before I came into office. Neepawa also was established and so was Portage la Prairie. Then there is Virden.

Mr. STAPLES. And Crystal City and Selkirk.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). And Morden.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, these are border towns.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Selkirk is not.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the revenue from the customs office in Selkirk?

Mr. PATERSON. I am told that it is $1,000 for the nine months fiscal period. That is not enough. Selkirk should not have an office if it is going to keep down to $1,000.

Mr. STAPLES. What is Portage la Prairie?

Mr. PATERSON. Portage la Prairie is $450,000.

Mr. STAPLES. What is Carberry?

Mr. PATERSON. $1,547.

Mr. STAPLES. What is Neepawa?

Mr. PATERSON. $4,500 for nine months.

Mr. STAPLES. What officer is appointed at Selkirk?

Mr. PATERSON. Geo. Wood.

Mr. STAPLES. What salary is he paid?

Mr. PATERSON. $550.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the revenue at Crystal city?

Mr. PATERSON. That is a border port. The revenue is $1,800 for nine months.

Mr. STAPLES. Who is the officer there?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Kerr.

Mr. STAPLES. Who is the officer at Portage la Prairie?

Mr. PATERSON. We have three or four.

Mr. STAPLES. What are the salaries?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Marshall, the collector, gets $1,200. One gets $800 and another, $600.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the duty on a threshing machine costing $3,000 under the new tariff?

Mr. PATERSON. It is 20 per cent; it was 25 per cent under the old tariff.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the difference in dollars and cents on a $3,000 outfit?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot tell that.

Mr. STAPLES. You should be able to give me that information.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman will come around to the department tomorrow we will get it for him.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to get a definite promise from the minister as to what he is going to do about establishing a customs office at Carman.

Mr. PATERSON. I will take the matter up with the commissioner.

Mr. STAPLES. The minister has made me that promise every session during this parliament.

Mr. PATERSON. We must make inquiries before we can do it.

Mr. STAPLES. I think it would be well for the minister to state distinctly what he is prepared to do.

Mr. PATERSON. We will have to make inquiry to find out the conditions and then look at the position of Carman on the map.

Mr. STAPLES. Provided you make these inquiries and discover that the amount of duty that is paid at Carman is as great as that at Selkirk will you promise to establish a customs house there?

Mr. PATERSON. If you do not pay more than they do at Selkirk I will not do it.

Mr. STAPLES. I suppose, when you make your inquiries and find that it is as deserving, from the consideration of revenue, as the town of Neepawa is, you will establish an office at Carman.

Mr. PATERSON. You are asking me to do something that no other member has asked. I am going to do the best I can.

Mr. STAPLES. This is a case that has been hanging for a long while.

Mr. PATERSON. I have applications from towns in Ontario that are almost twice as large as Carman.

Mr. STAPLES. I have listened in this House to discussions about places that do not do anything like the business that the town of Carman would do. I did not hear the minister say what the revenue of Virden is?

Mr. PATERSON. $22,900 for nine months. If Carman is paying that much, you look out.

Mr. STAPLES. I have been looking out for four years and I have not seen the horizon yet. If the Minister of Customs made inquiries he would find that the town of Carman is well entitled to a public building.

Mr. PATERSON. Selkirk will be a growing place.

Mr. STAPLES. I don't think it will grow as much as Carman will.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When St. Andrews rapids are constructed what will become of Selkirk?

Mr. PATERSON. You know the country better than I do.

Mr. STAPLES. I wish to know what lumber was imported and what duty was collected on it during the last five years.

Mr. PATERSON. Better put a question on the paper.

Mr. STAPLES. Can you not answer it to-night ?

Mr. PATERSON. I regret I cannot.

Mr. STAPLES. The member who lives in Selkirk goes around taking credit for getting new post offices and customs offices and lines of railway for his constituency and I think this is the proper time to discuss whether his claims are correct or not.

Mr. PATERSON. That will be out of order now.

Mr. STANFIELD. When was S. Macdonell, inspector, Port Hood, N. S., appointed, what are his qualifications and what is his age ?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Macdonell was appointed in 1903. He was a barrister by profession and unquestionably a capable man.

Mr. STANFIELD. What is his age ?

Mr. FIELDING. He was not a young man, but by no means an old man. He was in the prime of advanced life. His age will be found in the civil list.

Miscellaneous—printing and stationery, subscriptions to commercial papers, flags, dating stamps, locks, instruments, &c., for various ports of entry, legal expenses, premiums on guarantee bonds and uniforms for customs officers, $85,000.

Mr. STAPLES. It is now nearly two o'clock and the last item having been passed we should adjourn as we have to meet at eleven o'clock in the morning.

Mr. PATERSON. There are plenty of other items and you don't want to bother me. I am going away to-morrow and I want to get the items through.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I hope you are not going to take part in the provincial election.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You will have to tell us what you are going for.

Mr. DANIEL. How many officers are guaranteed out of this vote ?

Mr. PATERSON. 1,600 or 1,800 all over Canada.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Is there any particular guarantee company that the government deals with?

Mr. PATERSON. We deal with one company in the maritime provinces, one in Quebec, two in Ontario, which is the largest, and another company in Manitoba and the Northwest.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What are the two in Ontario ?

Mr. PATERSON. The Dominion Guarantee and Accident and the Imperial, I think. They are all Canadian or British companies, we refused to go into American companies.

Mr. LANCASTER. How much was paid in legal expenses last year by the customs department ?

Mr. PATERSON. $851.94.

Mr. LANCASTER. How was that incurred ?

Mr. PATERSON. For the extradition and prosecution of the defaulting broker Hobbs.

Mr. LANCASTER. There are uniforms for customs officers, but I notice that all do not wear uniforms.

Mr. PATERSON. Those who meet the public at steamboats or on trains are supposed to wear uniforms.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have seen some customs officers in civilian clothes, come on trains to examine baggage.

Mr. PATERSON. They should have uniforms.

Expenses of maintenance of revenue cruisers and preventive service, $40,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) desired to have some item reserved. Perhaps you will let the last item stand.

Mr. PATERSON. That would stop the whole item.

Mr. FIELDING. The several items constitute one resolution, so that there would be nothing to report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will you have any supplementaries ?

Mr. PATERSON. We may have, but I do not like to pledge myself that we shall have. Let the hon. member have the discussion on concurrence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When does the minister expect to be back ?

Mr. PATERSON. On Monday next.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose the hon. member for Brantford wishes to discuss this on concurrence, I suppose you will not have any objection to his speaking three or four times if it is necessary to answer you?

Mr. PATERSON. If it is necessary to explain himself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As long as there will be some freedom of discussion.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot promise about the rules of the House, but I do not think there will be any trouble about that. The fact is, he should be here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister should not go away.

Some resolutions reported.

SITTINGS OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. FINLAYSON moved :

That the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts have leave to sit during the sittings of this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no objection to the motion except perhaps that it does not go quite far enough. There are some other committees.

Mr. FIELDING. Banking and Commerce meets at 10, but we will probably get through by 11.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then there is the committee on the Quebec bridge.

Mr. FINLAYSON. They have asked leave.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the Minister of Finance bear in mind that the select committee on the Hodgins charges sits next day.

Mr. FINLAYSON. They have leave and have been sitting during the sittings of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue with Supply on the estimates of the Minister of the Interior.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.10 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 2, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called I beg to ask the Minister of Justice when I may expect a return respecting paroled prisoners which I moved for some time ago.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I may say to my hon. friend that extra efforts were made to prepare this return in order that it might be brought down as soon as possble. It was found that if only one man was kept at work on it, it would occupy him eight hours a day for about fifteen months. There are some 10,000 files and each file occupies ten minutes to a quarter of an hour in the preparation of the return, so it is a very laborious matter. I have pressed it forward, however, with all the urgency possible and inquired about it no later than yesterday when I was told that special exertions are being made, that more than one person have been at work on it for some time past and I was informed that possibly it might be ready in the course of a few weeks. I cannot speak more definitely than that, but I am very hopeful it will be possible to present the return before the end of the present session.

RELEASE OF AGNES B. KUN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When may I expect a reply as to my inquiry concerning the liberation of Agnes B. Kun, of Sydney. The Prime Minister will remember that I directed his attention to the resolution of the council passed about three weeks ago, on the 7th of May.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I saw what was said in 'Hansard' in regard to the matter and I have really nothing to add to what my hon. friend the member for the riding (Mr. Johnston) stated on that occasion. The resolution which was then read to the House by the hon. gentleman was forwarded to me shortly after it was passed by the municipal council and I replied pointing out to the council some considerations which it seemed to me had been overlooked in the preparation of the resolution. I have not since Friday last referred to the papers to ascertain exactly the date upon which I wrote, but I am quite sure it was a few days prior to the date mentioned by the hon. gentleman as that upon which he had been communicated with. The circumstances, however, are fully set out in the resolution and in the letter which I sent in reply to it, which letter, according to my hon. friend from the county (Mr. Johnston) has been published in the newspapers there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would there be any objection to laying on the table of the House a copy of the communication of the Minister of Justice in reply to the resolution ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No, certainly not ; it has been made public already, although it was not written for publication.

SUPPLY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

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

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I propose this morning to lay before the House as briefly as possible, but

yet somewhat in extenso, certain matters in relation to the administration of the Yukon, particularly as developed in correspondence which has taken place between the Rev. John Pringle, of the Yukon and various ministers of the Crown. It is a question of some difficulty sometimes to know just what a man is thoroughly justified in bringing before a parliament and in the mass of correspondence which has been laid before the House and which I have gone over very carefully, it is somewhat difficult to make a presentation of the question without going very extensively into the subject matter treated of. This, from its very nature in this case, touches individuals; it does not in any case touch individuals personally as individuals, but touches individuals as officials of the government in the Yukon, and officials appointed by and paid by this country. So that in placing this matter before parliament and the country I am to be taken as doing it in the public interest and from a public point of view. If it touches the individual in that way I cannot help it and I suppose the House cannot help it. The individual, if he is a member of the government or a member of the council of the Yukon or engaged in public office, has to take these disadvantages.

The Yukon for a long time has been a land of mystery, lying away off thousands of miles from the seat of government, with communications which in some seasons of the year are very spasmodic, always difficult and at the best seasons of the year not very rapid or frequent. It lies so far from the seat of government and the centre of interest that it is only by fits and starts that what occurs there catches the attention of the larger part of Canada and, in fact, is discussed in this House. It lies there chiefly in the charge of officials who are resident there. It is extremely difficult for a member of this House to find out what goes on, mixed up as the administration is between the Yukon council, which has certain powers of its own, keeps its accounts and does its own business and the department here whose action is under the immediate direction of this government and with whose accounts our own accountants have first and chiefly to do. We find it difficult to get any connected idea or any connected run of what goes on. Inquiries for information which is asked for and which one thinks he ought to get quickly have to be referred to the Yukon and it sometimes takes many many months to get it. The interest dies in the meantime and the sequence of events is lost. From the time that this government took hold of the Yukon to the present time it has been subject to rumour, subject to suspicions and subject, as well, to actual information in the way of facts that have gradually come to be established. It was first the happy hunting ground of the whisky permitter and extravagant tales, I daresay, are told of the fortunes that were made and the peculiar manner in which they were made by the army of pioneers in that branch of the development of that country. Suffice it to say that there has been for years a very general impression that the whisky permits were scandalously managed and that they resulted in ill-begotten wealth and wealth too, in no small degree, to various parties implicated in connection therewith.

But, it is not my purpose at this present time to go particularly into that branch. It has been the happy hunting ground of the royalty on mining inspection and it was with very great difficulty that here, at the seat of government, any connected idea could be got as to what was going on under the loose and far distant supervision of the particular persons or person who, for the time being, held that office. Out of that, as well, there have been strange tales and stories more or less founded which have come down to the present day. These things also I do not purpose to go into detail on at the present time. Then, there succeeded from the time that the early miners began to go in, the long, grinding, tortuous, mysterious dealings with mining claims, the history of which will, I suppose, never be written, the history of which, if written, would be a tale both of wonder and not unfilled with humiliating instances, I dare say, if they were ever properly known. I, myself, have known men of the greatest probity, men of the highest conduct, men of undoubted honesty, who have gone to the Yukon, have remained there and have come back and the tales that they have told in reference to the actions and doings in those early days are certainly wonderful and are not at all creditable, not a thousandth part of which has been placed upon the record and I suppose never will be. But, we know enough to know that if the history of that long series of years in which the mining areas and claims of the Northwest were being thrown about like battledore and shuttlecock between the inspectors and the officials were written it would furnish a history that would be intensely interesting, and, as I remarked, with reference to something else, not very creditable to the administration of affairs in that distant part of the country. That, I do not propose to go into in detail at the present time. I suppose it will never be gone into in detail according to its merits, but along with that there has been another and a more lurid illumination, so to speak, of the affairs of that far distant part of the country. It has had relation to the administration and the administrators and the results of the administration in a social and moral point of view. Not until 1902 was any individual found who appeared to be strong enough, bold enough, courageous enough to make

it a part of his duty to lay before the government and, failing the action of the government, before the public opinion of the east something of that not very creditable and somewhat dark history. In 1902 the Rev. John Pringle, clergyman in good standing in his denominational body and who had gone to that far off country, began to be stirred in his mind in reference to what he saw and heard and began to give evidence of that to the ministry of the day. It is also well to say that the Rev. John Pringle was a Liberal in heart and in practice and went into that country as a supporter and friend of the Liberal party, and, of course, of this Liberal government. But things came to him in such a way and they made such an impression upon his mind that he started out, in the first instance, for the good of his party and the salvation of the government to make them informed of what was going on in the Yukon. So, in 1902, or thereabouts, he commences his correspondence with Sir Wilfrid Laurier and certain members of the government and I do not think I can do better than to give his letter of 1902 which will be found in the papers that have been brought down. It is dated Bonanza, Yukon Territory, May 27. 1902, and addressed to the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., Premier of Canada :

Dear Sir,—I am the Presbyterian minister at Bonanza. I am a citizen of Canada by birth, a Liberal by conviction, believing that the triumph of Liberal principles is the triumph of right.

That was in 1902.

My object in addressing you is to inform you about the conditions here, which are unworthy of us as Canadians, are bringing our country into contempt, and are alienating from the Liberal party many who have hitherto been its unwavering and conscientious supporters.

We have here a very large alien population, the most of whom are clean and law-abiding, but we have also the scum of the United States coast cities. Some of these have the power which money gives, some the power which belongs to those who cater to lust. These seem to have acquired an influence over some Canadian officials, which amounts almost to control. Men are not only known, but also made by the company they keep, and we have here officials in high places who are known to be the companions of those who are the avowed defenders of lawlessness and blackguardism. One of these latter, evidently the friend of representative Canadians (one's eyes cannot always be deceived, and the street has a voice) told me in his own office, that a gift bestowed upon one of our Christian churches was given by him with the understanding that it was to close the minister's mouth; that the church should not disturb the gambling den and the dance hall. It makes me 'hot' to hear the stories retailed of public places—retailed mostly as if they were a good old joke—of the lust and 'graft' which one is almost compelled to believe are the outstanding characteristics of our public life here. I am quite well aware that human society, even where at its best, is not utopian, but the officials in a frontier mining camp, the men who represent, or are supposed to represent, the Canadian government, should be above suspicion—pure and upright—because the law, which is the expression of the moral sense of the Canadian people.

The poison has permeated every department of our life; affects business, personal and public; so that the prevalent impression is that one has to be 'on the inside' or must 'fix' some one before he can get even what is his right under the law. We may differ in our opinion as to the wisdom or unwisdom, the expediency or inexpediency of a government's policy in given conditions.

But there can be no question about this: That under the policy adopted, righteousness, not influence, 'graft' or 'pull' should prevail. You may ask me for specific examples, showing that the conditions of which I speak exist. That is not my business. I am not a detective; nor have I gone out of the way of my ordinary life to look for this condition. The people know it, act as if they knew it, talk as if they knew. I have heard the names of police and departmental officials used in connection with matters which belong only to the gutter. I would a hundred times have been angry, only that my anger was overwhelmed by sorrow at the truth of what was said.

You will permit me to speak in detail of certain things which are of vital interest to our people, and ought therefore to be of some interest to our government.

1. Hydraulic concessions.

He goes on to give his own opinion of hydraulic concessions and his opinion inclines to this at that particular time, that hydraulic concessions. concessions to people in large, should not be the policy of the government; that the individual miner and prospector ought to have the ground and that it ought not to be cut out from him by large quantities of this country being given over to the large holder, the speculator and, some time or other, the great hydraulic worker. He develops that and, in the course of it he says :

My blood boiled, when, standing on the Arkansaw Creek divide, I saw the great and beautiful river issue from the foothills, and remembered that it was in the grasp of capital, that the people had been disinherited; and that everything in this great rich district was to be food for the maw of a greedy government favoured corporation.

He was referring to the notorious Treadgold concession.

I own no claims in this district directly or indirectly, and am therefore not personally interested. But I feel for the plain men who have to compete in locating ground with a corporation which has unlimited money and no conscience; which, even when the miner has located, has a cinch on him through the iniquitous Klondike water privilege.

In more than one public meeting in the city of Dawson, it was stated in my hearing, and

was not denied, that concessions such as the 'Bronson & Ray,' 'Philip,' &c.—

Said 'Philip,' I believe, having been the law partner of a Minister of the Interior.

—were granted on representations which were suggestive of perjury. This, at least, is I believe true, that perhaps with one exception no proper knowledge of the ground was had before the concessions, none of the conditions on which it was granted have been fulfilled. I am convinced that men could stake and work, on any concession granted in the Yukon and that an appeal to the law would secure them in their claims; that all of them have been so loosely granted that they are void.

Last winter I went to the headwaters of the Stewart river on a missionary trip. On that great river a number had staked, and others were intending to stake in a district south of the McQuesten and Stewart rivers. Men who has prospected spoke again and again to me of the richness of the higher bars and the wooded bottoms of the Stewart. Three miles and a half below the police post at McQuesten, I found two of my old friends (Partridge and Nelson) of the Teslin trail. They had the easiest mining proposition in the Yukon pan open cut from the river about ten feet deep, with drifts on either side. The dirt averaged a dollar a bucket, in a paystreak 280 feet wide. When I returned, the first item of news I got from one of our daily papers, was that five miles of the Stewart banks, south of McQuesten, had been granted to one Wilson. I verified the report in the Gold Commissioner's office. It is an iniquity, whether granted in ignorance of the possibilities of the district, or because some one had a 'pull.'

This policy will depopulate the territory ere long. Let us keep hydraulic companies out and give the common people a chance, under the now more favourable conditions of living, to work the low grade ground.

Concessions have been granted, I am convinced, not only carelessly but iniquitously; the heritage of our people given to satisfy the greed of capital, without due consideration of the rights of the people in the ground, or of the character of the statement made to secure these concessions.

2. The laws against gambling, dance halls, and other immorality, are either not enforced at all, or enforced so spasmodically that people know that there is a 'nigger on the fence.' Of course, we all know about the order from a deputy minister a year or so ago which was practically an order to the police to keep their hands off. But where the gamblers and their friends of the dance halls and whisky trust got their promised assurance, we do not know. As to the gambling: it was closed all winter, partly because there was nothing in it for the gamblers, partly because the police said it had to be closed. But when the clean-up began this spring, i. e., when the men who had 'gophered' in hills and creek beds all winter, were about to reap their harvest, the vultures, evidently assured of immunity by some one, began their work. It was left to ministers and a few other cranks to see that the law was enforced. Our attempts to do so have taught us that we must choose between the alternatives of thinking that our lawmakers are incapable, or that our law enforcers are without conscience or moral courage adequate for the discharge of their duty.

The dance halls in which more men, some of them government officials, have been ruined than in any other of our protected dens, are run wide open. I wish the government would, for its own good name, either suppress these 'hells,' or at least take means to verify reports, current all over this camp, about officials who are their habitues. Prostitution flaunts itself everywhere; the abandoned woman (to say nothing of the abandoned man) is everywhere; beside respectable homes; across the street from them; beside our grocery and dry goods stores; on first and second and third, and every avenue and road. Unless some one is robbed or injured in her house she is undisturbed.

We have 210 licensed bars for a population of about 20,000. On twelve miles of the Bonanza road—60 above to 60 below—there are three for every mile.

That is a pretty large allowance even the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will agree.

Mr. FIELDING. The reverend gentleman seems to have known the locations very well.

Mr. FOSTER. He does. And he writes from knowledge. Does the Minister of Finance mean to impute anything to the Rev. John Pringle?

Mr. FIELDING. No, but I think that the reverend gentleman, having this knowledge, might certainly have exercised his power in another way. He could have found local authorities to deal with the matter rather than bring it to Ottawa. And, perhaps I may be permitted to remark that it seems a rather strange thing that the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Thompson), who knows all about the conditions there, sat here for many months and never alluded to this matter, and also that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) only brings the matter up after the hon. member for Yukon has gone away.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad the hon. minister has put in these words. It is the same poor, old, wretched excuse. When such things as these are being brought to light, when the attention of ministers is demanded, the only answer is to make not very nice insinuations against Rev. John Pringle, and they throw the blame on others —on any others—in order to shelter their own government.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will permit me: I do not desire to make the slightest imputation against the character of Rev. Mr. Pringle. If the hon. gentleman drew that inference, let me say that I had no intention of saying anything that would justify it; and, if what I said was capable of conveying that impression. I withdraw it at once.

Mr. FOSTER. It would have been better if it had not been made. It is exactly the same insinuation that one F. Tennyson Congdon made in reference to Mr. Pringle in a memo. that I shall have the pleasure of reading a little later.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 'Pleasure.'

Mr. JOHNSTON. Don't miss any of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not, because I have no doubt that my hon. friend who is making the interruption is probably listening with both ears wide open.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have lots of time.

Mr. FOSTER (reading):

There seems to be no limit to the number of licenses. The saloon men in Bonanza village, six in number I think, asked the license commissioners to grant no more licenses. The acting commissioner and the person known as Ikey Rosenthal—

Mr. JOHNSTON. What's the matter with Ikey?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a gentleman that I will introduce to the hon. member for Sydney. He will probably be quite familiar with such—

—drove to our village with the result that at least four additional licenses are to be granted. I make the foregoing statements advisedly, for I have the very best reason for believing that Mr. Hinton the license commissioner was forced against his judgment to grant the additional license.

But the worst feature of the licensed houses here is that a very large percentage of them are houses of prostitution. Many of them run it is true, by people of good character. But a large number of bawdy houses with a government license to prey upon the public.

I have wondered since coming north why the permit system was adopted. Was it to restrict the sale of liquor? Or to make it respectable? Or to make money for government exigencies? Or to make money for men with a pull?

Pardon this plainness, it is the way the people talk about it here. If either of the first two ends was sought, the permit system is a failure. If the last two, it has been an unqualified success. Of all the debauching influences which touch our private and our public life, the whisky permit and its possessor are the worst. Of it, almost all other evils are begotten.

What the officers of the Northwest Mounted Police think about all this, I do not know. But the rank and file do not hesitate to say that when they do their duty, they are praised as the finest force on earth, and then to use their own expressions, are 'buffaloed,' 'thrown down.' Again and again have they raided places running in defiance of the criminal law of Canada, only to be told by some official friend of gamblers, that they have exceeded their duty. The law is systematically manipulated not to protect the public, but to protect and nurse the gambler and shame honest men. It is enough to degrade any force, however fine, to know that where immorality is concerned, it is useless to do their duty that the law itself will be used to thwart them, and defeat the ends of justice.

I have written in plain terms. If I am asked what right I have so to address the government of Canada, I answer: That I am a Canadian and love my native land. I hold that we have a right to expect that the men who represent our government, the officers of the law and of departments, should not only do justly, but live rightly. I have said publicly here, and I repeat it, that there is a conscience in the east, and I shall do my best to arouse and invoke it for the overthrow of wrong. That I shall refuse to be silent, when I know that men who are public servants, are renegades from righteous and purity; and that I shall protest against the outrage put upon us, of having to look upon men as our superiors, who are hand-in-glove with crooks and gamblers and apologists for immorality, men who are not so much concerned about the enforcement of the law, as they are about finding excuses for the evasion of it.

Two years ago I refused to believe stories I heard about the scandalous lives of Yukon officials. These stories were used for party purposes, those using them not so much concerned about the interests of the country, as about the interests of their party. For this reason they were willing to exhibit their country's shame exaggerated greatly, I then believed before the world. I refused to believe these stories, and my statements concerning them were made use of on the public platform from Halifax to Victoria to rebut statements made by our opponents. I was largely in error I fear. If things then were worse than they have been during Mr. Ross' abcense this spring. I was certainly in error, I should at least have been silent.

I write this not as a minister, but as a citizen. I wrote it as one who has the greatest confidence in Mr. Ross' ability and integrity, and my strictures do not touch him personally.

But I have been so overwhelmed with the stories of lewdness and injustice, especially since his departure for Ottawa, that though I have never heretofore taken a public part in politics, I shall certainly use my influence in every legitimate way, to cast out of our public life the principles which are a menace to our life as a people and the men who are their exponents and apologists and the illustrations of their power.

I am, sir,
Yours in sincerity,
(Sgd.) JOHN PRINGLE.

P.S.—I have sent this only to members of the cabinet and to Mr. Ross.

You, Mr. Speaker, and the House, will remember that this was written by a friend to friends, by one of the Liberal party to the chiefs of that party and written, as he expressly states, that the facts might be brought before the Prime Minister and his government in order that by that knowledge of the facts efficient measures might be taken to redress the grievances and to do away with the evils as far as they could be done away with. Well, Sir, to that communication of 1902, the Rev. John

Pringle received no answers from some of the ministers at least, at least I do not find on these files an answer from any of them. The government went on with that astonishing statement before the face and eyes of the First Minister who is the representative of the government of this country. That state of things went on; not only was no heed given to it personally by the First Minister, as it would appear from these papers, but it does not appear that any step was taken at Ottawa to inquire into it or remedy it. It would seem to me that the first thing that the Prime Minister should have done on such an explicit statement being put into his hands and from the source from which it came, was to have instituted a searching and full inquiry; for two reasons, first for the reason of justice to his own officials and representatives if these stories were unfounded and, secondly, for the reputation of his own government and the people of Canada part of whose territory the Yukon, with its quite large population, was. But, neither of these things was done. Those conditions continued and the Rev. John Pringle remained in the Yukon, travelling from one place to another, going ultimately to Dawson City and, at last, seeing that nothing was done, he again adressed himself to the Prime Minister, on the 3rd of January, 1905. I shall ask the House to listen to the second letter written three years after the first as nothing had resulted from his first attempt at redressing the matters complained of:

Bonanza, Yukon Territory, January 3, 1905.

The Right Honourable
Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—A little more than four years ago I was asked by Mr. E. M. Macdonald, of Pictou, Nova Scotia, to write him my opinion of the Liberal administration of the Yukon Territory. Not suspecting the purpose of the request, ignorant, indeed, of the political faith of Mr. Macdonald, I replied to the effect that the charges had been largely trumped up by the enemy; that the administration of the Yukon was, on the whole, good. My letter was used in campaign literature all over Canada, especially in the maritime provinces. I had not then been in the northern mining district or at the administrative centre, Dawson, In October, 1901, I was transferred to Bonanza, 13 miles from Dawson. On May 27, 1902, I sent a statement of the situation here, as it then appeared to me, to each member of the federal cabinet and to Mr. Ross. Referring to my letter to Mr. Macdonald, I said I feared that I was mistaken when I wrote my letter to him; that I should at least have kept silence. For I found that the administration had been a disgrace to the Canadian name—such as no self-respecting Canadian would excuse. There was marked improvement during Mr. Ross' tenure of office. But things have gone from bad to worse under Mr. Congdon's administration. He has shown such a lack of moral strength in his relation to the public service and the public interests while commissioner, and in his relation to the political interests of our people, before his appointment, and since his resignation to run for parliament, that there has been a general uprising against him. It has resulted in the election of an independent Conservative. His election is significant not as a condemnation of the Liberal government or of its general policy. The real significance of Mr. Congdon's defeat may be read in the fact that it was made possible by the efforts and votes of loyal Liberals, who refused to recognize as true Liberals the man and the gang he had gathered around him, who had trampled upon the principles and traditions of the Liberal party, and made your administration of Yukon interests a stench in the nostrils of our people.

I need not speak of the character and loyalty of the dissentient Liberals in Dawson who refused to swallow the dose Mr. Congdon offered. I prefer to speak of the Liberals of the mining districts whom I know as no other man does, and to assert that the votes which elected Dr. Thompson were Liberal votes; that the men whose organization and utterances made the victory possible were Liberals—Laurier Liberals. The gang which Mr. Congdon gathered about him for the campaign—men who were the creatures of his administration and his political methods—were such as would damn any cause. All that the speakers in opposition had to do was to name them in connection with Mr. Congdon's candidature, and the work of getting votes for Thompson was done.

The fight was won by men who had their hearts in it, against men who had their pockets only in it—patriots against mercenaries. The issue was not, from the firing of the first shot, doubtful. Permit me, even at the risk of being thought tiresome, to refer to the course of affairs since my letter of May, 1902. It may be assumed to start with, that officials called to serve their country on the frontier, especially in a frontier mining camp, should represent in the highest degree the moral sense of the Canadian people. No lustful, drunken, grafting misfits should be found, or if found, retained in office here. In July, 1902, Mr. Ross practically compelled the passage of an ordinance suppressing the dance halls, the women in which were 'the most dangerous class of prostitutes,' and absolutely excluding lewd women from licensed liquor houses. In September of the same year, Mr. Ross lying unconscious at Whitehorse, the ordinance was amended at the instance of the legal adviser, now Judge Newlands, so as to render the ordinance abortive. But under Mr. Congdon's lead we have legalized the dance halls. Some government officials are their habitués, and an official here, Mr. Pepin, in the gold commissioner's office, plays nightly in the Dominion dance hall, getting $60 per week for the exalted service.

He goes on to mention others, but I will not read their names.

The inclosed affidavits concerning Mr. Girouard, the registrar, are sufficient, it seems to me, to ensure his permanent removal from office in this territory, at least.

Then follow certain remarks with reference to Mr. Girouard which for the time being I will not read.

Did the government know of these and similar doings by others? If it did, what words of condemnation are too severe for such neglect of the moral welfare of our people? If it did not, then I think such ignorance is almost criminal. The names of the controller of this territory and others whom the government can locate without difficulty, are coupled publicly with not very desirable persons.

The dance halls of Klondike City, the home of the abandoned women boldy advertise their dances in Dawson before the eyes of our wives and children by poster, and in their ears by megaphone. All this seems to accord with the moral sense of many whom the government has sent to guard our interests. We are bringing our wives and children into this territory, making homes here, and it is an outrage that we should have an executive who permits these things, that he should practically pander to vice. Here is one point at which the government must work a radical reformation before it can accomplish the contentment of the great mass of our people, or gain their confidence in the administration.

Then he goes on to state that without set purpose he was the means of bringing to the notice of the executive the steal and the postal service, and claims that the investigation was not a real investigation, and that the utmost leniency, amounting even to wrong, was shown in the matter.

The campaign for Mr. Ross' election began in the autumn of 1902. The representative of Mr. Ross in the territory, chairman of his executive committee, was F. T. Congdon. I am a Liberal and with other Liberals and Conservatives had the greatest confidence in Mr. Ross. We had the best grounds for our confidence. But was there ever such a dirty campaign in the interest of a good man? Mr. Ross would have had a larger majority if a man of unblunted political moral sense had been the leader in his interest. Scores of good Liberals refused to vote because of immoral methods adopted by the Ross executive. Bribes were given, money was paid out of the road fund—hundreds of dollars on one creek—to men who had not done a day's work on the roads. The Baldwin affidavits prove this, and the controller now knows it to be true, though he was not responsible for it. Lewd women were promised money to dope Clark men over election day. One hundred and twenty-seven votes were cast at Caribou crossing—one hundred and eight of them for Mr. Ross—where the legitimate vote numbered not more than ten.

That sounds familiar ; it has been heard of in other places.

Mr. TAYLOR. Hear, hear : that is what they want this Bill for.

Mr. FOSTER. (Reading) :

One hundred and seventy-two at Glacier and Miller where there were not half that number. It was a carnival of corruption which perhaps the people might have forgotten but for two things.

First, that thousands of dollars, promised road house people for board, and others for money lent for the fight, are yet unpaid. The Gold Hill road built for votes cost $7,800. It ought not to have cost more than $1,500. It is a perpetual reminder of the election of 1902, and of the man who engineered it. The original bluff road near Dawson, which I am told cost to build about $3,000, cost to widen, on the eve of the election, about $26,000, another reminder. Scores of men hired ostensibly to work on the roads were fed at points on the creeks, never worked on the roads at all, and were fed at the expense of confiding citizens. The Minister of Public Works had better, I would respectfully suggest, look into the road expenditure, wood expenditure, &c., with a degree of thoroughness which has surely been lacking in the past.

Second, I prophesied at the beginning of the Thompson-Congdon campaign that the man who was responsible for such dirty work would not let the people forget it, that it would be worse than duplicated when his own political life was at stake. We have had a reminder which has amounted to a 'jolt' all around.

He then goes on to describe what he calls the McAulay deal with reference to some tenders and others things in connection with that election, which I do not propose to read at the present time, except to state that one Pierre Leduc, a returning officer, refused to give the people cognizance of the lists, and Judge Dugas refused to advise Leduc to yield to the people's demands for their rights. As a matter of fact, there was a charge of conspiracy which was brought up later in an action, but I shall take another opportunity to bring that before the House.

The attempt to disfranchise the people succeeded, for not less than 500 of our best people found on election day, that Mr. Congdon and his band of political thieves, had robbed them of their franchise. It was such an apparent iniquity, that scores of men who had never voted for a Conservative were driven to vote for Thompson. I need not enlarge further, Majors Wood and Cuthbert can tell the story of the refusal of, and the struggle for, the admitted and most sacred rights of British subjects. We want a commissioner who will give us a clean, businesslike administration. Our party here must have it, or it will be dead. Surely the kind of thing we have had during the last two years must come to an end. We want a commissioner who will commend officials who act in accordance with the regulations of the civil service, and censure those who make themselves offensively partisan. The man of whom—and may I not say, of whose retinue also—this territory has purged itself, bullied the first, and took to his heart the second. A large part of our officials here are the right kind of men, and took the right attitude in the campaign, however they voted. Telegraph, customs, post office, police, refrained from any expression of partisanship. A large number of officials, in and con-

nected with, the departments in the Administration building also refrained. But there were many in the building and in the outside service who were an offence, and will never be anything but an offence to the people of this territory.

I have, we all have, our ideals; but life in the west teaches us, that all we can do is to move towards our moral ideals. I am not extreme. But I represent thousands when I say that I will not keep quiet, about officials, who are whore-mongers, when officials spend the people's money for party or private purposes. Give us an official body clean in public and private life, and the government will find the people of the Yukon not less intelligent, or moderate or less easily contented, than the people in older Canada. The alien people here, other than the moral scum which always gravitates to a frontier mining camp, or moderate or less easily contented, than the subjects of Britain whose home is here. Give us your best men, and you will find that we are not far from ranking with your best people.

I took a public part in this campaign because of its appeal to the moral sense in me. I never took part in a political fight before, never spoke on a political platform in my life until now. The unusual course has been justified. I began with some doubts as to the wisdom of my course, I ended it with none. I have written, as I have written, because I am a Canadian and also because I am a Liberal. Mr. Congdon and his party deny me the name. To me Liberalism is a synonym for progress and purity, and when I stand for these, I am a Liberal if I stand alone. Investigate. Investigate. It can be done quietly and yet thoroughly. Purge the public service of unclean and incapable men; get rid of the parasitic class; give us, as our executive, a Liberal, who is also a sane and upright man, and at the end of the five years, the appeal of the government to the electorate of the Yukon will not be in vain.

It is evident that Mr. Pringle has not yet forgotten his party allegiance because it breathes out in every line. What he is particularly anxious to do is quietly, by investigation and action, to purge the life of the Yukon of its evil elements and replace them by decent conditions. Mr. Pringle sends with that letter a list of affidavits. The affidavits I shall not read just at present. There is a series of them referring to J. D. Girouard, the registrar of land titles for the Yukon Territory. The facts set forth are sworn to by R. H. S. Creswell, T. D. Patullo, Robert McKay, Dan Currie, Frank E. McNeil, H. W. Sillars, Emil Poyza, Ben Johnson, Wm. J. Kendle, David T. Evan, Richard Rossmossur, Gus Lindbam, Chas. Stevenson, John Cameron, George J. Locke, Henry C. McLeod, William A. Munroe, Andrew E. Greenman, T. G. Wilson, T. James, E. Gordon, all of Dawson. The affidavits affect very vitally Mr. Girouard the registrar, both as an official and as a man. The occurrence took place at the time these elections were going on. When the parties wanted the lists of certain polls and were told that Girouard had them, they went to his office. There they were told that Girouard was not in but they routed him out from where he was concealed, chased and collared him, and brought him to his own office and made him deliver up the lists.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He had a run for it.

Mr. FOSTER. He had a hard run for it but could not run with sufficient rapidity to outrun the men who were after him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He was pretty well winded.

Mr. FOSTER. Maybe he was somewhat winded before he began to run. That letter and the accompanying affidavit was acknowledged by the Prime Minister in these words :

Ottawa, February 6, 1905.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of January 3, last. I have to inform you that all the charges which you bring to the attention of the government relating to the administration of public affairs in the Yukon territory, will receive immediate attention from the different departments interested.

Yours respectfully,
WILFRID LAURIER.

Thus three years ago the right hon. gentleman received that appeal from a friend of his own, and yet up to this time no action has been taken and no remedy applied. Again in 1905 the same information, with other information added, was brought to his attention. Then he acknowledged the letter and promised that matters would be attended to. Matters, however, were not attended to, so that later on, in 1905, the Rev. John Pringle addressed a letter to the Governor General of Canada, inclosing a copy of the one he had sent to the First Minister, thus bringing the attention of the head of the administration in this country, to what he considered intolerable abuses in a portion of the Dominion. He received an acknowledgement to the effect that the matter would be brought to the attention of the ministers of the Crown. That letter of 1905, which I have just read, was, it appears, handed by one of the ministers to Mr. Frederick Tennyson Congdon who appears at that time to have been in the city of Ottawa, and Mr. Frederick Tennyson Congdon wrote a memo. for the ministry, I suppose, on the letter and allegations of Mr. Pringle of the 3rd day of January, 1905. I am not going to read the whole of that memorandum of Mr. Congdon. It is a heated and I should say a partisan reply to the Rev John Pringle. But there are certain parts of it which it probably would be well to read. He commenced by saying :

Mr. Pringle commenced writing letters containing positive statements in regard to Yukon matters before he had entered the territory or knew anything in regard to its affairs. The first of his letters was written about four years ago to M. E. M. Macdonald, of Pictou, Nova Scotia.

Now if that was his first letter written to Mr. Macdonald, of Pictou, as Mr. Congdon says, what does Mr. Congdon mean by the statement that he had begun to write letters on Yukon matters before he had entered the territory or knew anything in regard to its affairs ? because when he wrote to Mr. Macdonald four years ago he was in the territory.

With respect to this, Mr. Pringle since has claimed that in spite of the positive terms of the letter he was ignorant and ill-informed. His ignorance and lack of information in regard to any matter have never in the slightest degree affected the assurance with which he spoke. In 1902 it became in the interest of Mr. Pringle to write once more. In this letter he expressed the opinion that he was mistaken when he wrote formerly and that he should have kept silence. This was during the term of office of Mr. Ross. No doubt later he will come to the same opinion with regard to the present letter. If it comes to his advantage to withdraw every statement he now makes he will have no hesitation in doing so.

I read that to show the nature of the purported answer of Mr. Congdon to the allegations of Mr. Pringle. He goes on :

In the winter of 1902-3, Mr. Pringle became a candidate for the Yukon council and was elected. During his candidature nothing was too severe to say against the administration of the Dominion government, of the Minister of the Interior and of Mr. Ross as commissioner.

Here is Mr. Congdon replying to charges of evils which had occurred under his administration. The first thing he attempts to do is to raise a spirit of prejudice against Mr. Pringle, alleging that he had spoken against the Minister of the Interior and against the government at a previous time. What on earth would it have to do with the facts of the case whether he had or had not so spoken ? But Mr. Pringle's letter and his assurances are to the contrary, that he was an ardent believer in the Liberal party and a defender and supporter of the government. He goes on and states whom Mr. Pringle opposed, how he spoke of them, and the like of that. Then he states that :

He had been elected to the council as an opponent of the government. He for a time supported the territorial government. He worked for the Liberal nomination. He failed to get it. In once more condemning the government, he was venting the spleen engendered by his disappointment and pursuing the only course by which he hoped to rehabilitate himself with his former supporters. His new policy was adopted as the only feasible mode of escaping from the intolerable position of being disliked and despised alike by friends and opponents of the government.

While Mr. Ross was labouring to reform and improve administration, Mr. Pringle was busy scandalizing and condemning him. He continued to condemn until in order to strengthen his criticism of my administration it became necessary to praise that of Mr. Ross. Undoubtedly there was a marked improvement in every way and in the social life particularly, in the Yukon territory, under the administration of Mr. Ross, but there is no one in the least fairminded who will not say that there has not been a continued improvement in later times. I claim no credit for this, although I have endeavoured in every way to aid it. As far as I am aware, Dawson is socially as free from vice as Ottawa. A lady is as safe from insult and from witnessing anything offensive on the streets or in public places of Dawson, as in any part of Canada. The men in the public service there will compare favourably in efficiency and character with similar officials elsewhere.

I do not propose to say anything in regard to Mr. Pringle's comments on my lack of moral strength. I do not acknowledge him to be a competent judge of moral strength or any other moral qualities. It is one of these sanctimonious expressions with which he endeavours to lend colour to the slanders he delights to spread. If he were possessed of common honesty he would have coupled with his condemnation of me the statement which I compelled him to make upon the public platform that while I lived in a country in which according to himself the besetting sin is that of alcoholism, I have continued to be a total abstainer, that while as he claims lust has prevailed, I have lived a quite, clean and decent life and while grafting in his estimation is the most common practice I have never made a cent by improper means and am as poor today as when I became commissioner of the Yukon Territory. It is not pleasant for me to mention these matters, and probably Mr. Pringle failed to do so, because they do not entirely support his theory of lack of moral strength. The reverend gentleman thinks it is sufficient condemnation for him to speak of my supporters as a 'gang,' as ' creatures of mine ' and as ' boosters ' to ensure their condemnation. Most of the men whose names he enumerated are as intelligent, as upright, as pure in life and as respectable in every way as the Rev. John Pringle. If the reverend gentleman wishes to make a comparison between his life and my own, I am quite ready to undergo the test. If it is condemnation of a public man that some of his supporters are not perfect in virtue, I am quite ready to compare my supporters with the men with whom Mr. Pringle delights to associate and who are supported by him.

With regard to the matter of the dance hall ordinance, it is somewhat surprising that neither in the council of which Mr. Pringle was a member, nor upon the public platform has he ventured publicly to condemn that which he now desires secretly to criticise. The Yukon ordinance, to which he refers, was passed unaminously by the council and was assented to by myself as a matter of course. It has never been criticised by any one publicly in the territory. It is a matter within the authority of the Yukon council and may safely be left to the decision of that body.

He then accuses Pringle of stumping with dance hall associates and says that he there-

fore found it difficult to condemn them. With regard to Mr. Pepin he says that Pepin had a perfect right to play where he pleases. He says that Pepin was playing in the dance hall because his salary was not large and he had to make money and whilst playing there he simply was the player and nothing else. That is a statement which may very well have its weight. The employment in that respect did not in the least interfere with the discharge of his official duties.

It has been the delight of Mr. Pringle to circulate private slanders with regard to every man from whom he differs. It is in this spirit that he speaks of Mr. Girouard. I have not deemed it my duty as commissioner of the Yukon territory to act as a spy upon the private life of the officials of the territory. With respect to Mr. Girouard, I know him to be an efficient registrar and useful member of of the council. The statements made by Mr. Pringle in regard to him and the facts set out in the affidavits accompanying the letter deal with matters of which I know nothing . . .

The notices of the deponents to the affidavits accompanying Mr. Pringle's letter will appear clearly to any one who makes inquiries into their modes of life.

He says their modes of life are not correct, and therefore their affidavits cannot be trusted.

The controller of the territory is one of the best officials in my humble judgment to be found in Canada.

The controller at the time, I think, was Mr. Lithgow.

His integrity and his efficiency in the discharge of his public duties are well known and recognized by everybody. It is in the discharge of these duties that I have had to do with the controller, and I have this to say in regard to him that his word would be accepted where Mr. Pringle's would be despised. Mr Pringle does not like the controller, and he therefore, according to his wont, indulges in low slanders against him.

I repeat once more that the social conditions of Dawson are as good as in most parts of Canada and that Mr. Pringle only pretends to be shocked at them in order to make a point against an opponent. Undoubtedly there is vice in Dawson, but I have yet to discover the community that is free from it.

He goes on to take up the question of the post office and alleges that Mr. Pringle did not discover the defalcations, and states also that everything was done by the Postmaster General that could possibly be done; that the trouble was that the clerk was insane and committed this theft during the period of his insanity, and, instead of being incarcerated and punished, he was put in charge of his brother and taken out of the territory as an insane person.

With respect to the charges affecting the election of Mr. Ross they are the usual ones made by irresponsible persons. He pretends to be a Liberal but did not work for Mr. Ross and he is ready to make a finding with regard to the election against myself without the slightest evidence either of the misdeeds or of my connection with them. I had no more to do with any corruption in that campaign than had Mr. Pringle. And Mr. Pringle knows this.

The evidence of Mr. Pringle with regard to election promises is not very trustworthy unless he himself were a party to the promises or were present when they were made.

With reference to the enumerators he claims that most of them were honest and did their work well, though there may have been some of whom this could not be said. And he goes on to say:

I may also mention the fact that I was not commissioner of the Yukon territory nor a member of the Yukon council during that election and was not in any way responsible for the expenditure of public money. . . .

The spoils system was never put in operation by me. I never dismissed an official on account of his politics, although there were many Conservatives in the government employ in the territory. I did endeavour in all proper cases to see that public patronage went to supporters of the government.

He says their modes of life are not corcharges made by Mr. Pringle, but as I have not read those charges in the House I will not read Mr. Cougdon's answer.

With regard to Mr. Pringle's statements as to enumerating the lists, the polling divisions, &c., I have only to say that I had no more to do with it than had Mr. Pringle. I did not appoint the enumerators and I did not nominate a single one of them. There were half as many enumerators in number as at the previous election, or even a less proportion. This was necessary on account of the enormous expense. The smaller number necessitated giving each a larger territory and as far as possible each enumerator fixed his location for the purposes of enumeration in the most central point within his district. This of course enabled Mr. Pringle and others to appeal to prejudices in certain localities necessarily ignored.

It is easy for an irresponsible individual like Mr. Pringle to say that five hundred of the best people were disfranchised but it is a different thing for him to prove anything so absurd. Most of the enumerators I believe did their work fairly and well. The other to appeal to prejudices in certain localities necessarily ignored.

Now, I have read the chief parts of the reply of Mr. Congdon, because I had read the charges made by Mr. Pringle, and thought it but fair to place on record also Mr. Congdon's reply. Now, a peculiar thing took place. Mr. Congdon had Mr. Pringle's letter placed in his hands as soon as it came here. Concerning his former letter, that of 1902, Mr. Pringle says that, though it was written to the ministers and marked 'private,' it got into the hands of the Yukon officials and he had to meet it on every occasion. The letter of 1905 was at once given to Mr. Congdon, who made

this long memorandum upon it; but the Congdon memorandum in reply to Mr. Pringle was not given to Mr. Pringle. He wrote for it again and again, and complained bitterly that the courtesy of seeing the memorandum was not given to him. On November 30, 1906, Mr. Pringle wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier as follows:

On the 18th August last, I wrote the Hon. Frank Oliver to ask him for a copy of Mr. Congdon's answer to my letter of January 3, 1905. That letter was, in part, a criticism of Mr. Congdon and his policy as the government's commissioner here; in part, a statement of the iniquities perpetrated upon the electorate of the Yukon in the elections of 1902 and 1904. In the first he was chief of the campaign executive, in the last the government Liberal candidate, in both the champion debaucher of constituencies.

Mr. Oliver informs me in effect that no such answer is in the government's possession.

Now, mind you, this last letter of Mr. Pringle's was handed to Mr. Congdon here in Ottawa, and, about January, 1905, Mr. Congdon made this elaborate reply. On August, 18, 1906, Mr. Pringle writes to Hon. Frank Oliver asking him for a copy of this memorandum, and Mr. Oliver informs him, in effect, that no such answer is in the government's possession. Mr. Pringle says:

No one in Canada received a copy of my letter save Rev. Dr. Warden, then chief of our home mission work, the ministers of the Crown and the Governor General. This letter was placed in Mr. Congdon's hands by a minister, and was answered by Mr. Congdon. I have not received a copy of his vindication of himself. I do not know how such a discourtesy can be justified.

This was November 30, 1906, and refers to a document of January, 1905. So, nearly two years had elapsed and Mr. Pringle had not received a copy of the memorandum, although it was in the hands of the government. The astonishing statement is made to him that there is no such document in the possession of the government. He goes on:

I wrote as a friend of the Liberal party, not as an enemy. I was desirous of having you, Sir, and your cabinet, purge the administration here of the impure, scheming, grafting gang who were in control, who have done irreparable moral and material injury to this distant territory, have made Canadians blush for their country, and have brought the Liberal party and government into contempt.

I have been treated with courtesy more scant than would have been extended to an enemy. For an enemy would not have scrupled to advertise the condition of which I complained.

Mr. McInnes and others have seen Mr. Congdon's answer. The only copies of my letter accessible to him are in the hands of ministers of the Crown. The conclusion is obvious. Nor is it less obvious that Mr. Congdon must have satisfied the government of the falsity of my statements and of the wisdom and purity of his administration, for the government sent Mr. Congdon back to high and lucrative official position when this territory had him out of its mouth.

Kindly send me a copy of Mr. Congdon's answer to my letter of February 3, 1905.

I am, yours respectfully,

(Sgd.) JOHN PRINGLE.

Mr. Pringle again writes from Dawson on the 31st of July, 1907, to the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier as follows:

Sir,—I would again, and for the last time, call your attention to the drunkenness and lust in official circles here, which are the open scandal of this city and territory.

It then goes on to make certain charges in reference to Mr. Girouard which I shall not put upon the 'Hansard.'

I have no personal motive in bringing these disgraceful conditions and doings to your notice. But I have taken these matters up before the public and the government because they are an outrage upon the moral sense of our people, a disgrace to us as Canadians, and because of the influence which the presence of drunkards and whore-mongers in high public office, has upon the moral tone of our people. Dance halls and bawdy houses are the natural concomitants of the presence in our administrative life of unshamed male prostitutes.

I have resolved, if this continues as at present, to state the case in the plainest terms in the eastern press, without regard to the notoriety and discomfort which such disclosures may bring to myself. The disgraceful scenes of the last ten days, in which prominent public men and government officials of more than one department have been the chief actors, have more than justified everything I have written to members of the cabinet or to the press in regard to the immorality which prevails in our community and official life.

I am yours in sincerity,

(Sgd.) JOHN PRINGLE.

After all that had taken place and all this time had elapsed the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), in answer to a letter of January 9, 1907 and particularly in connection with the struggle of Mr. Lithgow, the controller, to be appointed as governor or commissioner of the Yukon, had brought a flood of strong testimonials from party workers, from Liberal organizations and some equally strong and lurid ones from the Young Men's Liberal Association against the appointment, the Minister of the Interior at last begins to think that something will have to be done and he writes as follows:

Ottawa, February 2, 1907.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 9th instant——

It should be ult.

—with reference to the appointment of a new commissioner for the Yukon. I note what you

say regarding Mr. Lithgow, and shall give all your views careful consideration.

(Sgd.) FRANK OLIVER.

In reply to a letter of the 31st of July, 1907, addressed to the Hon. Frank Oliver and which I have just read, the minister writes on the 28th of August a letter in which he says :

Since my return I have received a letter from the Governor General's secretary informing me that His Excellency had received a copy of the same letter. The premier has also informed me that on receipt of the copy of the letter sent to him he communicated with Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow the allegations made by yourself against them.

By letter of this date to Commissioner Henderson I am instructing him to investigate fully the charges which you have made against Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow and to receive from you any specific charges which you may desire to make against any other officials in the employ of the government and especially of the Interior Department in the Yukon Territory.

I have instructed Mr. Henderson that you are to have every opportunity to establish the facts which you have stated in your letter of July 31.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) FRANK OLIVER.

That is on the 28th of August, 1907, five years and more after the first full and specific information sent by the Reverend John Pringle, the Minister of the Interior plucks up sufficient force to ask Mr. Henderson to make an investigation. It is rather a remarkable thing to find that one of the chief reasons why he seems to have done it is because he has received a letter from the Governor General's secretary informing him that His Excellency had received a copy of the same letter. So, he writes to the Hon. Alexander Henderson as follows :

Ottawa, August 28, 1907.

Dear Sir,—I beg to inclose herewith copy of a letter received by me from the Governor General's office. As you will note from the address and contents, the original of this letter was addressed to the premier and myself.

You will be good enough to investigate fully the specific charges made by Mr. Pringle against Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow, and you will, of course, call upon Mr. Pringle to substantiate those charges. You are to investigate fully and report.

Should the Rev. Mr. Pringle desire to lay charges against any other persons in the employ of the government, or of the Interior Department especially, you are to investigate them as well.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) FRANK OLIVER.

That is received and is acknowledged by the commissioner at Dawson on the 23rd of September, 1907. Mr. Pringle, to make a long story short, is notified and a time is set when he is to be present with his evidence. But, Mr. Pringle begins to find out the authority that Mr. Henderson had and he comes up against this fact that it is simply to be an examination, that Mr. Henderson is not a royal commissioner and that he has no power to summon witnesses and to examine them on oath. Immediately when this comes out the Rev. John Pringle says that he cannot undertake to carry on an investigation in the Yukon, bring his witnesses and face all the opposition that he will have there unless these witnesses are to be examined under oath and he can be protected as a royal commission or a commission appointed to examine under oath alone could protect him. On the 2nd of October, 1907, he says, writing to Alex. Henderson, commissioner, Yukon :

Dear Sir,—I am prepared for the investigation which you have been instructed to hold into the charges which I have made of scandalous living on the part of J. T. Lithgow and J. E. Girouard, prominent public servants in the Yukon.

He specifies his charge against both of these gentlemen and continues :

I have to complain that similar charges have been made by myself and others during the past four or five years, and that the government has until now ignored the charges and palliated the evils.

I shall give the names of my witnesses as soon as the date and place of investigation are fixed.

(Sgd.) JOHN PRINGLE.

Then the date and place were fixed. Then comes the refusal of Mr. Pringle. I think I can best show that by reading a letter which he writes to Hon. Frank Oliver, as follows :

Dawson, Yukon Territory, October 18, 1907.

Hon. Frank Oliver,
Minister of the Interior.

Sir,—Inclosed is a copy of a letter sent by me to Commissioner Henderson with reference to the investigation into the scandals connected with the names of Messrs. Lithgow and Girouard, controller and registrar of this territory, respectively.

I think that the position which I take therein is reasonable.

When the government appoints an investigator with the power to subpœna, commit and protect witnesses, I shall be ready with overwhelming proof of the truth of the charges I have made.

To us, who have lived here for years, whose moral sense these officials have habitually outraged, it seems almost ridiculous that the government should require any formal investigation. The kind of thing against which we protest, in the public service has had a very impressive illustration here in the last few days.

More than two months ago nearly $40,000 in gold in transit from the American side was stolen from the post office in Dawson. The principal in the robbery and who died it is believed by his own hand, while under arrest,

had been for years a frequenter of saloons and dance halls and the slave of the women who swarm in them; and at the same time an employee of the Public Works Department, with keys in his possession which gave him entrance to every public building in Dawson.

His pay $10 a day—did not suffice for the demands of his life and therefore he stole to make up the deficiency. A dance hall employee decoyed a post office employee from his place and the Public Works Department employee used the department key to gain entrance to the post office, and abstracted the gold.

It is useless to expect morality in the public service when immoral men are nursed and protected therein.

I am, yours in sincerity,

(Sgd.) JOHN PRINGLE.

Mr. Henderson writes to Mr. Oliver:

Dawson, November 8, 1907.

Dear Mr. Oliver,—I am inclosing herewith a copy of the correspondence relating to the charges of the Rev. Dr. Pringle against Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow. You will see from Dr. Pringle's letter to me of the 23rd ultimo, he declines to appear as a party in what he calls an informal investigation. I would suggest, if agreeable to you, that I be appointed a commissioner to investigate the charges under the provisions of the Inquiries Act, chapter 104, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) ALEXANDER HENDERSON.

Commissioner.

Hon. Frank Oliver,
Minister of the Interior, Ottawa.

I have here the minister's reply to Mr. Pringle:

Ottawa, November 14, 1907.

Dear Sir,—Yours of October 18 to hand inclosing copy of your letter to Commissioner Henderson in which you decline to offer evidence as to the correctness of the statements made in your former letter regarding Messrs. Lithgow and Girouard. I note that you say 'when the government appoints an investigator with the power to subpœna, commit and protect witnesses, I shall be ready with overwhelming proof of the charges that I have made.'

I take it from this that you are not ready to offer evidence of those charges to Commissioner Henderson in the investigation which he is instructed to hold. This is a matter for your own consideration. For my own part, I see no necessity for an appointment with the powers you suggest.

On the strength of your statement I have as already said instructed the commissioner to investigate with a view to arriving at the facts. He has communicated with you in order to fix the investigation, to suit your convenience. As you do not intend to appear the investigation will have to proceed without your assistance, and the commissioner has been so instructed. If for lack of the evidence which you say you are able to furnish, the investigation should not establish the facts which you desire, I beg to point out to you that the fault is your own, and not mine.

Mr. FOSTER.

The minister seemed to forget entirely that there is any public side to this question and seems to be making an attempt to throw the whole onus upon Dr. Pringle if he does not come to time before the insufficient tribunal.

I note in your letter of the 18th you say 'it seems almost ridiculous that the government should require any formal investigation.'

And here the native justice of the minister bursts into a flame:

I can only say in regard to that, that it is an inherent right of every British subject that he should not be condemned without evidence; that he has a right to hear the evidence against him, and has a right to be heard in his own defence. I might remind you that Canada is not Russia of the present day, not Spain of the time of the Inquisition.

Having delivered that splendid burst, which he might have thought of when he shortly before this told Rev. John Pringle that he had not a copy of Mr. Congdon's criticism of Mr. Pringle's letter, although the government had had it in their possession for six or eight months—and by the way Mr. Pringle did not secure a copy of it until more than a year and a half afterwards, when he had to beg for it. It was very like being in Spain or Russia for a man to be unable to get a criticism of his own statement. The minister concludes:

I will take the liberty of saying that while the Canadian government cannot do the impossible, it is admitted by all unprejudiced people who have had the opportunity of observing that so far as the support of law, order and morality is concerned, the Canadian Yukon, under the administration of the Canadian government, compares most favourably with any other gold mining camp in the world.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) FRANK OLIVER.

That about ends the letters which I shall read except that I shall note that Commissioner Henderson on December 17, 1907, sends out a report and in it he includes a telegram he had sent a little before, as follows:

I can unhesitatingly affirm that the Yukon including Dawson is as moral in all respects as any other part of Canada. The report follows by mail.

The report is found on page 29 of these papers. He accompanies this also with reports from Major X. T. Wood, assistant commissioner and from Capt. Wroughton, commanding 'B' Division, Northwest Mounted Police. His own report and the testimony of these two men is directed to establish the statement that at the present time the moral conditions of the Yukon as regards dance halls and the sale of liquor and the like of that are tolerable at least and as the commissioner says probably as

good as anywhere else in the Dominion of Canada. They are very long and I make that statement as to their purports in order that it may appear without putting them upon 'Hansard.' If it is thought best however we can have them read so that they shall go on 'Hansard.' If the minister thinks I had better read them I shall do so. Very well I shall do so.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. You did not want much encouragement.

Mr. FOSTER. No. I read these simply because the House might think it unfair that I should publish other statements and not publish these statements of the commissioner and I might be criticised for so doing. I gave what I considered a fair summary of them but I am not going to submit myself to criticism on the ground that I did not give the statements of the commissioners and of these other officials. The first which I shall read is as follows, this is Mr. Henderson's report to the government:

Dawson, December 7, 1907.

Sir,—I have the honour to report that I have received your letter of the 4th ultimo, in which you state that some time ago you asked me to let you have a general report with respect to the allegation of immorality in the Yukon. I also received in due course your letter of the 6th September on the same subject, in which you state that you are in receipt of certain papers concerning the licensing of two music halls in Dawson, which papers are set out fully in your letter and which it is perhaps necessary for me to again enumerate. On receipt of your letter of 4th ultimo, I wired you as follows:

'I unhesitatingly affirm that the Yukon including Dawson is as moral in all respects as any other part of Canada, report follows by mail.'

My reason for sending you the telegram was that I thought perhaps a telegram giving the purport of my report might be of use to you. Before my arrival in the territory I had heard that the question of dance halls had been brought prominently before the public through a letter addressed to a Winnipeg newspaper by the Reverend Dr. Pringle, and I felt that one of the first questions which would demand my attention would be the devising of some solution to remove the conditions complained of should I find the complaint was well founded. After my arrival in Dawson on July 14, I ascertained that two dance halls respectively called the 'M & N' and the 'Floradora,' were in active operation, and that there was some diversity of opinion as to whether these institutions were a menace to public morals or otherwise. My own opinion was that they should be suppressed, and before the session of the Yukon council, which opened on the 9th of August last, I had thoroughly canvassed the situation with every member of the Yukon council. I made no secret of the position I proposed to take in the matter. An amendment to the liquor ordinance was introduced by the Honourable Mr. Justice Dugas, providing in effect that no music hall should be kept in connection with premises licensed to sell liquors (sec. 3, chap. 9, ordinance, 1907.) There was some opposition to this Bill in the council, and various amendments proposing the postponement of the operation of the Bill to a later date received some support, but eventually the section passed as proposed, the effect being to immediately make the sale of liquors in dance halls illegal. The two dance halls I have mentioned continued to run for some time without selling liquor until the largest, the 'M. & N.', went out of business, and the other still continues to run as a dance hall, but I am credibly informed by the police that there is very little business being done and that no liquors are sold in the dance hall.

The most vicious feature of the dance hall was undeniably the sale of liquors to frequenters with the result that it is has been stated that on many occasions men, who were induced to drink excessively, lost large sums of money, but since my appointment as commissioner I have never had any complaints of this kind. I might add that I have given instructions to the police that they are to watch carefully for any infraction of the law and immediately prosecute those who are guilty of any violations thereof.

I have also informed Dr. Pringle that I feel it my duty to investigate any complaint he may make respecting any infraction of the liquor laws or any laws enacted for the suppression of vice or immorality.

I might add that I delayed making a full report, as I understood that the effect of the amendments I have spoken of, would be brought to the attention of the government by a perusal of the ordinances passed at the session, copies of which were duly forwarded to the government in accordance with the order in council governing the same.

Generally, I am of opinion that the standard of morality is as high in Dawson as in any other town in the Dominion. From my own observations I am quite at a loss to understand the necessity for comments such as have recently been made to the effect that there is greater immorality in the Yukon than elsewhere in Canada.

I might call attention in this connection to section 4, chapter 9, of the amendment to the Liquor Ordinance, 1907, which repeals section 61 of chapter 76, of the Consolidated Ordinances, and substitutes therefor a new section consisting of subsection 1 and 2. I have every reason to believe that public sentiment is overwhelmingly in favour of the legislation enacted at the recent session of the council, and I feel that I have the support of the community in my efforts to see that these laws are strictly lived up to. However, I have learned since my arrival in Dawson, and I am convinced, that the conditions now are better than at any time in the history of the city; and I am greatly surprised to learn that this fact is not recognized by those who give publicity to statements regarding morality in the territory.

I am inclosing you herewith reports of Major Wood and Captain Wrighton, respectively the assistant commissioner of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police and the officer commanding 'B' division of the same force. As both these gentlemen are familiar

with the past and present conditions of Dawson, I felt that reports from them would be exceedingly useful in giving desired information upon the subject.

I have the honour to be, Sir
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) ALEXANDER HENDERSON,
Commissioner.

Hon. Frank Oliver,
Minister of the Interior, Ottawa.

He appends the report of the assistant commissioner at Dawson and Captain Wrighton, which are largely in the tenor and to the purport of the report of the Commissioner of the Yukon. They all of them say that there has been an improvement in the last few months. It is of course to be understood that these reports, those of the commissioner and of the police officers, are written in the dead of winter, the latter part of December and the first part of June, and the statement is made somewhere that there are not over 1,500 people in Dawson at that time, and it is of course much easier at such a period to keep fair conditions than it would be during the press of the season or in the summer. Now I will read the Commissioner's report on the investigation :

Commissioner's Office,
Yukon Territory, Canada.
Dawson, December 7, 1907.

Sir,—I have the honour to report in respect to the charges made by the Reverend Dr. Pringle against Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow that after receiving your instructions to investigate fully these charges and report, I immediately communicated with Dr. Pringle, and on the 1st of October last informed him of my instructions. I stated to him that both officials named had made emphatic denials to me with respect to the truth of the charges and that it was in the interest of all parties concerned that these charges should be investigated without undue delay, and I suggested that a day be fixed so that the investigation might be proceeded with as speedily as possible. Dr. Pringle replied by letter to me of the 2nd of October, stating that he was prepared for the investigation, which I had been instructed to hold, and informed me that he would give me the names of his witnesses as soon as the date and place of investigation were fixed. On the 8th October, I, by letter, asked him whether he would be ready to proceed with the charges against Mr. Girouard on the 8th October at 4 p.m., if this date was convenient; if not, I requested him to advise me. I pointed out that I thought there would be no objection to have the charges against Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow heard separately as there was no necessary connection between them. On the 14th of October, Dr. Pringle advised me that as I had not the authority to summon and swear witnesses, he declined to appear in the investigation ordered into the charges, but he submitted two alternatives for my consideration. (1) 'As the agent of the Minister of the Interior to inquire into the scandals, at least six years continued, connected with the names of these two officials,'; (2) To get from the authorities at Ottawa the powers of a royal commission to investigate the charges made. Dr. Pringle informed me that if I adopted the first course he, having made specific charges, would do all he could to aid me in investigating them and getting at the truth, and that if I adopted the second course, he would also be ready to proceed. Having been advised by Mr. Girouard that he desired the charges against him to be investigated, and asking that a day be fixed for the hearing of the charges, adopting the first course suggested by Dr. Pringle, I communicated with him on the 19th of October requesting to hear from him as to whether he was prepared to proceed with the investigation as far as Mr. Girouard was concerned, the latter having pomised to lend assistance in obtaining witnesses. On the 23rd October, 1907, Dr. Pringle advised me by letter, stating that he had decided not to take any part in the investigation which I was instructed to make into the charges against Messrs. Lithgow and Girouard. As I concluded that Dr. Pringle had abandoned his suggestion that I should inquire into these charges in the manner suggested by him in his first alternatives, and as he had not submitted to me the name of any witness, in support of the charges as he had promised, and as no other person in the territory had made any charge to me with respect to either of the officials named, I was unable to proceed further and advised you that Dr. Pringle declined to proceed unless a commission was issued to me to take the evidence.

That appears to me to be peculiar ground taken by Mr. Henderson. He was instructed by the Minister of the Interior to investigate into the circumstances, as commissioner, and report. When Mr. Pringle, on the ground that there was not a proper commission issued, refused, unless protected by that commission, to bring his witnesses, then Mr. Henderson thought that his whole duty was done. And because no one appeared to prosecute he said he could do nothing more. That was an extraordinary idea to take of a duty. As an investigator he was bound, in the carrying out of the instructions of the Minister of the Interior, to make a thorough examination, hunt up his own witnesses, take evidence wherever he could find it and thus be in a position to determine whether or not the charges were true. He had been ordered by the minister to make a general investigation and report. Instead of doing this, he washed his hands of the whole thing when Mr. Pringle refused to take part on the grounds I have mentioned. The following is the letter from the commissioner:

I have the honour to add that since my appointment as commissioner, I have seen nothing in the conduct of either of the officials mentioned which would warrant the conclusion that the charges made by Dr. Pringle, against them, or either of them, could be substantiated.

That is an odd statement.

They are both competent and capable officials and their performance of their duties eminently satisfactory to me.

Just look at it. A man is charged with a theft committed at a certain time. An investigation is ordered, the witnesses do not appear, the prosecutor does not act, and the judge, relying upon the absence of prosecutor and witnesses and because he did not see the theft committed himself, decides that there is nothing against the accused and that there is nothing to investigate. That is an odd position for a commissioner to take.

Since Dr. Pringle's refusal to proceed with the investigation, as hereinbefore mentioned, Mr. Girouard has commenced an action against him for damages for libel and the action is now pending.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

ALEXANDER HENDERSON,

Commissioner.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER (reading) :

Ottawa, January 2, 1908.

Dear sir,—I have before me the papers in connection with the inquiry ordered in respect to Dr. Pringle's charges with your covering letter of December 7. I note that in your letter of November 8, you suggest your appointment as a commissioner to investigate the charges under the provisions of the Inquiries Act, chapter 104, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.

In reply to this suggestion I beg to say that it appears to me that it would be a very strained construction to put upon section 2 of that Act to say that an inquiry into charges of the nature of those made by Dr. Pringle was an inquiry 'into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof.'

Inasmuch as Dr. Pringle has been requested to make a specific statement of his knowledge of the facts regarding which he complains and has failed to do so, I do not think I would be warranted in applying the terms of the Inquiries Act. If Dr. Pringle had availed himself of the opportunity which you gave him under my instructions it would then be a matter for consideration whether we might or might not invoke the terms of the Act, but without something more definite than has yet been brought to your attention, I do not think we have sufficient warrant for doing so.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) FRANK OLIVER.

To the Hon. Alexander Henderson,
Commissioner Yukon Territory,
Dawson.

There are just two points in that letter on which I wish to comment. The first is that Dr. Pringle having been requested to make a specific statement of facts and he failed to do so. It is well to give just at this point Dr. Pringle's statement again.

Dawson, Yukon Territory,
October 2, 1907

Alexander Henderson, Esq.,
Commissioner of the Yukon.

Sir,—I am prepared for the investigation, which you have been instructed to hold into the charges which I have made of scandalous living on the part of J. T. Lithgow and J. E. Girouard, prominent public servants in the Yukon.

Then follow explicitely (a), 1, 2 and 3; (b) and (c), the charges that he makes and which he declares himself ready to substantiate. So it is not because there were not charges made by Dr. Pringle and it is not because he was not ready to substantiate them. But he knew the crowd against whom he had to go up and he did not propose to put himself in the position of having no sworn testimony and no protected witnesses, in fact no protection at all before the examination and no punishment for perjured witnesses. He had too large an experience with those whom he calls 'the gang' in the Yukon, to put himself in that false position and in that I think he was absolutely correct. The other comment is that the Minister of the Interior says that he will not grant a commission to examine under oath because he does not consider that an investigation of the charges made by Dr. Pringle was :

An inquiry into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof.

I think that simple comment upon that is quite sufficient. I have always supposed that it was a part of good government in Canada to see that men in office conducted themselves with credit and honour to the country. Of course if we are to revise that and subscribe to the doctrine that it does not matter a tinker's fiddle as to what a man representing the Dominion of Canada does when he is in office, then the position of the minister may be a fair position. But I would ask the Minister of the Interior if he did not grant a commission on oath but a few months or weeks ago to investigate a case simply with reference to property. I forgot the name of the person but the minister, I think, will know. When that person made a complaint, the investigation into the business under review was made without oath and without the power to swear witnesses. He made an application for a commission to examine under oath in a mere matter of private property and it was granted to him by the Minister of the Interior. But in a case of this kind, the Minister of the Interior could not see that it was pertinent or came under the law.

The Toronto 'Globe' sometimes has a spasm of virtue and in one of those it wrote a criticism:

The paper containing that criticism says :

Dr. John Pringle's charges of scandalous immorality against two prominent officials of the Dominion government are not at present to be investigated. Commissioner Henderson required the names of Dr. Pringle's witnesses and Dr. Pringle declined to give them to the commissioner until the latter should receive authority to compel witnesses to appear and testify on oath, he not having been vested with such power. The minister refused to delegate such authority to the commissioner, and there the matter rests.

The Toronto 'Globe' discussing the question says :

The issue thus raised is one that may be considered entirely apart from the question of the truth or falsity of the accusations. It is incredible that a clergyman of Dr. Pringle's standing should make grave charges against public officials in a community such as the city of Dawson without having good ground for believing them to be not only well-founded but capable of being proved. He was desirous of having them investigated, but he knew he would have little chance of establishing them unless witnesses could be compelled to testify on oath and thus become indictable for perjury if they swore falsely. The request for an inquiry conducted under this commonly used and easily afforded safeguard, was, under the circumstances a perfectly reasonable one, and it is not easy to understand why it was refused. Public opinion will not throw responsibility for failure on Dr. Pringle until some adequate reason is forthcoming.

I think that represents the sane and proper view of the case under the circumstances.

I notice that, as usual, some of the papers have not been brought down. For instance there was a joint telegram of protest from the Protestant minister of Dawson somewhere about the 14th or 15th of December, 1904, at the time when riots were fairly within the horizon on account of the outrageous proceedings at the election. Nor are there the telegrams of the police officials notably that of assistant Commissioner Wood at about the same date. He also made very strong telegraphic representations to the government with regard to the seriousness and urgency of the situation. There is also a telegram sent by Rev. John Pringle himself which has not come down with the papers but, fortunately, I have a copy of it.

Dawson, December 15, 1904.

Hon. Clifford Sifton,
Minister of the Interior,
Ottawa.

Conditions here intolerable. Names illegally removed from lists. Enumerators refuse lists, polling divisions on order returning officer. Some enumerators missing—others in barracks under police protection. People incensed and assembling. If people's rights further invaded forbearance will cease. Congdon and outfit desperate adopting desperate methods. People will not stand for it: Judge Dugas refuses even to advise in matter. Girouard public scandal. Outrage on common decency. Must not retain position nor get other, humiliates self-respecting people to do business with him. Statement and affidavit by mail. Government dare not countenance these things. Take some measures that will produce lists, polling divisions immediately.

JOHN PRINGLE.

And so the case ends, so far as the papers are concerned. But Rev. John Pringle still stands to his guns, and as late as February, 1908, I find a letter from him published in the Toronto 'News' and dated Dawson, January 28. In this letter he says :

Has the law been enforced in the Yukon? Has it been enforced in precisely the same way as the law in every other part of Canada has been enforced? Let us see.

1. There is, or it is generally believed that there is, a law forbiding the immigration into Canada of prostitutes and criminals.

Has this law been enforced?

We have a customs house at Summit, and a strong police force at Whitehorse—the door to the Yukon. What has been done to throw back the steady stream of prostitutes with the collateral stream of male undesirables which have poured into this territory for years? Absolutely nothing.

The police who are always ready to do their duty have not been instructed or permitted to prevent this shameful immigration.

It is sufficient for my purpose to quote the words of the assistant commissioner of police, spoken in the Yukon Council, last August, during the debate on dance halls: 'If the dance halls are closed hundreds of these women will not flock to the city, as they have been doing, for the past two years.' If there is any such law or regulation governing immigration and its enforcement elsewhere, has been on Yukon lines, it is a dead letter, dead as a coffin nail.

2. There is a federal Sunday law, passed after sore travail. I shall not argue whether it is good or bad, broad or narrow. It is a law for the enforcement of which in the unorganized districts and territories the Minister of Justice is responsible.

Has this law been enforced in the Yukon?

Last April the assistant commissioner of police was advised that the law was in force, and instructed to report to the Minister of Justice infractions of the law. He did so. Was the law enforced?

Was there any pretense made of enforcing it?

Absolutely none. The assistant commissioner was told that the police would do their duty if they attended to complaints made by private citizens, and the constables on duty on the streets of Dawson and on the creeks, saw the law broken—book stores, cigar stores, general stores, teams, wood-sawing machines going on Sunday as on other days—and under order, did nothing to enforce the law. The Department of Justice had forbidden action, and had thrust the onus and the odium of prosecution on the private citizens.

3. The Criminal Code forbids the business of prostitution. Has this law been enforced as in any other part of Canada.

He goes on to give very explicit reasons to show that this law is a dead letter. He says that it is impossible to convict. The Minister of Justice, he says, instructed the

authorities in a particular case which was reported to him to take no action. He goes on to speak of gambling :

4. The Criminal Code forbids gambling. Has the law been enforced precisely in the same way as in any other part of Canada?

To say, here, that it has, is to raise an incredulous laugh. I have seen in the police court, right under the eyes of the police magistrate, all the furniture of the common gambling houses raided by the police, money taken from the faro tables, cards and chips from the poker tables, the best men in the police court swore to the facts. The case was dismissed. How do police magistrates in the east calculate the preponderance of evidence? By counting the witnesses solely or by considering their character and weighing their testimony also? . . . Have the laws for the protection of life and property been enforced?

I believe they have, thanks to the police, unthwarted and unhindered in this sphere of their duties, and also to the impossibility of escape except north or south by the river into the arms of the police, and east or west into an untrodden and unhospitable wilderness.

Has the liquor ordinance——

6. Has the liquor ordinance been enforced as such laws are enforced in any other part of Canada?

Emphatically no.

He then goes on to give his proof, and proceeds :

My mind is, of course, unlegal, and I shall be pardoned if, in a measure, I fail to see and appreciate the nice distinctions which laws and lawyers make. But the foregoing seems to me to be a pretty fair case against the contention that law has been, or is now, enforced in the Yukon, in the same way as in any other part of Canada. If way means procedure, I admit it; if it means the measure of the law's enforcement by the procedure provided, I unhesitatingly deny it.

He then goes on to mention the postal frauds and to show how much or how little has been done in reference thereto. He continues :

What about the criminal conspiracy cases after the election of 1904? The franchise stolen from one in eight of our voters, and no redress found. Why were the cases dropped? A gentleman now on the Supreme Court bench could, I think, give the reason. Was there what I learned from the eastern press is called a 'saw-off,' or some other new scheme as yet without a name? The cases were dropped. The public never knew why. They would like to know even now. Administrative and judicial abortion where a great public wrong is under investigation arouses the suspicion of free men. I think a very interesting and informing series of papers might be written on: 'curiosities of representative government, with illustrations from the Yukon.' Perhaps 'Immoralities' might be substituted for 'curiosities.'

JOHN PRINGLE.
Presbyterian Minister.

Dawson, January 28, 1908.

I clipped from the Vancouver 'News' a letter signed with a nom de plume, which letter bears out in much the same, or even stronger, language the statements made by the Rev. John Pringle in the letter the reading of which I have just concluded.

I do not propose at this stage to make any extended comments on the papers I have read. My object has been to lay this matter before the House and through the House before the country. I think that comments that might be made and sustained would be something of this nature: In the first place that the government is certainly at fault for not having given such attention as it should to the high standing and character of the men whom it placed in commanding positions in official authority in the Yukon. In the second place, that the government must have found it absolutely impossible not to know during the last five or six years what was going on in this connection in the Yukon. They must have had information both from official and unofficial sources. I believe they did know. In addition to the other information that came to them, there were in 1902 the explicit and fully detailed information of Rev. John Pringle. From 1902 up to 1905 the government did absolutely nothing by way of investigation for adequate redress. Then when Rev. John Pringle sent an additional letter in 1905, with fresh information added to that already given in 1902, that letter also resulted in no action on the part of the government. After waiting for months, Rev. John Pringle wrote to the Governor General in 1906 and sent to the Governor General with his covering letter the letters that he had sent before to His Excellency's ministers. Even then the government did nothing adequate, made no investigation or examination and procured no redress. But the Governor General's letter seems to have got later into the hands of the minister (Mr. Oliver).

Then, in 1907, on a fresh impulse given by the extraordinary canvass made both for and against Mr. Lithgow, as governor of the Yukon, the whole matter was brought to a head and the minister took tardy action. But for all these five years the Prime Minister, knowing absolutely just what was going on, paid the salaries of the men who were involved and implicated, raised their salaries from time to time, gave them the official mantle of this country and of this government and kept them in their places despite everything that had been said. Then, when at last they made a show of investigating, they did not grant, in a case like this, the formal and effective investigation which they would and did grant to a man whose small claim was in question and who called for an investigation under oath and got it. The Rev. John Pringle, with his information and his witnesses ready had to declare that he could not put himself in the position of attempt-

ing to give his evidence unless he had the protection of the oath for the witnesses and all that proceeds from that. Then the investigation is entirely dropped and the commissioner has nothing better to say than that as the Rev. John Pringle did not go on with his charges and as no other prosecutor appeared he did not consider it of use to carry it on any further and he ends it with, in his report, giving a certificate of good character, in so far as he himself goes and in so far as he himself knew, to the very parties who were accused and whose conduct ought to have been inquired into under the accusations of the Rev. John Pringle. I think that in the administration of any part of Canada, and more particularly of that distant part of Canada where people from every clime come, and where they judge of the character of this country and the character of its people and government by what they meet with there, a special care ought to have been taken to have kept common decency, at least, side by side with official life and to have redressed the monstrous and almost incredible grievances which all good and moral people in that country had to complain of.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I did not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in the course of his remarks, but it appeared to me that the gravamen of his charge was that certain officials of this government were in the habit of playing music in dance halls. I think he gave the names of them—the Floradora and the M. and N. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he knows the instrument upon which these gentlemen played because if this is a question of comparative ethics between a mining centre like Dawson and other centres we ought to know the character of the instrumental music which they rendered. We all know that a gentleman who could play well on the banjo or the concertina, or the violin would be very popular with the heterogeneous population which floats into these music halls. These music halls are not recognized as being hopelessly immoral in a great many centres. In London, in New York and in a great many other centres there are music and dance halls. It would not be a question of immorality if an official were endeavouring to while away a long evening in Dawson by playing well upon any of the instruments indicated or engaging in the festive dance provided he did not disturb the peace by attemptng to perform upon the trombone or any instrument of that kind. I think the hon. gentleman ought to give us that information now.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House will allow me I will take just a moment to, in the first place, commend the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. W. Roche) to the government and the Prime Minister as also the defence which he proposes to put up to a case such as has been presented to this House. If the government have as high an appreciation of the issues involved as the hon. member for Halifax has, it will be for them to say. But, as to the hon. gentleman himself and the query he has made, I will leave him and the peculiar position he has just taken now to the people of the city of Halifax who will understand the issue and understand the position that he takes in reference to an issue of this kind. As to the peculiar type of instrument upon which this gentleman was playing I have no special or detailed information such as my hon. friend evidently desires to have. It may probably have been an instrument of many strings ; I am not sure.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, while my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who has spoken at such length, has not seen fit to offer the House any conclusion to his remarks, we can at least give him credit for having made good his suggestion of yesterday that although the government might take the mornings it would not necessarily get more business done on that account. However, we will not begrudge our friend the double pleasure that he has had during the last two hours and a half, pleasures in which he revels so much : one, the sound of his own voice, the other, the pleasure of putting discredit upon other people at a distance from here, not only individually but collectively, not only by reason of his own ingenuity and imagination, but by the ingenuity and imagination of another man. I think it is not going too far to say that my hon. friend has traded perhaps too much on the fact that that gentleman whom he quoted so much was a member of the clergy of a great church in this country. I would not suggest such a thing in regard to the Rev. Dr. Pringle, but my hon. friend will have to admit that as there are members of parliament who have their imperfections, so there may be ministers of the gospel who are not entirely perfect, and it is not sufficient to say that because a statement is made by the minister of the gospel it is absolute evidence that it is in all parts and points absolutely correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It might perhaps be regarded as a fair ground for investigation.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely; so it was considered to be a fair ground for investigation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was the investigation held ?

Mr. OLIVER. It was a matter of regret on my part that it was not found to be sufficient ground for investigation when the opportunity was given.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the minister mean by that ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry to say that it was not found to be sufficient ground for investigation when the opportunity was given.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what way ?

Mr. OLIVER. The opportunity for investigation was given and it was not taken advantage of on a paltry lawyer's quibble. Our hon. friend has traversed a great deal of ground during his harangue of to-day, from the question of the general administration of the Yukon to the private conduct of certain individuals connected with it. The character and propriety of the comment that has been made may be brought out by one or two instances in the quotations that he has given. The letter of the Rev. Mr. Pringle, dated May 27, 1902, contains the views of the reverend gentleman in regard to the administration of the mining business in that country. He says :

In one notorious case, Treadgold, the most important water privilege in the Yukon has been handed over to a corporation. I do not hesitate a moment to say that this concession is an iniquity and the people will some day reap the bitter fruits of its government's wrongdoing. The Klondike water should be used directly by the government of Canada in the interests of the people.

My blood boiled, when, standing on the Arkansaw creek divide, I saw the great and beautiful river issue from the foothills, and remembered that it was in the grasp of capital, that the people had been disinherited; and that everything in this great rich district was to be food for the maw of a greedy and government favoured corporation.

My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) could not have improved on that language, and I am sure he read it to-day with a great deal of gusto. This letter was written six years ago and necessarily we know more to-day than we did then. The Klondike river still flows out of the foothills ; it is not in the grasp of government favoured corporations and to this date its water has not been utilized for the purposes that the Rev. Dr. Pringle desired it to be utilized for, and declared it would have been utilized for if it had not been for the action of this government. The reverend gentleman says the water at that time was in the grasp of the notorious Treadgold concession. There is no Treadgold concession to-day, there is no Treadgold water privilege ; whatever water privilege Treadgold got upon the Klondike river he never exercised it, for the good and sufficient reason that it was not any good. But Mr. Treadgold has utilized another water privilege on another river and as a result of Treadgold's personal efforts capital has been induced to come into the Yukon so that there is to-day in process of construction, a scheme for the purpose of mining completely the remaining gold bearing gravels of that country on a scale that does not exist in any other country in the world. An expenditure is being made there for this purpose under the supervision of this man Treadgold in the way of building flumes and in the purchase of claims to the extent, I am credibly informed, of $10,000,000. And it has not utilized in any way, shape or manner the water of the Klondike river which the Rev. Dr. Pringle has announced to the world was tied up from beneficial use in the development of that country. Now, the Rev. Dr. Pringle was mistaken at that time ; he was absolutely and utterly mistaken in that.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister deny that Treadgold did not have possession of it then ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not denying that Treadgold had possession of it then.

Mr. SPROULE. Then Dr. Pringle was not mistaken when he said that Treadgold had it ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am denying that the possession of it by Treadgold had then or has now or ever had any deleterious effect upon the development of the gold mining of the Yukon.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister himself admits that Treadgold had it but did not use it.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. SPROULE. If he did not use it, it would not enure to the advantage of the mining interests there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What became of it?

Mr. OLIVER. It has been free for the use of any body for years and years since then.

Mr. SPROULE. It was not free then ?

Mr. OLIVER. It was not at that time.

Mr. SPROULE. Then Mr. Pringle could not have been mistaken in the statement he made.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Pringle was not mistaken as to the ownership by Treadgold of the concession but he was mistaken in the statement that the ownership by Treadgold of that concession was any injury to the development of the Yukon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What became of the concession ?

Mr. OLIVER. The concession was forfeited because it was no use.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Forfeited because is was no use ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is very remarkable.

Mr. OLIVER. It may be remarkable but there are many things that my hon. friend does not know and that is one of them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Treadgold forfeited it ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is the first time I ever knew he could do so. He might surrender it but the government alone could forfeit it.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is a lawyer and I am not able to quibble with him on legal points. The fact is that Treadgold had that concession and he has not it now. The essential point of the statement of the Rev. Dr. Pringle was that Treadgold's ownership of that concession was an injury to the Yukon and I say Dr. Pringle was mistaken as the facts to-day prove. I say that the concession was of no value to Treadgold, that the Yukon is being developed to-day, not by the concession but by the investment of money made by the same Treadgold at another point and in another direction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the concession were of no value to Treadgold so that the property could not be used, would not that of itself be an injury to the Yukon.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not. If it was no good to Treadgold and no good to any body else what difference who owned it. If my hon. friend owned it to-day and if it could not be utilized by anybody, is the ownership of it hurting anybody.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did it not tie up the property in the meantime ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, but so long as the property was of no value to anybody what difference did it make ? That is elementary and my hon. friend though a lawyer ought to know it.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the property tested?

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman know what property is in question ? It was not land, it was a water right. It was a question of investing money to bring that water into beneficial operation on the mining claims, and the engineering conditions were such that it could not be brought economically into beneficial operation on these claims.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what remained to be tested.

Mr. OLIVER. The evidence of that is that to-day Treadgold is bringing water from another source altogether at a total expenditure of some $10,000,000. I am not finding any fault with Dr. Pringle for the view he took. I am merely suggesting he was mistaken in that view ; that he was absolutely and entirely mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. As also was Treadgold.

Mr. OLIVER. As also was Treadgold ; as anybody is liable to be mistaken in a gold mining country.

Mr. FOSTER. They never know what is going to happen.

Mr. OLIVER. They never know what is going to happen until they get the gold in their pockets. Giving Dr. Pringle credit for good intentions, I say that Dr. Pringle is liable to be mistaken ; and here is one very clear instance in which he was absolutely mistaken. If my hon. friend was aware of the conditions of that country he has not the same excuse for offering this quotation from Dr. Pringle's letter to the House to-day as a condemnation of the government, as Dr. Pringle had in writing it, because the events have proven that Dr. Pringle was wrong although my hon. friend did not inform the House on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. I had to give the whole document. My hon. friend would not have me read one part and omit another part.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not finding fault with what my hon. friend said. He was making a partisan presentation of the case and he took advantage of this statement which Dr. Pringle made years ago before the knowledge had come, and he was using that statement to create the impression that that condition existed to-day. If he was aware of the facts—I do not say he was—he must have known that it did not exist and that Dr. Pringle was mistaken when he made that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend does not want to be unfair to Dr. Pringle, and would not like it to go out that Dr. Pringle was mistaken in that statement. Dr. Pringle, as the minister agrees, was right in his statement of the facts at that time, but was not right in his appreciation of what might happen from them.

Mr. OLIVER. He was right in a part of his facts, but not in the whole of them.

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine that he was right in the whole of his facts, but not in his anticipations.

Mr. OLIVER. He stated his anticipations as facts, in the most emphatic language. The Yukon is a very important territory, and it is not necessarily surrounded with that air of mystery which my hon. friend suggested, and which seemed to be such a

source of enjoyment to him. The Yukon is a business proposition, and it is desirable in the interests of every part of Canada that it should be fully and properly developed. The value of the Yukon is in its gold production. When gold was discovered there the means whereby that gold production could be made most effective, most economically, was under the consideration of the government of the day. In a vast country like the Yukon no government could expect, and this government did not expect, that there was abundance of gold everywhere. While there was abundance of gold in one or two or three locations, a great balance of the area contained either no gold or a limited quantity of gold. Therefore in their mining regulations they made provision not only for the mining of the limited area where gold was abundant, but also for other areas where gold was less abundant; that is to say, they provided for miners' claims and for hydraulic concessions. Rev. Dr. Pringle, in this letter written in 1902, declares most strongly against hydraulic concessions, declaring them to be iniquitous, and holds the government responsible for the iniquity of the policy, as he was perfectly right in doing if it was iniquitous. The principle underlying that policy was an absolutely sound principle, a principle which it is necessary to recognize in the securing of the gold production of that country. Any policy that does not recognize the necessity of providing for the development of the vast areas of low-grade values in that country is not an effective or sound policy. It is possible that, owing to lack of knowledge of the conditions at the time, the administration with regard to the hydraulic concessions was not all that could be desired; but the idea that is attempted to be conveyed by Dr. Pringle, that the principle of hydraulic concessions was a principle of corrupt dealings, intended to bar out the individual and to advance the interests of corrupt friends of the government, had absolutely no foundation in fact; and my hon. friend, in using Dr. Pringle's letter to place that same idea before the House, is in exactly the same position as Dr. Pringle.

There is just one other allusion I want to make to these long letters of Dr. Pringle's. In the letter of January 3, 1905, he deals with conditions as he considers he finds them at that time, particularly with the circumstances surrounding the election of Dr. Thompson, the sitting member for the Yukon, and he gives his opinion, in good free terms, of the gentleman who was or claimed to be, the government candidate, and of the methods by which he attempted to secure election. I want to read one line of this letter, because I think it is desirable that the House should have its attention drawn to it in view of further or future letters written by Dr. Pringle. He is dealing with the expenditure of money, asserting that the money of the country was being administered under the Yukon government with a view to advancing the interests of those who were likely to support Mr. Congdon. This he particularly charges was the case in regard to road works, and he says:

> It is an open secret that Mr. Bertrand would have started a road around the cliff to Moosehide, to cost about $15,000 had not Mr. Lithgow refused to be responsible for the expenditure.

Mr. Lithgow was the controller of the territory, what might be called the Finance Minister of the government as it then was, and Dr. Pringle declares that Mr. Lithgow, in the discharge of what he believed to be his duty in his official position on that occasion, saved the government of the country $15,000 which he charges it was desired to expend corruptly in the interests of the election of the government candidate. That is the same Mr. Lithgow whom in his letters of last year, he charged with divers and sundry crimes and misdemeanours, which I think was very little to the credit of the gentleman making the charges.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister allow me one remark there? That seems to me to show a spirit of eminent fairness in Dr. Pringle. He gave to Mr. Lithgow the full credit of stopping the illegal expenditure. When it comes to other sides of Mr. Lithgow's character, he prefers his charges.

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. Pringle at that time did not make any charges against Mr. Lithgow. His charges in 1905 were against Mr. Congdon and his supporters. Mr. Lithgow apparently was not one of Mr. Congdon's supporters, and therefore he has no charges against him, and the simple statement was made that Mr. Lithgow had prevented an improper expenditure of $15,000. Either the statement that Mr. Bertrand wanted to expend $15,000 improperly is untrue, or the statement that Mr. Lithgow prevented that is untrue. He can have it either way.

Mr. FOSTER. Which way is it?

Mr. OLIVER. I say he can have it either way. I do not think it is either way. I am not entitled to accept his statement.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not in a position to deny it.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not in a position to deny it, but I do not accept it. There is nothing in these letters to warrant an acceptance of their general allegations. I have pointed out one or two cases in which they are very wide of the mark, and where a gentleman uses such strong language as Dr. Pringle does, the chances are that he has gone wide of the mark in more cases than one.

Dr. Pringle wrote in 1905 and received a

reply, but he finds fault because he is not given a copy of the reply which Mr. Congdon sent to the department. I want to point out in this connection that when the government received Mr. Pringle's letter in the beginning of 1905, the government at once asked Mr. Congdon what reply he had to make to it. It was not therefore a case in which the government was letting the matter rest. The demand for a reply from Mr. Congdon was immediate and so was his reply, and in my humble judgment his reply was conclusive. It seems to me that the case was then closed. The government had inquired into it and the allegations had not only been denied but disproved. And there was nothing further to be done. And I am not aware that Dr. Pringle had any particular or inherent right to be given a copy of the letter sent by Mr. Congdon. He had seen fit to make a statement, the government had made inquiry, and it was for the government to decide whether it was satisfied or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What inquiry did the government make ?

Mr. OLIVER. It inquired from Mr. Congdon, who was the man charged by Dr. Pringle with impropriety in the conduct of the election. Mr. Congdon's reply was, in my judgment, conclusive.

Mr. FOSTER. Why then was Mr. Henderson appointed to investigate ?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is mixing up his dates. That was subsequent. Mr. Henderson was not appointed until the summer of 1907 and Mr. Pringle's charge and Mr. Congdon's reply were in 1905. The matter rested there until the necessity came to appoint a commissioner to the Yukon in succession to Mr. McInnis. In the interval between the beginning of 1905 and 1907, Mr. McInnis had been appointed commissioner, and after having served a certain time he resigned and we had to appoint a successor. Mr. Lithgow's name was mentioned favourably for the vacancy by some of his friends in the Yukon. His name was forwarded in nomination for the position, and Dr. Pringle, having heard I presume of this recommendation, came out with another letter in which he gave his opinion of Mr. Lithgow and matters and things generally in the Yukon. His letter was written to myself and replied to. Dr. Pringle's letter was dated 19th January, and is as follows :

I am ashamed to think that the impression will go abroad that the people of the Yukon are willing to have such a man as Lithgow as commissioner, much less to request the government to appoint him. His life here has been a public scandal, and while if he were a private citizen, I should have nothing to say except to himself, as a public official and one evidently seeking the highest position in this territory in the people's gift, he is open to the judgment of any citizen.

He says that Mr. Lithgow's life was a public scandal, and after a long statement to that effect, concludes :

Last night a meeting for the purpose of promoting Mr. Lithgow's interests was called by his friends who are for the most part those who surrounded Congdon. The meeting was overwhelmingly anti-Lithgow. Many did not vote, but it showed 97 to 73 against Lithgow.

J.P.

In that letter there is no suggestion of an attack on Mr. Lithgow because of any act in his position as controller. The attack is based wholly on the possibility of his appointment as commissioner. That letter was promptly replied to and did not call for further action ; but on the 31st July, 1907, the Rev. Mr. Pringle comes forward with his charges against Mr. Lithgow and Mr. Girouard in their positions as government officials.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister correct in that ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is as I understand it.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will look, he will find that the charge against Girouard, substantiated by affidavits, was made in 1905 by Mr. Pringle.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly, I am speaking of the correspondence addressed to myself and of which I have personal knowledge.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Pringle's letters of 1905 were also addressed to the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. I was not minister at the time ; but if this letter was addressed to the then Minister of the Interior in the early part of 1905, I myself visited the Yukon during that period. I visited that country for the purpose of looking into the conditions for myself, and I am bound to say that neither Mr. Pringle nor any one else in or about the Yukon gave me any hint or indication of any such charges such as have been made in the letter. It appears to me that if the conditions were so bad and urgent as represented, it would have been only reasonable and fair that I should have been informed of them at the time and in the place where I was for the express purpose of seeing and hearing all I could with regard to the administration in the Yukon.

Mr. FOSTER. They might have been a little frightened.

Mr. OLIVER. If they were, they were the only people in the Yukon who were, because I think I saw nearly all except them. On the 31st July, 1907, Dr. Pringle made certain specific charges against Mr. Lithgow and Mr. Girouard. These were the first intimations to me that there was anything to be said against these gentlemen. To that letter I did reply at once and gave

authority to the commissioner to investigate the charges. I replied on the 28th August to Dr. Pringle's letter of the 31st July. I was not in Ottawa when the letter arrived :

By letter of this date to Commissioner Henderson I am instructing him to investigate fully the charges which you have made against Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow, and to receive from you any specific charges which you may desire to make against any other official in the employ of the government and especially of the Interior Department in the Yukon Territory.

In regard to this investigation it seems to me the case is very simple. Dr. Pringle made certain general statements against two specific officials in the Yukon. They are statements which if substantiated would certainly lead to a question as to the usefulness of these officials and the desirability of retaining them in the public service. Forthwith the commissioner of the territory is authorized and instructed to hold an investigation into these charges. The gentleman who has seen fit to make these charges —general charges remember—against these two specific officials is asked to come forward and in the first place to make his charges specific, and in the next place to substantiate them.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister read the charges as shown on page 14 ? I think that he and the House will find they are tolerably specific.

Mr. OLIVER. They are tolerably specific.

Mr. FOSTER. I think they are very specific.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the point I want the House to come to. Well, I do not wish to discredit ' Hansard ' by reading the wording of this statement unless my hon. friend insists.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not insist if you only admit they are specific.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not admit they are specific, and if the hon. gentleman insists they are I will have to read them to show they are not specific, and that they are not in a form which will enable any man to come forward and disprove them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He would not come forward to disprove the charges ; he would come forward to disprove the evidence that was brought in support of them.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend forgets he is in parliament and not in a court.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the hon. gentleman knows where he is.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the party who makes the charges produces credible evidence to prove them.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not learned in the law, but I think we all know enough about the law to know that when I bring a complaint against you I have to state the time and place and occasion, and the reason for that is so that you may have an opportunity of disproving that charge in particular and in general. Unless time and place and occasion are given you have not a fair opportunity to disprove my charge. In this case Dr. Pringle does not give time and place and location. He says that certain things occurred but he does not put that assertion in such shape that Mr. Lithgow or Mr. Girouard could come forward and say : That is false, I was not there at that time or place. Under this statement of Dr. Pringle, Mr. Lithgow and Mr. Girouard would have to prove a negative covering an indeterminate period of it might be one week, or one month, or six months, or five years as the case might be, and I submit that is not a fair or reasonable proposition.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the minister read the particulars of the affidavits with reference to Girouard ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not going to read them.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me he would find them very particular as to date, as to place, as to circumstance.

Mr. OLIVER. But these are not the statements of Dr. Pringle and it is Dr. Pringle I am dealing with now.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought it was Dr. Pringle's evidence.

Mr. OLIVER. I am dealing with Dr. Pringle and the statement he made, and I am arguing in defence of the position I took in dealing with this question, and I want to show the House and the country that the position I took was fair. I want to point out that the statements made by Dr. Pringle were not in specific form such as would be fair and reasonable to enable the men who are charged with these offences to absolutely disprove them. I say that the man who makes a general charge such as that is not acting fairly towards the person against whom he makes it. And I say that charged with my responsibility I would not be warranted in doing otherwise than offering Dr. Pringle an opportunity to come forward and make specific statements as to these charges before I would have further proceedings in the matter. Fair play is bonnie play, and while Messrs. Lithgow and Girouard may be people living away in the Yukon, they may be discreditable or creditable. In the position which I occupy it is not for me to consider where they are or who they are or what they are, but to give them just the same square deal that any white man is entitled to in this country. I don't think I was entitled to do otherwise than to require, before taking further proceedings, that Dr. Pringle should

say when, where and how these transactions took place so as to give these men a fair and reasonable opportunity to disprove the charges if they could.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister pretend to say that under a royal commission issued by parliament to inquire into the conduct of officials charged with wrong-doing, it is necessary to state specific dates and specific instances? Does he think that you should lay a complaint in such a case as you would lay a complaint before a magistrate? Does he think that was done in the case of McGreevy and Connolly, who were charged with certain offences in connection with public works?

Mr. OLIVER. I take issue with that position here and now and I do it on my responsibility as a member and as a minister. As I understand it the very foundation principle of British justice is that there shall be no trial unless there is an accusation. Whatever may be the view of parliament on any special occasion, or of the Governor in Council on any special occasion, for myself in the administration of my office I have not taken any other view, and I may inform the House and the country that I do not propose to take any other view than that there shall be a charge before there shall be an investigation.

Mr. FOSTER. Why then did the minister appoint Mr. Henderson to make an investigation?

Mr. OLIVER. To give Dr. Pringle an opportunity to make his statements specific so that there could be an investigation. I further gave Mr. Henderson authority to make inquiries as to the general or specific conduct of any official in the Yukon.

Mr. FOSTER. Which he did not do.

Mr. OLIVER. Which he has reported to me in his letter, that he did, and that he has nothing to report as to misconduct on their part.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister regard it as necessary that a charge must be made specifically against an official with regard to date, time, and incident? Does he think he is doing the proper thing to go on with an inquiry and not allow the witnesses to be either subpœnaed or sworn, but take their ipse dixit; and is he willing to accept that as evidence but not allow the commission he has appointed to put these witnesses on oath?

Mr. OLIVER. When the charge is made specific, when a statement is made which is capable of being proven or disproven as a question of fact—then is the time we will take to put witnesses on oath, and until that specific statement is made, I say I am not warranted, as a matter of fair play, in putting it in the power of a man who is unwilling to make such a specific charge to compel this or that citizen to come forward and make a statement under oath concerning matters on which, perhaps, he has no information or, perhaps, concerning which he does not wish to speak.

Mr. SPROULE. But he says: Give such a commission and I will make a charge, but until you do that I will not make a charge. He probably has a reason for that.

Mr. OLIVER. I say that, until he makes a specific charge, I will not give him an inquiry under oath, but if he does make his charge specific the question of an inquiry under oath will be one for consideration. That is a point I want to make absolutely and positively clear.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the policy of the government?

Mr. OLIVER. That is my policy in administering this department in this connection. I want that distinctly understood. While I want to see honest officials and clean administration, I will not be a party to a system of simple slander which will discredit honourable men—or dishonourable or any other kind of men—without anybody being responsible for the circulation of the slander.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) think that he ought to be higher or greater authority than parliament? Take the example of what this House has done in the Hodgins case. A committee has been appointed to inquire into certain allegations that have appeared in the press, and we give the committee charged with that duty power to swear every witness who comes before it and bring out all the information under oath, though the charges are only of a general character and though neither dates nor specific instances are alleged. Parliament is supposed to be a model in what it does with regard to inquiries or anything else. Does the minister think he is a higher authority than parliament or what parliament does it is not proper for him to do?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that parliament has a higher authority than I have, and that what may be perfectly justifiable for parliament may not be justifiable for me, that what may be justifiable action on the part of parliament in the prosecution of the public business would not necessarily be justifiable in me in the investigation of the private character of an individual. Parliament is supreme; parliament can do what it pleases; parliament can be unjust if it likes; parliament can make any inquiry it wishes to make, but I say that even parliament has no right to set up an inquisition into the private character of individuals. Still, even if parliament had such a right, it would not follow that I have that right. I do not pretend to such

a right, and I do not propose to exercise it. I say distinctly that I do not propose to make myself a party to any general scheme of slander, let it be put forward by any person, minister of the gospel or any other. If a slander is uttered, the best I can do is to afford the man who utters it an opportunity to prove what he has stated, to substantiate it by any evidence he may bring forward, to choose his own time, his own place, his own occasion, and if he will not do that, if he will not choose time, place and occasion so that the party accused can disprove the accusation, if it be a thing that can be disproved, I think I have discharged my duty, as I have said in my letter to the Rev. Dr. Pringle, and I believe that the country will sustain me in that position.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the country will reach a different conclusion.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think that, because men live in the Yukon they are less entitled to the rights of Canadian citizenship than are those who live in Toronto, or Ottawa or elsewhere. I deal with all Canadian citizens in the same way. I want to say that it seems to me it has been the habit in discussing this question of the Yukon to discuss it with the idea that the man who has taken his life in his hand, who has risked his all and his life every day in the reclaiming of the wilderness and the building up of the country—this man, merely because he is a pioneer, is to be regarded as less than the ordinary kind of man and that he is not entitled to the same consideration as other people. I want to say to this House, and I will say it to the country, that so far as I am concerned the pioneer is the man whose interests require first attention at the hands of this government, of this country, of this people ; and that, because a man is a pioneer in the Yukon, because a man is a gold miner, he is none the less a citizen of Canada and none the less entitled to every consideration that every other citizen of Canada is entitled to. Because Dawson is in the Yukon the citizens of that city are not less entitled to fair play, honest treatment, fair consideration, they are not less entitled to being spoken of fairly and decently, than are the citizens of Toronto or Ottawa. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how would such a proposition as this which has been suggested by Rev. Dr. Pringle be received if applied to the city of Toronto or the city of Ottawa? That a slander should be uttered against a citizen of Toronto or Ottawa, that it should be declared that his private conduct was not such as it ought to be, and because he held an office from the city or from the province or from the Dominion, therefore there must be an inquiry by royal commission into whether it is true or false. It would be absurd. No man would justify such a proposition applied to Toronto or Ottawa. Why then apply it to the Yukon?

That is the case as it has struck me—we must give to people who are living in the Yukon the same consideration as we are giving to people anywhere else, and that to trespass upon the rights of a citizen of the Yukon, whether a government official or a private citizen, is just the same as to trepass on the rights of a citizen of Toronto or Ottawa. And Rev. Dr. Pringle has no more right to circulate throughout this country allegations that this man or that man is not correct in his private life than any reverend gentleman in Ottawa would have to circulate such statements regarding the members of this House or regarding any other citizen.

It is said that there is vice in the Yukon. It is said that there is crime in the Yukon. The evidence is that there is less crime in the Yukon, man for man, than there is possibly right here in Ottawa. As to vice, I am not able to answer. But it is certainly a notorious fact that the city of Ottawa is not free from vice—that the city of Toronto is not free from vice—that the city of Montreal is not free from vice. Why should not parliament concern itself with the morals of the city of Montreal as well as with the morals of the city of Dawson? It seems to me that there is a wrong point of view in regard to this question of the conditions in the Yukon and in regard to the observance of law and morality there. It is unquestionable that, from the establishment of the authority of the Canadian government in the Yukon, there has been a most phenomenal maintenance of law and order, of enforcement of the rights of life and property. No one can gainsay that. When you consider the facts in the Yukon along with those in Alaska immediately across the line, the comparison is simply startling.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the minister a question? If that be so, how does he account for the fact that we have paid for a number of years $500,000 for a police force to look after the people up there—$500,000 for a police force for 8,000 people?

Mr. OLIVER. I say that the maintenance of law and order in the Yukon——

Mr. SPROULE. That is what the police are for.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, they are there, and they maintain law and order.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any portion of Canada where the condition of things is anything like that ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the hon. gentleman say? I do not think the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) ought to be so needlessly offensive.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Somebody ought to; it is time. You had better sit down now.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. OLIVER. The Mounted Police are maintained in the Yukon by the country for the purpose of keeping law and order. They have kept law and order. So, that, I say, the contrast between the conditions in the Yukon and in the immediately adjoining territory of Alaska, in so far as law and order are concerned, and in so far as protection to life and property are concerned, is simply startling. There is no consideration given to that fact. Conditions are painted in the Yukon with regard to vice and immorality, which conditions exist, I say, in every city of the Dominion and in every city of the world. It is a matter of regret that these conditions do exist. It is to be regretted that they exist in Dawson, but they do not exist any more in Dawson than can be helped. The authorities are as energetic in suppressing this condition in Dawson as they are anywhere else, but because they are not successful in Dawson, as they are not successful anywhere else in the world, is no reason why the people of the Yukon should be slandered in general or in particular.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it a fact that you will have an equally good condition of affairs in a country where you have one hotel selling liquor for every ninety-four of the people as you will in a country where there is only one hotel for every thousand people. The former was the condition that they had in Dawson a few years ago.

Mr. OLIVER. On the other hand it must be remembered that there is a good deal of difference between the conditions in Dawson and the conditions in other places. The conditions in Dawson were at that time that there was an immense aggregation of men engaged in active, energetic, outdoor employment with plenty of money to spend and limited opportunities for spending it. I do not know that there were more opportunities for getting liquor in Dawson in proportion to the class of men who took liquor than there were in any part of Ontario; because, it must be remembered that in Ontario the proportion of men who are of the class which I have described is very limited as compared with the whole population whereas in Dawson they are the whole population. There is no use of comparing conditions unless you compare like conditions, unless you compare the conditions that existed in Dawson with similar conditions elsewhere. However, I am not apologizing or saying anything with regard to the conditions as to the sale of liquor. That is a matter within the regulation of the Yukon Council itself. It is in accordance with the public opinion of the people of the Yukon. Perhaps they are wrong. If I had to answer the question I would say that they were absolutely wrong and that is their business and they must transact that business as best they may and according to their own judgment. I will not repeat the slanders which have been uttered by the Rev. Dr. Pringle with regard to Mr. Lithgow's private character and I will only revert to the certificate that he gave in these very letters to Mr. Lithgow with reference to his character as a public official. A man who, as he says, saved the country $15,000, even though there was pressure upon him to allow the expenditure to be made in the heat of an election when a supporter of the government was concerned, is the man that he asks us to condemn, that he asks us to put out of his position where he has served a useful purpose during all these years and he asks us to do so because he chooses to repeat a slander that he heard against him. When he was given an opportunity to give us the proof he was not able to get the people who had given him the story to come forward and say it was true. Under these circumstances we could not do other than we have done. If we are to listen to every attack that might be made upon every officer of the government in his private capacity we are not giving that credit to good service that good service is entitled to. Let me allude to the suggestion that the hon. member for North Toronto made as to the difference between the treatment given the demand for an investigation by Dr. Pringle and the demand for an investigation by a Mr. Perron who complained of some mishandling of his affairs in the Gold Commissioner's office. The difference between the conditions was this: The complaint of Mr. Perron was in regard to public business and Mr. Perron was entitled to a commission under the terms of the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister mind stating what was the business?

Mr. OLIVER. It was something in connection with priority in the filing of a certain document. I have just forgotten the actual facts. It was a matter of the transaction of public business. The Act expressly says:

> The minister presiding over any department of the civil service of Canada, may appoint at any time, under the authority of the Governor in Council, a commissioner or commissioners to investigate and report upon the state and management of the business, or any part of the business, of such department, either in the inside or outside service thereof, and the conduct of any person in such service, so far as the same relates to his official duties.

The charge made by Mr. Perron related to the official duty of a certain member of the service and under that section an in-

vestigation was held. I submit that the charges made by Mr. Pringle against Mr. Lithgow and Mr. Girouard are not charges in regard to their official duties and that therefore this section does not give authority to hold a commission upon these charges.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is wrong with reference to the charge made against Mr. Girouard. I think that absolutely and definitely refers to his official duties. He should have been somewhere and he was somewhere else.

Mr. OLIVER. No, I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I am afraid we will have to read these charges in order to satisfy him.

Mr. FOSTER. If you read the affidavits you will find it.

Mr. OLIVER. But there were no affidavits.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, there were six of them.

Mr. OLIVER. Given by Dr. Pringle ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sent by Dr. Pringle to the Prime Minister.

Mr. OLIVER. I am speaking of the charges amde by Mr. Pringle, in 1907.

Mr. FOSTER. What's the odds as between 1907 and 1905 ?

Mr. OLIVER. The odds is this that I ordered an investigation into the charges made in 1907, and if Dr. Pringle had these affidavits in his possession all he had to do was to put them before the commission. I do not know why he did not do so. He did not do so although we gave him the opportunity to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. He told you why.

Mr. OLIVER. But he did not do so at any rate. He refused to do it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why would the affidavits be any better in the possession of the commissioner than in the possession of the government ?

Mr. OLIVER. The government appointed a commissioner to hold an investigation and when a commissioner is appointed to hold an investigation it is through his hands formally that everything has to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. The commissioner asked the minister for a commission ?

Mr. OLIVER. I know he did and that is a point in regard to which the commissioner and I differed. As he was the commissioner, my view, for the time being, prevailed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Only for a short time.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot read the section in any other way. It is provided that there shall be a commission of inquiry into the conduct of any person only so far as the same relates to his official duties. We have granted commissions to inquire into matters affecting the official duties of officials in the Yukon. We have not granted a royal commission to inquire into the private conduct of any official in the Yukon, but when allegations against the private conduct of any official were made, although they were not specific and although they were not substantiated by evidence, an opportunity was given both to make them specific and to substantiate them by evidence. While I do not wish to load up 'Hansard' it might be just as well to read the conclusion of the correspondence between the commissioner and myself so that it may be available to the public. On the 2nd of January, 1908, I wrote the commissioner :

Ottawa, January 2, 1908.

Dear Sir,—I have before me the papers in connection with the inquiry ordered in respect of Dr. Pringle's charges with your covering letter of December 7.

I note that in your letter of November 8 you suggest your appointment as a commissioner to investigate the charges under the provisions of the Inquiries Act, chapter 104, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.

In reply to this suggestion I beg to say that it appears to me that it would be a very strained construction to put upon section 2 of that Act to say that an inquiry into charges of the nature of those made by Dr. Pringle was an inquiry 'into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof.' Inasmuch as Dr. Pringle has been requested to make a specific statement of his knowledge of the facts regarding which he complains, and has failed to do so, I do not think I would be warranted in applying the terms of the Inquiries Act.

If Dr. Pringle had availed himself of the opportunity which you gave him under my instructions, it would then be a matter for consideration whether we might or might not invoke the terms of the Act, but without something more definite than has yet been brought to your attention, I do not think we have sufficient warrant for doing so.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) FRANK OLIVER.

Hon. Alexander Henderson,
Commisisoner Yukon Territory, Dawson.

I followed that with another letter on the 9th of January, as follows :

Ottawa, January 9, 1908.

Dear Sir,—Your report of December 7 on charges made by Dr. Pringle against Messrs. Lithgow and Girouard has been duly received.

I note your statement that both Messrs. Lithgow and Girouard have emphatically denied to you the truth of the charges. I also note the refusal of Dr. Pringle, when offered the opportunity, to make such further statements in connection with his charges as would be necessary to enable you to reach a

conclusion; also your statement that no other person in the territory had made any charges to you with respect to either of the officials named; that you had seen nothing in the conduct of either of them which would warrant the conclusion that the charges made by Dr. Pringle against them, or either of them, could be substantiatel; and also that Mr. Girouard has commenced an action against Dr. Pringle for damages for libel, and that the action is now pending.

In view of these facts, and as you have no authority to hold an inquiry under oath, such as Dr. Pringle desires, it does not seem to me that the case at present calls for further action on your part.

At the same time I desire it to be distinctly understood that in case of there coming to your knowledge such personal actions of any official of this government in the Yukon Territory as would or might constitute a public scandal, or as to reflect unfavourably upon this government you are expected to report the case to me fully and without delay so that the government may be in a position to deal with such official as the circumstances seem to warrant.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) FRANK OLIVER.

Hon. Alexander Henderson,
Commissioner Yukon District, Dawson, Yukon Territory.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister know what was the result of the action for slander; was it prosecuted?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say. I presume the courts will deal with it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Girouard now an officer of the government?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Girouard is not an officer of the government at the present time. Mr. Girouard applied to leave the government service and the office he held has been consolidated with another office in the interests of economy.

Mr. FOSTER. Who holds the consolidated office?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Laliberté was librarian of the Justice Department and he now holds the dual position of librarian and registrar at the former salary of the registrar. In conclusion I want to say that I think there should be a very wide distinction drawn—at any rate I want to draw a very wide distinction—between allegations made against the public and against the private conduct of any official. I am quite aware that a man is the same man in public as in private, and I am quite aware that it is to the credit of the government and to the credit of the country that its officials should conduct themselves so that there should not be any scandal attaching to their names while they are in the public service. I do not think there is any person in this House who is more thoroughly imbued with that idea than I am. But, as was stated in the quotation from the 'Globe', this is not a question of the conduct of Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow; this is a question of whether a royal commission should be appointed by a responsible minister to find out whether an official of his department had conducted himself properly in his private capacity. In regard to that I want to say that I hold myself responsible to the House and to the country for the private conduct of the officials of the department which I have the honour to administer so far as that private conduct can be considered to come in collision with public interest or public duty, and for my part I do not need any royal commission to tell me what to do in the case of an official in the employ of the Interior Department, whose private conduct is such as to reflect discredit upon the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). The Minister of the Interior has treated us to one of his old time extraordinary speeches which fortunately are becoming less and less frequent the longer he continues in office. When he seeks to cast discredit on Dr. Pringle, naturally he does not allude to the circumstances that four years ago he and his party were perfectly ready to exploit that reverend gentleman's name for the purpose of clearing themselves from odium in connection with the Yukon. But now that this gentleman has made certain statements, first in 1902, again in 1905 and afterwards in 1907, the minister while preserving a certain appearance of fairness has endeavoured before the House and the country to cast that discredit upon Dr. Pringle which is hardly consistent with the fair play for which he himself cried out so vehemently in his address. The minister asks for fair play. Does he think it is fair play to the people of Canada or to the people of the Yukon or to his own officials, that he should make a mockery of the investigation he pretended to carry on in regard to the charges made by Dr. Pringle? I endeavoured during the course of his remarks to find a single line of intelligible thought in the mind of the minister with regard to the course that ought to be pursued, and I say in all candour that I was absolutely unable to find it. I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House will be able to extract from the remarkable address of the minister any comprehensible line of thought as to the duty of a public man in regard to officials under such circumstances. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) came under the censure of the Minister of the Interior. My hon. friend exercised a remarkable control in dealing with this matter. He over and over again as I know—because having a copy of the return before me I followed

him—left out passages that he might very well have read had he desired only to cast discredit upon the administration of this government. There was no attempt by the hon. member, except to put forward a few of the least, but not any of the worst of the abominations and deviltries that have been carried on in the Yukon under the administration of this government and by certain officials of this government during the past six or seven years.

I do not desire at the present moment to speak of the allegations of Dr. Pringle so far as they concern the remarkable concessions granted in the Yukon or the policy of the government in regard to the development of that country. I will not even refer to his charges in respect of the manner in which the election in 1904 was carried on, although it is perfectly well known to any one who has come in contact with men from the Yukon, that not only in that election, but in the first election in the Yukon, exactly that kind of work was carried on. In the first election there were two polling places established near the American boundary, and eight or ten men were brought over from the other side of the line. They went up and voted. Five minutes afterwards they went up and voted again under other names ; and so they continued, with the result that in places where there were not more than five or six people living, the then member for the Yukon had a majority of between 300 and 400, if I am correctly informed, a majority greater than the total majority by which he was returned.

But these are not the important parts of the statement of Dr. Pringle. His statements concern, in the first place, the administration of the Yukon by this government. I will take for the purpose of my argument simply one challenge by Dr. Pringle with respect to the administration of that country by this government. Let us look at what he says in his letter of the 3rd of January, 1905, with respect to the carrying on under the sanction of this government of what are known as dance halls in the Yukon—licensed dance halls :

I found that the administration had been a disgrace to the Canadian name, such as no self-respecting Canadian could excuse.

I may say that throughout Dr. Pringle's letters he seems to have noting but good words for the endeavours of Mr. Ross, now Senator Ross, to bring about decency and public order in that country. He says further :

In July, 1902, Mr. Ross practically compelled the passage of an ordinance suppressing the dance halls, the women in which were the most dangerous class of prostitutes, and absolutely excluding lewd women from licensed liquor houses.

That was the work of Mr. Ross, the condition of whose health, I understand, compelled him afterwards to leave that country, so that he was not responsible for the condition that supervened after his departure.

In September of the same year, Mr. Ross lying unconscious at Whitehorse, the ordinance was amended at the instance of the legal adviser, now Judge Newlands, so as to render the ordinance abortive, but under Mr. Congdon's lead we have legalized the dance halls. Some government officials are their habitues.

And further on :

The sergeant of the town station tells me that fifty per cent of the licensed houses are houses of prostitution.

There is a distinct charge by Dr. Pringle —in the first place, that these dance houses were carried on as houses of prostitution; in the second place, that Mr. Ross, then Commissioner of the Yukon, had put them down ; in the third place, that Mr. Newlands, afterwards elevated to the bench by the government of this country, had introduced an amendment into the ordinances of the Yukon which practically rendered nugatory Mr. Ross's efforts ; and, in the fourth place, that afterwards Mr. Congdon gave full swing to these dance houses by permitting them to be carried on under the sanction of the government. Has the Minister of the Interior any denial of the truth of what Dr. Pringle stated as to the character of these houses ? Though he has not a word of denial, I will answer him out of the mouth of his own officials in the Yukon to-day. Instead of endeavouring to cast aspersions upon Dr. Pringle, as he has done, he and every other member of that government ought to be grateful to this man for raising the agitation which has resulted in the abolition of dance halls in the Yukon.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman inform the House by whose legislation the dance halls have been abolished ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will show that as a result of the agitation brought about by Dr. Pringle they have been abolished by Mr. Henderson, since he has been there as commissioner. That is my answer to the minister ; does he regard it as satisfactory ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is satisfactory as far as it goes, but it is hardly correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For his information I will read the evidence of one of the hon. gentleman's officials, in order that he may be convinced that he does not know everything about his own department or even about the Yukon which he pretends to govern.

Mr. OLIVER. To save the hon. gentleman trouble, I will say that the dance halls were abolished, not by Mr. Henderson, but by ordinance of the Yukon council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which Mr. Henderson brought about The minister may talk

about lawyers' quibbles, but I know no man more given to them than the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the Speaker control the legislation of this parliament ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, but the government having the majority of the members of the Yukon council, control them, and the commissioner, I suppose, can exercise a certain influence on the men appointed by this government to bring about legislation, and therefore, did it in this case.

Mr. OLIVER. The commissioner is the speaker of the council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister persists in his quibbling. I will not pursue the matter further.

Mr. KNOWLES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that members of the council appointed by the government, such as Judge Dugas, are open to political influences ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Beyond question they are under the control of this government, and they have carried out the policy of this government ever since they have been in the Yukon.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman explain for the information of the House just how Judge Dugas is under the control of this government in his action ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not make the slightest difference to me whether his action was under the control of the government or not. The point I make is that the abolition of the dance halls was brought about as a result of the agitation carried on by Dr. Pringle. I have read the evidence of an official of this government, and I will proceed to read the evidence of an official of the Northwest Mounted Police, bearing date the 7th December, 1907.

Mr. OLIVER. Before we get away from the point as to the right of this government to control the legislation of the Yukon council. I think it would be interesting to the House and the country to have that point settled. The hon. gentleman has suggested that the appointed members of the council are subject to the authority of this government in their legislation. I may ask him, since Judge Dugas' name has been mentioned, to what extent is Judge Dugas' action in the council of the Yukon subject to the control of this government ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is subject in this way, that this government, so long as it keeps that council under its control, is supposed to have its policy carried out by that council. If any member of that council does not see fit to carry out the policy of this government in that connection, he is in the same position as would be a member of the cabinet who did not find himself in accord with the policy of the government as a whole. He would find it necessary to leave that council just as a dissenting minister would have to leave the cabinet. If my hon. friend does not agree with me, I am sorry that we differ, but the point is a very subsidiary one. Instead of cavilling at Mr. Pringle, this government ought to be grateful to him for having started and carried out an agitation which has brought about the dissolution of these dance halls in the Yukon. The government should have expressed their gratitude to Dr. Pringle, rather than endeavour to cast aspersions on the gentleman who has brought about that very good reform.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to have the credit placed where it belongs. The dance halls were abolished by the legislation of the Yukon council and not by the authority of this government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am glad to have the minister make practically the admission that if the policy of this government had been carried out, the dance halls would not have been abolished.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not make that admission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know what else the hon. gentleman's words mean. I would have supposed that the government were in accord with the policy of the Yukon council in that regard, but the minister makes it clear that, for some reason or other not apparent, he desired to have these dance halls continued.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot allow my hon. friend to suggest that anything I have said is open to any such construction. I say that the Yukon council, on its own responsibility and by its own authority, abolished the dance halls and that it was not this parliament or government that abolished them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am reading from a letter of the 7th December, 1907, from Mr. T. A. Wroughton, commanding 'B' division of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, to the assistant commissioner of that corps, and dated from Dawson, Yukon Territory :

Royal Northwest Mounted Police.
'B' Division.
Dawson, Y.T., December 7, 1907.

The Assistant Commissioner,
R. N. W. M. Police, Yukon Territory,
Dawson, Yukon Territory.

Sir—I have the honour to report, pursuant to your instructions, as follows, with regard to the alleged social evils in Dawson.

Formerly, while dance halls were permitted to exist under a licensed system, they were undoubtedly hot beds of evil; women were encouraged to frequent these places by the glare and glitter and a life of comparative

luxury as compared with the lives of their hardworking and honest sisters. These women were ostensibly under salary, whereas as a matter of fact the salary they received was a mere subterfuge, their real pay being derived from the monetary percentage they derived from the price of drinks, &c., which they were enabled to persuade the customers to buy. Time and again cases have been prosecuted in the courts, but we were unable to get convictions; we were confronted with the cleverest legal talent that money could procure (these people always appeared to have unlimited capital at their backs.) Time and again we spent money and energy in working up cases, employing special men (stool pigeons) but always with the same result.

The last attempt we made in the percentage cases was as strong a case as we could possibly hope to get (this was the opinion of the Crown prosecutor) but what with perjured evidence and advantage taken of every technicality we failed. Naturally the class of men we have to employ (our regular men being too well known to conduct this species of work) was not of the highest order, and this the defence never failed to bring forward.

The last assembly of the Yukon council, however, repealed the objectionable ordinance with the result that conditions are much improved. The principal dance hall has gone out of business, and the only one remaining is trying to keep up its end on the sale of temperance beverages, and is, I am informed, tottering to its fall. It was said that intoxicants were sold on this side; I have employed detectives on the matter who report that such is not the case.

That is the report of this officer of the police regarding the character of these dance halls. Let us look at what Mr. Henderson says about his action in the matter. The minister, as I understand, denies that this reform was brought about through the action of Dr. Pringle. I am reading from a letter of Mr. Henderson, being his report, under date of the 7th December, 1907, to the Minister of the Interior :

Before my arrival in the territory I had heard that the question of dance halls had been brought prominently before the public through a letter addressed to a Winnipeg newspaper by the Reverend Dr. Pringle, and I felt that one of the first questions which would demand my attention would be the devising of some solution to remove the conditions complained of should I find the complaint was well founded. After my arrival in Dawson on the 14th July, I ascertained that two dance halls respectively called the M & N and the Florodora were in active operation, and that there was some diversity of opinion as to whether these institutions were a menace to public morals or otherwise. My own opinion was that they should be suppressed, and before the session of the Yukon council, which opened on the 9th August last, I had thoroughly canvassed the situation with every member of the Yukon council. I made no secret of the position I proposed to take in the matter. An amendment to the liquor ordinance was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Justice Dugas, providing in effect that no music hall should be kept in connection with premises licensed to sell liquors (section 3, chapter 9 ordinance, 1907). There was some opposition to this Bill in the council, and various amendments proposing the postponement of the operation of the Bill to a later date received some support, but eventually the section passed as proposed, the effect being to immediately make the sale of liquors in dance halls illegal. The two dance halls I have mentioned continued to run for some time without selling liquors until the largest, the M & N, went out of business, and the other still continued to run as a dance hall, but I am credibly informed by the police that there is very little business being done and that no liquors are sold in the dance hall.

The matter then is perfectly plain. Here is the statement of Mr. Pringle that these dance halls, licensed and sanctioned by this government, were no better than dens of iniquity. Here is the report of their own officer, a prominent officer in the Northwest Mounted Police, who makes practically the same statement. Here is the report of Mr. Commissioner Henderson who says that his attention was drawn to this matter by the letter of Mr. Pringle published in a newspaper at Winnipeg, that he looked into the matter and satisfied himself that Mr. Pringle was right, and that he thereupon canvassed every member of the Yukon council and had the necessary legislation introduced, which was accordingly passed by the council, and which put an end to these public nuisances. That is exactly what I said in the first place and what the Minister of the Interior controverted, and I leave it to the House whether he or I was right.

The next question debated by the minister was whether or not this government were right in practically refusing an investigation into the charges made by Mr. Pringle. I confess myself unable to follow the devious journeyings of the minister in his argument on this subject. In the first place he said that it was not proper to enter into any investigation of the private conduct or character of public officials. Why then did he propose to grant any investigation at all ? Why did he authorize Mr. Henderson to make any such investigation ? If the private character of public officials, even when it amounts to a public scandal, flaunted in the face of the whole community, is not a matter of no public interest, why did the Minister of the Interior empower Mr. Henderson to make any investigation into these charges ? Then later on he took the ground that although it was proper to make an inquiry, it was not proper to make one on oath. That does seem to me a most remarkable position for the government to take even through my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior.

You proposed for some reason—the minister did not make it at all clear—to grant an inquiry into certain charges made against the conduct of certain government officials and you proposed to refuse the very thing which alone could make that

inquiry effective, namely, the power of examining witnesses on oath. What a perfect farce it would be, assuming that an investigation was to be granted and the minister took that position, to ask Dr. Pringle to bring men before that commission and not have the power to have them sworn to tell the truth before the commission! What would be the use of it? Did the government in the many investigations which it has carried on during the past eight or ten years at any time refuse the power to examine witnesses on oath? With respect to every department of this government, from 1896 to 1908, power has been given over and over again, in respect of matters of infinitely less importance than those to be investigated on this occasion, to examine witnesses on oath, because only in this way can an investigation worthy of the name be carried on. What would be the value of any investigation without power to summon witnesses and examine them on oath? What power had Mr. Henderson, apart from that of a royal commission, to enforce the attendance of witnesses? Was Dr. Pringle to go through the Yukon and drag them in by force, hire a gang of armed men and bring those not willing to come? When you got them before the commissioners, what power would there be to compel them to say a word? The minister should know, as every hon. member does, that an investigation without the power to compel witnesses to attend or to administer the oath or compel them to speak would be an absolute and perfect farce, and that Dr. Pringle would have been an absolute fool if he had embarked on any such investigation carried on under such a condition.

The next point was that the charges were not specific. Let us see. On August 20, 1907, five years after the first letter of Dr. Pringle, and two years after his letter forwarding affidavits containing the gravest charges with regard to a permanent official of the Yukon, two years after Dr. Pringle's letter of 1905, containing still graver charges, and some months after the communication from Dr. Pringle in that year and after Dr. Pringle's letter had been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, at this late date, after all these delays, which have been absolutely unexplained by the minister to-day, the Minister of the Interior on August 28, 1907, wrote to the Commissioner of the Yukon:

Dear Sir,—I beg to inclose herewith copy of a letter received by me from the Governor General's office.

Why was that letter of any more importance when it came from the Governor General's office than when it came from the Rev. John Pringle? Perhaps the minister on some future occasion will explain that to the House and to the country?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps my hon. friend would take this opportunity to explain on what he bases the supposition that it was of any more importance when it came from the Governor General's office than when it came from the Rev. John Pringle?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because when it came from Dr. Pringle no action was taken and when it came from the Governor General some action was taken.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, he is quite in error. Rev. John Pringle wrote to several parties at once. The letter was received in my absence and while I was absent letters were forwarded to my office from the premier and His Excellency. When I arrived I found the letters and I notified Dr. Pringle that I had received his letter and had received the letters from the other parties whom he had notified. They came to me at the same time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We will accept the minister's explanation.

Dear Sir,—I beg to inclose herewith copy of a letter received by me from the Governor General's office.

Was that letter also addressed to the Minister of the Interior?

Mr. OLIVER. I imagine that there was a letter addressed to myself and to the Governor General, that is my remembrance of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The letter to the minister and the communications forwarded to the Prime Minister and the Governor General reached the minister all at the same time?

Mr. OLIVER. The minister reached them all at the same time as I remember.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister reached them all at the same time. It is another illustration of my hon. friend's capacity for what he calls the lawyer's quibble. However, I shall read the letter:

Ottawa, August 28, 1907.

Dear Sir,—I beg to inclose herewith copy of a letter received by me from the Governor General's office. As you will note from the address and contents, the original of this letter was addressed to the premier and to myself. You will be good enough to investigate fully the specific charges made by Mr. Pringle against Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow, and you will, of course, call upon Mr. Pringle to substantiate those charges. You are to investigate fully and report. Should the Rev. Mr. Pringle desire to lay charges against any other persons in the employ of the government or of the Interior Department especially, you are to investigate them as well.

The minister tells us to-day that he would not issue a Royal commission because the charges were not specific. In his letter of

August 28, 1907, he referred to them as specific charges and they were made much more specific by Dr. Pringle during the negotiations for an investigation which took place between him and Mr. Henderson. So I think that will fairly dispose of the minister's contention that the charges were not specific.

But let us take another authority, if the minister's authority is not sufficient for himself. In a letter from Alexander Henderson, Commissioner, to the Hon. Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior, bearing date 23rd September, 1907, I find the following statement :

The charge against Mr. Girouard seems to me to be reasonably specific, but I informed Dr. Pringle that before I could hear and investigate charges against Mr. Lithgow, these charges in fairness to Mr. Lithgow should be made definite and specific.

Mr. OLIVER. That is exactly what I have been saying.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is exactly what you have been saying, and on October 23, 1907, as will appear on reference to that page, Dr. Pringle, in compliance with the request of the commissioner in that behalf, made his charges against Mr. Lithgow a great deal more specific than those against Mr. Girouard, which already had been declared by the Commissioner to be reasonably specific. So that I think will dispose of the contention of the minister that he did not issue this Royal Commission because the charges were not sufficiently specific.

Why then did the minister refuse to issue a Royal Commission? He had embarked on this investigation after receiving a certain communication from the Governor General's office in connection with the private conduct of certain public officials which was declared to be a public scandal. Let us see how the minister comes out of the investigation in that respect. The Rev. John Pringle on October 18, 1907, in a letter addressed to the Minister of the Interior, used this language :

When the government appoints an investigator with the power to subpœna, commit and protect witnesses, I shall be ready with overwhelming proof of the truth of the charges I have made.

On the 14th day of October, 1907, in a letter addressed by him to Alexander Henderson, the Commissioner of the Yukon, he said this :

I think, Sir, that the alternatives before you are the following :

1. As the agent of the Minister of the Interior to inquire into the scandals, at least six years continued, connected with the names of these two officials.

2. To get from the authorities at Ottawa the powers of a royal commission to investigate the charge I have made.

If you adopt the first course I shall, having made specific charges, do all I can tc aid you in investigating them and getting at the truth.

If you adopt the second course, I shall be ready with adequate proof of the truth of the statements I have repeatedly made about these two public servants.

On November 8, 1907, following that letter from Dr. Pringle, Commissioner Henderson wrote to the Minister of the Interior as follows :

Dear Mr. Oliver,—I am inclosing herewith copy of the correspondence relating to the charges of the Rev. Dr. Pringle against Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow. You will see from Dr. Pringle's letter to me of the 23rd ultimo, he declines to appear as a party in what he calls an informal investigation. I would suggest, if agreeable to you, that I be appointed a commissioner to investigate the charges under the provisions of the Inquiries Act, chapter 104, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) Alexander Henderson,
Commissioner.

That was the situation. The minister had declared the charges sufficiently specific. Commissioner Henderson had held those against Mr. Girouard to be sufficiently specific, but required further particulars regarding Mr. Lithgow; these particulars were given. Then, Mr. Henderson found himself in a position to proceed, because specific charges against both these men had been filed with him and brought to his attention. Dr. Pringle held, and properly held, that the investigation would be only farcical if there was no power to compel the attendance of witnesses, to examine those witnesses on oath and to force them to speak. So, in the letter I have read, the commissioner, Mr. Henderson, suggested that he should be given power to make the investigation an effective one. And the only answer of the minister is that he saw fit to differ from Mr. Henderson in that opinion, and, for that reason, he refused any effective investigation; that is the best I can make out of it. The minister is in this dilemma : charges had been made of a character which were a public scandal, so that a public servant of this country, if the charges were true, should no longer hold his office. In that case there should be an investigation—an effective, and not a farcical investigation. If, on the other hand, the charges were not of a character to affect the status of a public servant, there should not have been any investigation at all, either informal or effective. The minister started the informal investigation, not only acknowledging that the charges were of a character to affect the status of a public servant, but that those charges were sufficiently specific, and they were made more specific afterwards—but, when the true situation was placed beore him, for some reason not made known to this House, he declined absolutely to allow witnesses to be examined on oath and rendered

abortive any attempt on the part of Dr. Pringle to prove that the charges were true. In the result, that is unfair to the public servants themselves—there can be no question about that. Because, Dr. Pringle, having the courage of his convictions, has not been silent during the last four or five years : on the public platform and in the press he has made known to the people of the Yukon and of Canada generally the charges that he has asked the minister to investigate. When this government, acting through its Minister of the Interior, declined to investigate these charges in any effective way, they did a grievous injustice not only to the people of this country but to those two men as well. More than that, they did an injury to the public service of the country, and they have shaken public confidence in the intention of the government to carry on as it ought to be carried on the government of the Yukon. So far as Mr. Lithgow and Mr. Girouard are concerned, I pass no opinion as to the truth of the charges against them; no member of this House is called upon to do that. What we insist upon is that, charges having been made and investigation ordered, and these charges touching the value of the service of these gentlemen as public servants, there should be a proper investigation. So far as integrity as a public servant is concerned, and so far as capacity is concerned, all I knew of Mr. Lithgow when he was in Halifax many years ago, in the public service there, led me to believe that he would be a valuable public servant in the Yukon. I have no knowledge of his conduct in the Yukon, and no knowledge concerning Mr. Girouard ; but I do believe that these charges ought to have been investigated, and ought to have been investigated in an effectual way. In the result the minister has seen fit to leave upon the records of this country, in the shape of the affidavits forwarded by Dr. Pringle in regard to Mr. Girouard in 1905, and upon the records of parliament sworn testimony which Mr. Girouard, as well as the government, ought to have desired to have investigated and investigated to the utmost. If the charges against Mr. Giourard are false, then the men who made these affidavits and the men who put forward these charges ought not to be walking the streets of this country in perfect immunity. On the other hand, if the statements in these affidavits are correct as to the conduct of Mr. Girouard on a certain occasion, then the government of this country is sadly in default in having permitted him, for the past four years, to exercise the functions of a public servant in the Yukon. There is the dilemma ; you can take either one horn or the other, as you see fit. It is the result of the inaction of this government ; for, the very moment that these affidavits were placed on the files of the Department of the Interior, it was the duty of the government, without regard to Dr. Pringle or anybody else, to have the mattter probed to the bottom. The minister (Mr. Oliver) seems to think this is purely a matter between Mr. Pringle and the government, and that if he (Mr. Oliver) can discredit Dr. Pringle in some way, if he can cast some aspersion upon his character or conduct or motive, he has disposed of the question. But it is a much larger question than that; it is a question of public morals in the Yukon; it is a question of the administration of public affairs in a distant portion of the country. The issue, to my mind, is scarcely such as the Minister of the Interior would suggest. I regret that the government have seen fit to adopt the course they have adopted. It will not be commended by any intelligent citizen in this country, Liberal or Conservative, who really understands the facts and the situation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). As the letters of Dr. Pringle, which have been made the subject of this debate, were addressed not only to the Department of the Interior, but also to myself—and, indeed, for that matter, to the whole of the cabinet—perhaps it would not be out of place for me to give my views on this question as it arose from time to time from 1902 up to the present year. Addressing myself at this moment to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who has taken charge of this matter and who has read the correspondence out and out, I may say to him that, as I saw that correspondence as it arose from time to time, beginning in 1902, added to in 1905 and added to still further in 1907, it seemed to me that these letters came from a gentleman who certainly was zealous for the public weal, but one whose discretion and language, perhaps, were not such as to strike one very favourably. I cannot help having for Dr. Pringle great respect, for certainly, he has shown that he is very much in earnest in prosecuting what he considered to be the public good. At the same time, for my part, I might have wished that his language was a little more moderate than it always was in his communications. My hon. friend has read numerous letters which have been addressed to the government by Dr. Pringle, but he read only one part of the letter of 1902.

Mr. FOSTER. I read the whole of the 1905 letters.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend did not read the whole, but only part.

Mr. FOSTER. I read probably nine-tenths. There is here and there a little passage that I did not read.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly, my hon. friend left out several passages which

I think he did very well to leave out. But, in that letter of 1902 there was nothing that he could not place upon the pages of 'Hansard' and allow it to go to the country. I have to observe to my hon. friend that in this letter of 1902 there is nothing definite, there is nothing positive, but it is full of general assertions, assertions of immorality in certain quarters, assertions of malfeasance in other quarters, assertions of peculations and other offences in still other quarters. My hon. friend expressed some doubt as to the propriety of the course which was followed on that occasion by the government. He expressed surprise that no action had been taken. The reason, Mr. Speaker, seems to be very obvious. I ask my hon. friend what action could have been taken by the government upon a letter of the character of the one that we are now discussing ; that is the letter of 1902 ? I repeat, no name is mentioned, officials are aspersed with some vehemence but no names given, charges are made of a very indefinite character which could not be investigated. But at that moment, when Mr. Pringle was addressing the government and making complaints as to what was going on in the Yukon, or at a later date, if not at that moment, the Yukon was presided over by Mr. Ross and to the efforts of Mr Ross he gave the most ample credit. Not only does he give credit to his efforts but he also gives credit to Mr. Ross for the success of his efforts and he says, in so many words, in the correspondence, that Mr. Ross, during his administration, had succeeded in uprooting many of the evils of which he had been complaining. Unfortunately, the administration of Mr. Ross was not very long, not as long as perhaps it should have been for the good of the Yukon. The difficulty which the government has always had in the Yukon has been to get such officials as would discharge their duties in a manner that would be satisfactory to all concerned. As my hon. friend has said, the Yukon is a land of mystery. It is so far off that I think my hon. friend will agree that it is difficult, with the numerous officials that the government has to employ there to make sure that every one of these persons shall be of the character which we would all desire. Mr. Ross was an exceptional man, he was a most successful administrator and everybody bears testimony to that fact, not only his friends but his opponents, every man who has had any thing to do with the Yukon bears testimony that under Mr. Ross, as also under the administration of Mr. Henderson, his successor, the Yukon was and is well administered. But, with Mr. Ross' departure the complaints commenced again. The character of the administration established by Mr. Ross is well justified by the correspondence of Mr. Pringle himself because, Mr. Pringle who, as I said a moment ago, I think, was actuated by a desire for the public weal, allowed three years to elapse before addressing any further complaint to the government. He addressed his first complaint to the government during the administration of Mr. Ross in the year 1902. In the month of January, 1905, Mr. Pringle sent another complaint. Communication is reasonably speedy when navigation is open, but as soon as navigation is closed communication is very slow. I do not remember the exact time at which the letter reached me but I am quite sure that when the letter reached me the hon. gentleman who had been Minister of the Interior was no more in office. That hon. gentleman resigned about the commencement of March and it was about that time I received the letter from Mr. Pringle. In that letter of Mr. Pringle there were two charges ; charges were made against two different parties, Mr. Congdon and Mr. Girouard especially. The charge against Mr. Girouard was a very positive, specific character. It was not so much a charge of a direct offence committed by him but it was leading to a very direct charge against him. The matter dropped at that time because there was an interregnum in the Department of the Interior, but in the summer of that year the new Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who wanted to know exactly what the condition was in the Yukon, took the very wise precaution of proceeding to the Yukon himself so as to investiagte all matters and see what was to be done. We know that the result of his trip has been very far reaching and that it has corrected many abuses of which the people complained and has introduced a new era into the administration of that country. As I understood from my hon. friend on his return, he heard no complaints whatever from anybody of the character which have been mentioned in Mr. Pringle's letter of January, 1905. But, more than that, the letter of Mr. Pringle was referred, by the Minister of Justice, who had received also similar complaints from Mr. Pringle, to Mr. Congdon for his observations upon it and Mr. Congdon denied absolutely all the allegations of fact contained in Mr. Pringle's letter. This disposes of the charges made by Mr. Pringle in 1905.

But the latter charge which was brought by Mr. Pringle in 1907 was perhaps the most important of all and it was one to which immediate attention had to be given. Mr. Pringle, in his letter of 1907, made positive accusations against two officials of the government in the Yukon. I think Mr. Girouard and Mr. Lithgow, who were the parties charged by Mr. Pringle, are

acknowledged to have been very good officers discharging the duties of their offices remarkably well. Of Mr. Lithgow, especially, I am bound to say, in justice to him, that there is not in the Yukon a more painstaking officer or one who commands more generally the respect of the community than he does. Everybody acknowledges that. I do not know Mr. Lithgow personally, I do not remember of ever having seen him, but in all of the correspondence I have had about him testimony is rendered universally to the fact that he is a most competent officer and discharges his duty fairly well. But, he is of the human race and he is not free from faults. He has his faults, I am bound to say, but with the faults he has. everybody in the Yukon, while acknowledging his faults, will say at the same time that he is a good, competent officer. This is the testimony which I have to bear of him and which I think is only his due. The charges that were made by Mr. Pringle against Mr. Girouard were very formal. They could not be ignored. What was to be done under such circumstances ? I appeal again to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster): What would he have done under such circumstances ? He was a minister at one time, and he had numerous officers under him. Let us take a hypothetical case. If the hon. member for North Toronto had been in office and if some one had made the charge against any of his officers that he had been guilty of intoxication, not only privately but openly in the streets of the city, what would he have done ? Would the hon. gentleman have appointed a royal commission to investigate the charge and pronounce upon it ? The offence is a private one but it may be such that a minister may have to take notice of it, and sometimes a minister does. In my humble opinion this was a case for departmental investigation by the minister to ascertain whether the official was guilty, and if guilty whether he was excusable or whether he should be expelled from the service. I am glad to say these things do not occur very often, but they do happen almost every year in the public service and the minister in charge of the department concerned does not appoint a royal commission under the great seal of His Majesty to investigate such cases. It is a departmental affair.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a provision for a departmental investigation under oath.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think that the investigation of such an offence would come under chapter 104 respecting public and departmental inquiries, which says :

Sir WILFRID LAURIER

The minister presiding over any department of the civil service of Canada may appoint at any time under authority of the Governor in Council a commissioner or commissioners to investigate and report upon the state and management of the business or any part of the business of such department, either the inside or outside service thereof, and the conduct of any person in such service so far as the same relates to his official duties.

My hon. friend is a good lawyer and I think he will agree with me that the charge made by Mr. Pringle did not come under the scope of that Act. However, I will not examine this case in the light of the technicalities of the law but rather under the broader law of common sense, common fair play, and common justice to the accuser and to the accused. Under such circumstances I say that the action taken by the minister was very proper. Had these officials resided in Ottawa the minister himself might have decided what should be done, but in this case he had to delegate his power and he gave instructions to Mr. Henderson to look into the matter and to ask Mr. Pringle to attend and investigate the charges. Mr. Pringle was notified, but he said he would not come to the investigation unless he had a royal commission to compel the attendance of witnesses and to have the protection of the law for them. Now, the charge made by Mr. Pringle was that these officials had been guilty of public scandal in their private conduct, and he said it was notorious and that the whole community of Yukon had been aware of it. Was it not the duty of Mr. Pringle when the commissioner was authorized to receive his complaint, to come before the commissioner and to say that he made these charges for such and such a reason seeing that he had alleged they were notorious and a public scandal? Then, when Mr. Pringle would not come forward Mr. Henderson investigated for his own satisfaction the life of these officials.

Mr. FOSTER. In what manner did Mr. Henderson make any investigation as reported by him ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I don't mean to say that Mr. Henderson pried into the private life of these gentlemen or that he examined any witnesses to burrow into their lives to see whether they had misbehaved themselves or not. But the commissioner dealt with the charge of Mr. Pringle as couched in this letter, that these men had behaved in their private life in a public and scandalous manner. The commissioner was able to say to the minister : I live in Dawson ; I have been here for some time ; I know these men ; I know they are good officials and discharge their duties properly, I have not heard of any such public scandals as are mentioned by Mr. Pringle.

Mr. FOSTER. He says : Since I came here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the substance of the report he made to the minister. Mr. Henderson has been in the Yukon since May, 1907 and Mr. Pringle's letter was written in July, 1907, and here is part of the letter which I can read.

The disgraceful scenes of the last ten days in which prominent public men and government officials of more than one department have been the chief actors, have more than justified everything I have written to members of the cabinet or to the press in regard to the immorality which prevails in our community and official life.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the date of that ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the very last charge made by Mr. Pringle on the 27th of July, 1907. With this language of Mr. Pringle before him the commissioner reports to the minister : I am not aware that anything has taken place in the life of these men which I can report on ; I know them to be good and honourable men. That is the comment of the commissioner. Mr. Pringle would not come before the commissioner and I think he was not fair to himself in that. I repeat the minister was perfectly right in refusing at that time to issue a commission under the King's great seal to investigate the private conduct of these two officials. The minister was told he had two men in his service who had misbehaved in a public and scandalous manner in the community. If they were guilty of such scandal he would probably come to the conclusion they were not fit to remain in the service, or at all events he would call upon them to give their explanation of their excuse as to whether or not they should be retained in the service. Therefore it was open to Mr. Pringle to come forward with his evidence, his own and that of other witnesses before the commissioner. If the other witnesses had refused to come forward, the commissioner could have reported the fact to the minister, and have advised a further investigation. But in the circumstances of the case, I say that the conduct of the Minister of the Interior was absolutely right. Certainly it was not his duty to order such a solemn proceeding as an investigation by a royal commission into matters which were departmental, affecting the private conduct of officials.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the charges had been proved would they have justified dismissal ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the charges had been proved with regard to one of the officers I would say yes, they would. But let us take a supposititious case. Suppose it were true that Mr. Lithgow had misbehaved on a certain occasion; suppose he had been intoxicated, I would say for my part to the minister : Give that man a further chance; do not dismiss him; he is a good officer ; I would not be thet first one to cast a stone at him ; he may have misbehaved, but he is doing better and will do better, and I would not dismiss him. That would be my advice to the minister. But it is a very different thing for a man to be accused of having continuously lived in open shame to the scandal of the community. I have no hesitation in saying that such a man would have to make a very strong case before I would retain him in the service. But if such a good officer as Mr. Lithgow has the misfortune to make a break, as the saying is, I would ask him to give his promise that he would not fall again, and on that condition I would not dismiss him from the service. I repeat, I do not know Mr. Lithgow, I never saw him, but all the reports that I have had from the Yukon agree that his public conduct has been remarkably good and in the public interest. That is my own view of the matter. I may say further that I know —and perhaps my hon. friend from North Toronto knows also—that there are men of the same persuasion and I think of the same cloth as Mr. Pringle who do not take the view he does with regard to Mr. Lithgow. After all, in a country like the Yukon, if a man has the misfortune, as we say in common parlance, to make a break, I think it would not be wise on the part of the government to exact from him the pound of flesh and be absolutely merciless towards him.

With regard to Mr. Girouard, who has been accused of the most grievous offence. he could not remain in the service with that cloud over his head. He had to do one of two things, and he has done both. First of all, he had to clear his character, and to do that he brought an action for libel against Mr. Pringle, which action I understand is pending. I was asked by an hon. member if the action had been tried. As I understand, the courts in the Yukon take their recess during the winter and sit during the summer, so that the case has not yet been tried. At all events, Mr. Girouard has left the service, and, therefore, these matters are not perhaps of much interest at the present time except so far as they show whether or not the government have done their duty. I have only to repeat that, in my humble judgment, the minister in this matter behaved as he should have behaved ; he gave Mr. Pringle the opportunity to bring his charges and have them investigated, and Mr. Pringle was not fair to himself when he refused that opportunity. If he had taken it, and if the witnesses on whom he relied had not come forward, then it would have been open to the minister to decide whether or not he would prosecute any further. The House will agree with me that the minister did his full duty, not only to Mr. Pringle, but to himself and to the government of which he is a member.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 180) respecting the Crown Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Sproule.

SUPPLY—THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

House resumed discussion on motion that House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to deal somewhat briefly with the subject at present engaging our attention. That subject is the alleged misconduct of officials in the Yukon Territory extending over a period of six years. From time to time charges of misconduct on the part of these officials were made to the government—charges of misconduct, of immorality, of dishonesty, of graft—and in various ways it was brought to the attention of the government that the officials in that remote territory were not conducting themselves in a manner creditable to the administration or the country. These charges date from the year 1882, and two of the officials especially implicated were Messrs. Lithgow and Girouard. The charges were first made by the Rev. John Pringle in 1902. Mr. Pringle speaking of the conditions prevalent in the Yukon among government officials, stated that the characteristic of these officials were 'lust and graft,' and claimed that no one was able to secure what rightly belonged to him unless he were 'on the inside' and 'had a pull.' In other words, it was impossible for those who were prosecuting the industry of mining to either secure or maintain their rights without influence at court, and that influence was presumably an improper one. In a public meeting in Dawson City, it was stated publicly, before an audience of hundreds of people, that such concessions as the 'Bronson and Ray,' and the 'Philp' concessions, granted on representations which were, to say the least, suggestive of perjury. Mr. Pringle says that he heard it said that two cabinet ministers were in these. In case I might be charged with misquoting, let me give the exact words used :

> I heard it stated before an audience of hundreds by a lawyer named Woodworth that two cabinet ministers, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) were interested in one or more of these loosely granted concessions.

Now, if Mr. Woodworth was making a statement which was libellous, you would naturally expect that he would be prosecuted, because the statement was of too important a character to be allowed to pass unnoticed. If he were not making a libellous statement, then the government were remiss in their duty in not calling them to account for it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. I should like to know what it is that so much amuses the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). Is it laughable that any minister of the gospel should make such a charge ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He is amused at the word 'lie-bellious'.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the hon. gentleman know about it ? Nothing more than to sit and laugh. We know the saying that laughter at times denotes the vacant mind, and that is evidently the case in this instance, because the hon. gentleman appears neither willing to take the trouble to inquire into the facts nor desirous of knowing them. Instead he treats the whole thing with levity, though it is the solemn statement of a minister of the gospel who, in his desire to improve the morals of the people, brought the matter to the attention of the ministers of the Crown so that they might have it inquired into and punish those guilty of corrupt acts if the charges were established. If the charges were libellous, the party who made them could be punished, and surely no minister of the Crown—especially those implicated—could afford to let them pass unheeded. Mr. Pringle specially stated that the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were specially interested in one or more of those loosely granted concessions. I draw more particularly attention to this because of the statement made by the right hon. first minister to-night that he saw nothing in these charges which ought to engage his attention. There was nothing in them, he said, to warrant an inquiry. They were all of a general character and there was not a single specific allegation. But was not the public declaration made before a large audience that two of the right hon. gentleman's colleagues are improperly interested in certain concessions sufficiently specific. Yet the first minister himself said : I see nothing in these charges upon which to hinge an inquiry. They are of such a vague and general character that there is nothing to inquire into. Yet this man says that two cabinet ministers, the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Marine, were interested in one or more of these loosely granted concessions.

Then he says :

> Concessions have been granted, I am convinced, not only carelessly but iniquitously ; the heritage of our people given to satisfy the greed of capital, without due consideration of the rights of the people in the ground or of the character of the statements made to secure these concessions.

He charges general immorality, but yet the First Minister says these charges are vague and general and there is nothing to inquire into. What does he say?

The dance halls in which more men, some of them government officials, have been ruined than in any other of our protected dens, are run wide open. I wish the government would, for its own good name, either suppress these 'hells,' or at least take means to verify reports——

But there is nothing there to inquire into——

—current all over this camp, about officials who are their habitués. Prostitution flaunts itself everywhere, the abandoned woman, (to say nothing of the abandoned man) is everywhere ; beside respectable homes ; across the street from then; beside our grocery and dry goods stores; on first and second and third, and every avenue and road. Unless some one is robbed or injured in her house she is undisturbed.

He goes on to say :

But the worst feature of the licensed houses here is, that a very large percentage of them are houses of prostitution.

He tells us that there were 210 houses licensed to sell liquor there at that time and yet there was a population of, at the most, 20,000 people, That is about one licensed house for every 95 of the population in that district.

But the worst feature of the licensed houses here is, that a very large percentage of them are houses of prostitution. Many of them run, it is true, by people of good character but a large number are bawdy houses with a government license to prey upon the public.

And yet the government are not concerned about it and see nothing to inquire into.

I have wondered since coming north, why the permit system was adopted. Was it to restrict the sale of liquor?

At the time it was adopted we were told it was in the interest of temperance. I remember the ex-minister saying that this was one of the means we kept in our own hands for the purpose of promoting temperance in these camps in the west.

I have wondered since coming north, why the permit system was adopted. Was it to restrict the sale of liquor or to make it respectable or to make money for government exigencies, or to make money for men with a pull?

I think the experience of times since has proven one thing, that it made money for men with a pull. We remember when J. D. McGregor, the license inspector there who had authority to give permits, refused permits to a number of people who desired them to take liquor into that country, but gave it to be understood to one of his friends that a permit would be granted to him. That man rushed in all his liquor in the fall of the year when navigation was expected shortly to close and then the permit was granted when it was too late for others to bring liquor in. McGregor then resigned his position as inspector and became a member of the firm that got the permit. I believe he was one of three who shared in the profits and I am told they made a large amount of money. With these facts before us, can we say that the permit system was intended to restrict the sale of liquor? No, it was rather to make money for government exigencies or to make money for men with a pull. He was one of the men with a pull.

Rev. Mr. Pringle says:

The law is systematically manipulated not to protect the public, but to protect and nurse the gambler and shame honest men.

This man speaks with knowledge and has been very reasonable and fair in the statements he has made. Speaking of the Northwest Mounted Police he says that they are a splendid body of men, the finest on the earth but:

It is enough to degrade any force, however fine, to know that where immorality is concerned it is useless to do their duty, that the law itself will be made to thwart them and defeat the ends of justice when they endeavour to carry it out.

I have written in plain terms because if I am asked what right I have to so address the government of Canada I answer that I am a Canadian and love my native land. I hold that we have a right to expect that the men who represent our government, the officers of the law and the departments of the country should not only do justly but live rightly. I have said publicly here and I repeat it that there is a conscience in the west and I shall do my best to arouse and invoke that conscience and I shall refuse to be silenced as long as this continues.

Mr. Pringle follows this up by affidavits which are here from different parties setting forth the crookedness of the officials there with regard to their conduct in political life, and speaks of one of the commissioners who is absolutely keeping the list from the people while he is known to be in a house of prostitution. I have affidavits here presumably from respectable people.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read them?

Mr. SPROULE. I may read one of them as they are practically all the same. This one reads as follows:

Canada, Yukon Territory, to wit:

I, Robert Howard Stanley Creswell, merchant, of Dawson, Yukon Territory, do solemnly declare as follows:

1. That I am a member of Dr. Thompson's campaign committee.

He is the man who attended to the list.

2. That E. Barbeau, enumerator for South Dawson, had stated on the 8th day of December that he could not allow the said com-

mittee to see a copy of the voters' list for South Dawson, as the same was in the safe at the office of J. E. Girouard, registrar of land titles for Yukon Territory.

This is the same Girouard against whom the charges of immorality are made.

3. That the said Barbeau further stated that he could not find the said Girouard and did not know his whereabouts.

4. That search was made for said Girouard, both at his office and at his home but he could not be found.

5. That I had good reason to believe that the said Girouard was located in a cabin at the north end of town occupied by one Marie Lambert, known as 'Montreal Marie,' of Klondike City.

6. That at about four o'clock in the afternoon, in company with T. D. Pattullo and T. G. Wilson and a large number of supporters of Dr. Thompson, I repaired to the house in question, and upon making inquiry at the said house was informed by the girl inmate 'Marie' that Girouard was not there.

7. That a minute or two later the said Girouard rushed out the back door of said house and ran towards the hill, followed by a large number of men who were crying lustily in the chase to head off the said Girouard.

8. That a few moments later the said Girouard was overtaken and captured by the crowd and conducted to the administration building without any violence being done to him.

9. That thereupon I went to the telephone and telephoned to George Black who had remained at the administration building with Enumerator Barbeau and Returning Officer Pierre Ledieu, telling him that Girouard was being brought to the building.

10. And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and knowing it to be of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Sgd.) R. H. S. CRESWELL.

Declared before me at Dawson this 9th day of December, 1904.

(Sgd.) FRED. G. CRISP,
A commissioner for taking affidavits in and for the Yukon Territory.

This is one of four affidavits which I have here, all of a similar character and relating to the same events, one of these affidavits being signed by four or five persons. They disclose the fact that the man who is charged with the responsibility of providing lists for the election was either purposely keeping out of the way or indifferently disregarding his oath of office and allowing the electors to be deprived of this list without which they could not discharge their duties. And this is handed in to the premier with these other charges, and he tells the House and the country that the charges were of a general character and not to be paid attention to. Here we have charges of political crimes, and moral crimes, and implied charges of dishonesty in several instances, the individuals being named in some cases, and yet, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, all these are not worthy of consideration. That is what the Prime Minister said to-day. But what does he say in answer to the Rev. Dr. Pringle? Here is his letter:

Prime Minister's Office,
Ottawa, February 6, 1905.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 3rd of January last. I have to inform you that all the charges which you bring to the attention of the government, relating to the administration of public affairs in the Yukon Territory, will receive immediate attention from different departments interested.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

Did they receive that immediate attention? We have nothing before this House to show that they did. And now, three years after, the Prime Minister tells us that the charges were of a vague and general character, that they could not be inquired into, and so they must be allowed to pass. The Prime Minister, speaking of Mr. Lithgow, one of the parties against whom these serious charges and specific charges are made, says: 'Mr. Lithgow's conduct was good, so far as I know, except for one break.' Now, here is a resolution that was passed by men who ought, I assume, to command the respect even of the Prime Minister himself:

Dawson, Yukon Territory, November 13, 1907.
Resolution.

At a regular meeting of the Young Men's Liberal Club on Wednesday evening, November 13, 1907, held in the Liberal hall, Dawson, Mr. John Grant, president, in the chair, the following resolution was passed unanimously:

That, whereas the conduct of Mr. John T. Lithgow, controller of the Yukon Territory, has been of a publicly flagrant and immoral character, he having repeatedly, in an unseemly and grossly improper manner, been seen in a condition of indecent exposure in broad daylight in the open streets, and in a state of disgusting drunkenness, in company of lewd and dissolute women who are well known and notorious prostitutes.

And whereas, said controller's conduct in this community has been a public scandal, and cannot but have a very serious effect on the morals of the people, thereby greatly endangering the foundations of society, and bringing obloquy and disrepute upon the Liberal party.

The First Minister says there is nothing to inquire into, even though the conduct of this official should bring obloquy upon the Liberal party.

And whereas, in open violation of the established and well-understood custom and principle, that no federal employee can or should be paid, two, or more salaries, at one and the same time, and as the said controller is drawing three distinct salaries, viz.: one federal of $5,000, one territorial of $1,000, and one salary from the city of Dawson (which city ceased to exist as a corporation over two years ago) of $1,000, making a total of $7,000 per year salary, and this abuse of 'power or

pull' being constantly referred to as a 'graft' does great and incalculable injury to the Liberal party in Yukon.

And whereas the further continuance in office of the said J. T. Lithgow will not only make it utterly impossible to uphold the government responsible for his retention in office, and will completely overthrow the said Liberal party in the Yukon, but is subversive of the high standard of morality which is the pride and boast of Canadianism

Therefore, be it resolved that 'The Young Men's Liberal Club' of Dawson, Yukon territory, in regular meeting assembled most respectfully and emphatically urge the immediate steps be taken by the proper authorities of the government for the removal of the said J. T. Lithgow from office.

And, be it further resolved that copies of this resolution signed by the secretary be forwarded to the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier premier, to Hon. W. S. Fielding, Minister of Finance, and the Hon. Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior at Ottawa.

It was correspondingly done. Yet, in the face of that the Prime Minister says: We see nothing to inquire into; all these are vague charges of a general character; I acknowledge that this man made one break and that is all and he asks: Are we prepared to condemn him for that? We do not think that we should. The conduct of the Minister of the Interior was interesting as well. What was it? He said: We have nothing but charges of immorality against these parties. What have we to do with their immorality, drunkenness, lewdness and graft? Nothing at all. It is not our duty to inquire into all this. Yet, they are government officials. Is that likely to keep up the morale of the civil service ? Is it likely to secure for the civil service the type of man whose acquisition would be for the good of the country? Is it not calculated to bring about that respect which every civil servant in this country should have for his position? Is that the example that is to be put before the world? Shall we say that we shall allow this to go on? Shall we condone drunkenness? Shall we condone every vice to which human nature seems to be addicted? The minister says: It does not concern us one iota. Why? Because we could not lay a charge and inquire into the official conduct of these officers. We have to deal only with their official conduct. An official may be the biggest thief, rogue, blackguard or drunkard in the country; we have nothing to do with that, says the Minister of the Interior, so long as he does his official work. What an example to set before the world! He seems to care nothing for that whatever. These charges are made against three officials—Congdon, who was the commissioner, Girouard, who is the registrar, and Lithgow, who is the controller. They are made against these officials in various forms, they are specifically set out and yet the government refuse to take any notice of them whatever. The Minister of the Interior commenced the defence by saying that the charges of the Rev. John Pringle are political. He said that ministers of the Gospel are not all equally good, that there is an occasional one that you cannot rely on, thereby insinuating that Rev. John Pringle was a gentleman of that character. He has made his charges very specifically. With respect to many of them he has given specific instances and others have backed up their charges by sworn evidence; yet the insinuation is made that this is all done for a political purpose.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) must have taken down my words incorrectly. I do not recall having alleged that the Rev. John Pringle, in making his charges, had a political purpose. If I did I certainly did not intend to.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the inference I drew. If I misunderstood the hon. gentleman I wish to withdraw my statement because I do not desire to misrepresent him in any particular. But, if he did not do it I find that some others have. I have here a copy of the 'Daily News-Advertiser' of Vancouver, B.C., and I notice that a writer in that draws attention to it. It reads as follows:

To the editor 'News-Advertiser.'

Sir,—I noticed in a recent issue of the Vancouver 'Province,' an interview given by Mr. Alexander Henderson, commissioner of the Yukon——

He says that Rev. John Pringle is doing it for some other purpose rather than for the purpose of elevating the moral standard of the people.

—lately from Dawson, headed 'Pringle campaign a political one.' 'It is a political move'——

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend is not quoting the commissioner's interview. My hon. friend is quoting a letter.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quoting a letter stating what the commissioner said.

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, my hon. friend is not.

Mr. SPROULE. I am.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The interview was not given to the 'News-Advertiser.' The interview was given to the 'Province.'

Mr. SPROULE. I am quoting a letter written to the 'News-Advertiser.'

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes, but I want my hon. friend to make the distinction fairly.

Mr. SPROULE. Have I not made it fairly? Have I not said that it was a letter written to this paper? Is that not fair enough? How much fairer could it be? It is impossible to make it any fairer.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend purports to give a statement made by Governor Henderson that Rev. John Pringle was conducting a political campaign. If my hon. friend will be fair he will quote Governor Henderson's interview, not a letter written by some one else referring to that interview.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I not reading this letter? If the hon. gentleman will listen a little more attentively he will find out that he was mistaken in his observations. What does this say?

I noticed in a recent issue of the Vancouver 'Province' an interview given by Mr. Alexander Henderson.

Am I stating other than facts?

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is all right.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, then, why get up and interrupt?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I have a reason for interrupting. The reason I interrupted was that my hon. friend purports to use a statement of Governor Henderson when, as a matter of fact, he has not the interview before him.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not purport to use any statement at all. I purport to read a letter, let it carry whatever weight it will in the House, and that letter sets forth that this is an interview given by Governor Henderson. The letter says:

I noticed in a recent issue of the Vancouver 'Province' an interview given by Mr. Alex. Henderson, commissioner of the Yukon lately from Dawson, headed 'Pringle Campaign a political one.' 'It is a political move,' started off the commissioner, in discussing the recent allegation of Rev. John Pringle, concerning the immorality of Dawson.

'He intends taking the stump.' 'He has fallen out with the government and will take the field in the Conservative interest, that is the explanation, I think'; 'the dance halls have been closed, and will not be re-opened.

Knowing what I am writing, for, I may say, I have lived several years in Dawson, and have fairly well kept tabs on matters there, going back half a dozen years, I will begin with the dance halls, which were authorized and made legal institutions during the Congdon regime, largely through the instrumentality of the appointed members of the Yukon Council, including Mr. J. E. Girouard, who also stood firmly by the dance hall element at the time they were put out of business, and during the present commissioner's time. As to the immorality of Dawson, to any one who knows and has kept the run of the matters, when any of the government advocates, from the commissioner down to Pinkert, assail Mr. Pringle as having said that Dawson is immoral, they are trying the old dodge of the herring across the trail. Mr. Pringle has in public print denied this charge, and has said that the opposite is the case. He has stated that certain of the government office holders have been leading such lives as to disgrace them and their offices. He has communicated this to the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior on several occasions, mostly without any effect.

Recently these matters have caused some folks to 'sit up and take notice,' and the outcome is that an action for damages has been instituted against Mr. Pringle (not by the city of Dawson, but by the friend of the dance halls). We see in the Dawson 'Daily News' of April 10, 1908, in extenso statements of claim and defence in the libel suit of J. E. Girouard vs. Rev. John Pringle. As most of the subject matter would be almost considered ancient and true history to Dawsonites, it would not likely be any surprise to them but to one so new to the territory as Commissioner Henderson, one would expect it would give him some concern, especially as it involved one whose services in the Yukon council he had 'found invaluable and had learned to lean on him.'

One is more than surprised to see in the April 14th issue of the same 'Daily News' that a farewell banquet is given to this same J. E. Girouard, at which Commissioner Henderson in his speech 'predicted from what he had learned that Mr. Girouard would be given an opportunity of a seat in parliament.' 'Mr. Henderson rose to enthusiastic and dramatic fervour during his talk,' says the 'News.' In the Dawson 'Daily News' of April 15, 1908, is a list of the 'guests,' beginning with Commissioner Henderson and former Commissioner F. T. Congdon and a long list of others, a few of whom would hardly be expected to be found at a banquet given to a party accused of sheep stealing which would be a very trivial offence against society compared with the matters mentioned in the Dawson 'Daily News' of April 10 last. But every one to their taste. When Commissioner Henderson says of Mr. Pringle's action. 'It is a political move,' he would seem to be measuring other people's corn by his own half bushel.'

Now as to this J. Girouard we were told by the Minister of the Interior to-day that he is no longer in the employ of the government and that he has gone God knows where. I imagine his suit against the Rev. John Pringle will not be prosecuted further. It would seem from this letter I have read that some one accuses the Rev. John Pringle of having nothing but a political aim in view, and Henderson the present commissioner goes to a complimentary banquet given to this man who is practically an outlaw of society, to try and make him somewhat respectable. And yet the Minister of the Interior sees nothing wrong in it. It is a nice position for the commissioner of the Yukon. What will the world think of it when they know this.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Know what?

Mr. SPROULE. Know that the present commissioner to the Yukon attended a banquet to such a man and made use of the remarks he did and vilified the Rev. John Pringle because he was honest and independent and truthful enough to say what he believed to be true.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Who vilified the Rev. John Pringle ?

Mr. SPROULE. I say that as far as I know Mr. Henderson did so when he said that the Rev. Mr. Pringle took this action for political purposes. If that is not vilification, what is it ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman takes a letter written by a man in Vancouver and a letter from Dawson and compounds the two and reads that.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. What is contained in that letter is what is stated by Mr. Henderson.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) will get the Dawson 'News' of April 14, he will find in it a three-column report of the banquet with Mr. Henderson's statement, and the extracts my hon. friend has read have been evidently taken from that paper.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend from North Toronto does not bear out then what the hon. member for East Grey states.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, because one part of Mr. Henderson's speech is the allegation that Mr. Pringle's motive was a political motive.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The interview is given in the 'Progress' and the letter my hon. friend reads is from the 'Progress.'

Mr. FOSTER. What my hon. friend is reading from is a letter written to the 'News-Advertiser' by 'Bona Fide,' and dated Vancouver, May 12, 1908, and he gives a quotation from the Dawson 'Daily News' of April 14.

Mr. SPROULE. And the interview with Commissioner Henderson.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend gives Commissioner Henderson's words as contained in that interview. Therefore, it is direct enough, and it ought to be correct.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Why does not the hon. gentleman read the interview?

Mr. SPROULE. I read the interview, which was in that letter between inverted commas, and so far as I know it has never been contradicted.

Mr. OLIVER. If there is a clash of evidence between the Rev. Dr. Pringle and Commissioner Henderson, why is not the word of Commissioner Henderson as good as that of Rev. Dr. Pringle?

Mr. SPROULE. Because the one is an interested party and the other is not.

An hon. MEMBER. Which one?

Mr. SPROULE. The Commissioner is the interested party, because he is defending himself. The First Minister says that Mr. Girouard has denied it ; should we not take his word as readily as the word of the Rev. John Pringle? Did you ever yet see a prisoner at the bar who did not plead not guilty? Mr. Congdon's denial is a plea of not guilty, but these affidavits which I have read from seven or eight individuals swear to something different. Will you give as much credence to the denial of interested parties, who are charged before the bar of public opinion, as you will to the statements of a disinterested party who swears to what he knows to be facts?

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend suggest that the Rev. Dr. Pringle has sworn to any facts? He had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. I have said that the Rev. John Pringle and others have made certain charges and these charges are backed up by affidavits. The First Minister says that we should accept the denial of Mr. Girouard and be perfectly satisfied with that against the sworn statements of seven or eight people as to what they saw with their own eyes. The First Minister and the Minister of the Interior desire to go no further, but turn round and practically insinuate untruthfulness on the part of the Rev. John Pringle without giving him the proper opportunity to prove his charges. I say that the country will not be satisfied with that. The First Minister says they gave him an opportunity, but they wanted to have his charges as specific as a charge made against a man charged with crime before a magistrate. They refused to allow Dr. Pringle to subpœna the witnesses and bring them before the court to prove his charges. They tell him to go and ask the witnesses to come, and in the meantime in all human probability the government officials would buy them off or spirit them away. There are strong grounds for believing that would be done, because the Rev. John Pringle says the administration of justice in that country is practically a farce—that instead of the Mounted Police being permitted to enforce the law, the law is invoked to prevent them enforcing it. In the province of Ontario we have found time and again, both during the Ross administration and the Mowat administration preceding it, that people could not be convicted of political crimes, because the moment the charges were made against them the witnesses were bought off or spirited away and kept in the United States. So it is in the Yukon. The administration is in the hands of men who do not desire to administer justice, but desire to prevent the administration of justice, and the same thing would most likely have happened if the Rev. John Pringle had attempted to prove his charges in the way proposed by the First Minister. But the Rev. Dr. Pringle said: Do as you do before any committee of the House of Commons ; subpœna these people in the

regular way, and then if they refuse or neglect to come, they can be dealt with for contempt of court, and when you bring them to the bar, put them under oath, so that they will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

But the Minister of the Interior said : I shall not give you the advantage of subpœnaing them. You can ask them to come; and if they do not, it is not my fault. I have given you the opportunity to prove your charges, and it is for you to prove them without any aid from me. Is that how a man should be treated who made these charges for the sole purpose of letting his party know what was bringing them into contempt and purging the political life of his country of what was bound, if unchecked, to demoralize it ? Will the country be satisfied with this failure to prosecute ? I very much misjudge the character of our people if they will. We have been told over and over again that the administration of justice in that country was vicious. We have been told that by parties who live out there and in whose integrity I have every confidence, and judging by the shuffling and evasive conduct of the government I have no doubt that every word they said is true. Mr. Pringle was perfectly justified in refusing to go on with the inquiry unless it was conducted on proper lines and unless he were given a fair opportunity to prove his charges. Was he given that ? Not at all. Yet the Minister of the Interior says there was nothing to inquire into. He takes the ground that the moral character of the government officials was not a subject for inquiry at all, that it was a matter in which the government had no interest. No doubt my hon. friend is sincere on that contention judging by the fact that although Wagner had been twice prosecuted and had been sentenced by the court and compelled to suffer the penalty due his offences, he was afterwards taken up by the minister and put into a responsible position. That evidently is the minister's idea of the right kind of a man to act as government official. Wherever the hon. gentleman got his training, he is evidently sincere, but I wonder what the great honest public, what the moral and church going element of our community, what the ministers of the Gospel will think when they find that doctrine propagated by a minister of the Crown? In my judgment, they will form a very low estimate of the morale of the Minister of the Interior. That however is the position he takes, and the responsibility for that position is with the government. Sooner or later their misdeeds will recoil upon them. When they appeal to the country, I have no doubt that thousands of honest, good meaning reformers will refuse to declare by their ballots that the government did their duty when they did not carry out this investigation. They will refuse to endorse the conduct of the Minister of the Interior and the Prime Minister and will show by their vote that they consider them anything but men of the highest type of character and animated by the best intentions.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (West Assiniboia). I shal endeavour to be as brief as possible as I do not wish to assist my hon. friends opposite in their obstruction or play into their hands any longer than the necessity of the case requires. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition was careful, in replying to the Minister of the Interior to indulge in his usual introduction by saying that the speech he had just listened to from that hon. Minister was one of the most 'extraordinary' he had ever heard.

Mr. FOSTER. He only uses that when the Minister of the Interior speaks.

Mr. KNOWLES. I notice that when he answers the right hon. the First Minister, whose speech has taken the wind out of the leader of the opposition, my hon. friend was wont to say that the speech he has just heard is the most 'remarkable' one he ever listened to.

Mr. FOSTER. That seldom happens.

Mr. KNOWLES. My hon. friend will find it frequently happens. It is a most convenient form of reply when one has no effective argument to make, and I have no doubt we will find it frequently resorted to before this session is through. Our hon. friends opposite have not had much success in their attack on the administration of this government in the Yukon. Their main attack was on the proposition of the government to build a railway to the Yukon. On that question, although they presented something of a united front, when we have had some light thrown on the inside facts, as we have had by one of the principal members of the opposition sitting very close to the leader of that party, learn that they were not so united as they led the country to believe they were. We have had the statement from Sir Charles Tupper, who is a true Canadian, that two great mistakes were committed by the Conservative party. One was a trivial mistake and the other was a serious one, namely, their opposition to the proposition of the government to build a railway to the Yukon.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend had read the papers, he would have seen an explicit denial by Sir Charles Tupper of that statement.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have not seen it. I have been away for several days and possibly missed the paper which gave publicity to it.

Mr. FOSTER. It was in the 'Vancouver News Advertiser'

Mr. KNOWLES. I have not seen it; and since we have not heard from the hon. member from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes), I do not think that he could have seen it either or we would have had him on his feet on another question of privilege. However, we will let that rest. I desire to say nothing but what is fair, but the country will have its own idea of the policy of the opposition when it attacked the Yukon railway proposition and will have its own idea as to whether or not there may not after all be a grain of truth in the statement of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). With all due respect to the great ability of Sir Charles Tupper, it is just possible that his memory may be at fault and that, without any reflection on his desire to be accurate, he may not have fully recollected the facts, and that there was consequently some truth in the straight statement which we had from the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). Coming more particularly to the proposition before us, we find that the only sources for the attacks of hon. gentlemen opposite regarding the administration of the Yukon are a certain young men's club in Dawson city and the Revd. Mr. Pringle. Mr. Pringle has been in public life many years, and it is no injustice to say of him that he has been almost always a man with a grievance. Whether federal matters or territorial matters were in question, he has always had an eye for a grievance. The statement was made this afternoon, and we find it in the letter of Mr. Pringle himself, that he is not in politics. Well, while I do not wish to impugn the honesty of the reverend gentleman, I must say that I do not see how that can be, because in the whole history of the Yukon territory there has been no man out there who has been more intensely and constantly active in political life. To such an extent has that been the case that I know of no one who has had so many intense friends and so many bitter enemies as he had while in the Yukon council. The result was that he ceased to be a member of that council, and had he run again, he would have had no show of being re-elected. I wish it to be understood that I have no reflection to make on Mr. Pringle personally. I do not desire to express any opinion concerning him, but we have his own statements, all made in a spirit of the greatest bitterness, against Mr. Congdon who won the nomination at the last election. Although in many respects Mr. Pringle is eminently fitted for public life yet the Liberal convention did not think so and in their wisdom they selected Mr. Congdon. And from that day to this, although previously he and Mr. Congdon were good friends, he became Mr. Congdon's determined enemy. It was stated by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that Mr. Henderson compromised himself by attending a banquet given to Mr. Congdon. Why, Mr. Pringle himself attended a banquet given to Mr. Congdon before Mr. Congdon secured the nomination to this House. When Mr. Congdon was appointed commissioner, the citizens of Dawson gave him a banquet and one of those who raised their voices most favourably in praise of Mr. Congdon was Mr. Pringle himself. But afterwards they became estranged, there occurred this cleavage between them and we find the condition which exists to-day where there seems to be a spirit of the utmost revenge, not to use a stronger word, in the heart of Dr. Pringle against Mr. Congdon and his friends.

In addition to that we have the resolution read by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) which embodies the views of the Young Men's Liberal Club of Dawson. I have no doubt that every one here knows what that club was. The Liberals of the Yukon Territory, of Dawson City, lived for many years in harmony and then there occurred this cleavage. In the one hand were the Liberals whose head might be recognized as Mr. Congdon. On the other hand there were the Liberals of whom as prominent a man as any was Dr. Pringle. They drifted apart until there was a cleavage and a new organization was formed early in the year 1904, about six months before the general elections. They formed a new organization absolutely different from the other and called themselves a Liberal club. They were men who were opposed to Mr. Congdon and his party, who would not recognize the convention that selected Mr. Congdon, but men who, one and all, supported Dr. Thompson, who always was and still is at heart an honest and consistent Conservative. They practically supported Dr. Thompson, the present member for the Yukon, in his election, and were most active, even taking the platform in that election opposing Mr. Congdon and supporting Dr. Thompson. It is true that Dr. Thompson came here as an Independent, it is true that until that last night when he made his dramatic departure from here that he followed that course as an Independent. It is true also that he was always a Conservative, but out of consideration for his constituents he left the councils of the Conservative party. But, during the time he was in this House he never voted on want of confidence

motions, he consistently adhered to the position of an Independent and apart from the vote on the Autonomy Bill he always absented himself from votes, taking his course manifestly and openly and saying that that was what he was doing. When he was about to catch the midnight train for Vancouver, expecting a dissolution of this House, he said that from that night on he would be no longer an Independent. Thinking that he would not again appear in this parliament, he took occasion to say that he would return to his first love and his constant love, the Conservative party. It was that gentleman whom Dr. Pringle supported and at the same time he was very bold and very constant in his assertion that the only thing he had at heart was the good name of the Liberal party and the good name of Canada. I do not think we need read very much between the lines of his letters to conclude that Dr. Pringle was inspired by motives other than those which he wrote on the pages of those letters. We know the characters of the men who have been administrators of the Yukon. We know that they cannot for one moment be accused of a desire to shield immorality, graft, corruption or anything of that character. Let us start first with Commissioner Ogilvie. Then we have the Hon. James Hamilton Ross. These are two men whose honour I think nobody will question. They have neither loose views nor loose conduct with regard to morality or drunkenness or political corruption. Then take the next man, Mr. F. T. Congdon. Mr. Congdon may not be a brilliant success as a politician, he may not be an arch schemer, he may not be a good man to make devices and plans. I believe that in this respect Dr. Pringle can cut circles around him, but he is a man who no one will ever dare to say has loose views or conduct with regard to morality. I do not think that even the most careless speaker will ever say that he is loose in his views on even a moderate use of intoxicants or that he is a man with an inordinate desire to graft or be corrupt. I have never heard such a charge made against him and I am familiar with all of these charges. The charge that has been made is that he had associates and employees under him in his position as Commisioner who have been open to suspicion, but I am confident I am stating the truth when I say that no responsible person will venture to assert that he is crooked or that he is a person who would in any way recognize, protect, encourage or tolerate corruption.

Then we have had the representatives of the Yukon in this House. The first was the Hon. James Hamilton Ross. I spoke of him a moment ago. Then we have the present member, Dr. Thompson. Those are the only two representatives we have had in this House from the Yukon. There again we have two men who represent

public opinion a thousand times more than Dr. Pringle. They have sat here since 1900 but did they raise any voice of denunciation against this government ? Surely it was for them to say : The government is not endeavouring to enforce the laws in that land. It seems to me that it would have been their duty to do this had there been ground of complaint. Dr. Thompson's first duty was to represent the people of the Yukon, his one plank was that he would first and foremost represent the good opinion of the Yukon Territory in this House and apart from that he left party questions alone. Dr. Thompson is a man just as responsible as the reverend gentleman of whom I spoke, a man careful in his life, well advised in his views, a person who would not be a party to corruption or immorality in any form. Messrs. Ross and Thompson have been here, they have come and gone and it has remained to this late date, when the public servants are crying out for their salaries, it remains for the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) after all these years to conclude that this question is so urgent and such a disgrace to the country that he cannot let the public servants have their salaries but he must discuss the affairs of the Yukon Territory. I take the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) at his word and I too will be pleased to see the effect this will have on the country. Here on the evening of the 2nd of June, when the cheques are already in arrears and the government desires to have money voted to pay the civil servants that they may not only not fall into debt but into the unprofitable habit of going into debt, the hon. member for North Toronto prevents the granting of supplies in order to discuss this question. It is a most serious thing and the country will appreciate its seriousness, that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) rises day after day to bring up such questions. The duty of bringing up this matter would have fallen on Senator Ross and Dr. Thompson and not particularly or properly on the hon. member for North Toronto.

But there is another conclusion I wish to draw from the silence of these gentlemen on the subject and it is that in view of this silence the presumption is altogether in favour of the accused. I do not for a moment say that it necessarily proves the innocence of these parties but I do take the stand that it makes a great presumption of innocence and that if this outrageous scandal had existed in the Yukon for all these years we would have heard of it from the representatives of the Yukon. If the charges of the hon. member for North Toronto are true it surely lays a most grave and serious reflection upon Dr. Thompson and Senator Ross, his predecessor.

Mr. FOSTER. May I say that the papers upon which the whole information has been

based were not brought down to this House until a few weeks ago ?

Mr. FIELDING. Three months ago, the main return.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so, I had to ask for a supplementary return.

Mr. FIELDING. On the 3rd of March, just three months ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose it was three months ago.

Mr. KNOWLES. Suppose they had not been brought down at all, would not Dr. Thompson and Senator Ross know enough to bring it to our attention if it had been such a public scandal as has been suggested? The truth is they did know the facts but knowing them they have not spoken about this matter. Surely, if there had been the open, public, outrageous scandal of which we have heard this afternoon, there would have been no trouble in Dr. Pringle finding many citizens well disposed towards decency and good government and desirous of maintaining decency in the conduct of public officials, to come and give their evidence before Commissioner Henderson. There are plenty of citizens in the Yukon who have just as strict and just as wholesome views with regard to public morality—and with regard to private morality too if you like—as Rev. Dr. Pringle has, or any of our friends opposite who have spoken on this subject, and who would be as strongly animated by a desire to keep clean the public life of their community. The Rev. Dr. Pringle is not so much holier or better than all the other citizens of the Yukon that, if there had been this glaring outrage, he would be the only man who would like to see a reform effected. The House will agree with me, I am sure, that, in such a case, there would have been plenty of people desirous of maintaining public morality who would come forward and give their testimony to support Dr. Pringle in bringing about a reform.

I am glad that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is now in his place as there is one remark which I wish respectfully to make with regard to what he said concerning the putting down of dance halls. He seemed to be determined that he would not admit that the Yukon government was primarily responsible in this matter or was really responsible at all. He seemed to say, in the first place, that Dr. Pringle was the initiator of the movement and afterwards seemed to say—and I am sure, did say—that it was really an act that this government was responsible for, in effect an act of this government and not of the Yukon Council. The hon. gentleman laid it down, I think, that everything done by the Yukon Council this government must get credit or blame for. I cannot understand the hon. gentleman taking that position. The Yukon Council surely exercises jurisdiction within the limits of the powers conferred upon it by the Yukon Act and amendments thereto, just as the provincial legislatures act within their jurisdiction by virtue of the British North America Act and the amendments thereto. The passing of such legislation, I submit, is wholly within the power of the Yukon Council; and I cannot for a moment understand my hon. friend making the statement that it is something for which this government must assume responsibility. And I was certainly very much surprised that the hon. gentleman should go so far as to say that Mr. Justice Dugas, who is Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Yukon, in the discharge of his duties would be subject to political influence. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that; if I am wrong, I hope he will correct me.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to be governed by what I said, and not by the construction which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) puts upon what I said. I may add, if the hon. gentleman will allow me, that what I stated in the first instance was that (Commissioner Henderson) procured the change in the law when he went there. That was disputed by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver).

Mr. KNOWLES. With that statement I find no fault. I am corrected by the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) if he said that I am incorrect in believing that he implied or stated that Mr. Justice Dugas, in his opinion, would be influenced by political considerations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I used no such language.

Mr. KNOWLES. I asked the hon. gentleman a question, and I understood him to say, 'Yes.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; I made no direct allusion to Mr. Justice Dugas.

Mr. KNOWLES. I asked the hon. gentleman directly and distinctly if he made that statement. I do not see how he can say he made no reference to Mr. Justice Dugas, for he answered my question. I made the reference in the first place, but the hon. gentleman answered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is entirely in error. I gave no answer of that kind. I said that the government, by virtue of the fact that it appointed a majority of the members, could, at any time, control the council. The point on which issue was taken by the Minister of the Interior was that which I have mentioned just now. I said that Mr. Commissioner Henderson was responsible for having brought about the change, and I said

that he had done it because Dr. Pringle had brought the subject to his attention. I afterwards read Commissioner Henderson's own report in which he declared that, having had his attention directed to the subject by Dr. Pringle's letter, he had canvassed every member of the council and procured the necessary change in the legislation to be introduced by Mr. Justice Dugas, and it was passed upon his initiative.

Mr. KNOWLES. Well, of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, which, I have no doubt, is correct. I understood him differently, and I believe that other hon. members on this side understood him as I did.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They misunderstood me.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am sure of it. However, the hon. gentleman did say that the Yukon Council was subject to the control of this government——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLES——in its legislation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLES. And I understood that control was not only in the way of the veto, but control in the ordinary sense.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In other words, it is in the power of this government to enforce its policy in the Yukon by reason of the control it has over the membership of that council.

Mr. KNOWLES. That would be possible only by way of removal of members of the council and the appointment of people who are nothing but tools in the hands of the government, and——

Mr. BRISTOL. You would not call them tools if they carried out the policy of the government?

Mr. KNOWLES. Certainly, if they were not true to their own opinions and to their oaths, I would call them tools. That is what I said, and that is what I shall be ready to say to-morrow. I was about to say that I understood the leader of the opposition to say that the law which was passed with regard to gambling houses and dance halls was a law which was made by reason of the fact that it was desired by this government. If so, I am confident that he does not do justice to the gentlemen who are members of the council, especially to the learned judge who is a member of that council, in thinking that that learned gentleman would fail to use his own good judgment and be true to his oath of office. I am sure the leader of the opposition could not, on reflection, renew that statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Apparently, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) has not understood me yet. What I intended to suggest, and what I desire to adhere to is that if the government of this country found the men appointed to the Yukon Council persisted in maintaining a policy and a system under which the most notorious houses of prostitution in the shape of dance halls were run in that country, it would be possible for this government, if it found remonstrances with these gentlemen unavailing, to dismiss them from their office and appoint men who would not allow that condition to continue.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. gentleman will correct me if I am wrong. He will agree that that could have no influence upon the present action of the council in Dawson?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking of the supposed control of the government of the Yukon Council.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think the hon. gentleman cannot understand the point to which I am referring—his contention, as I understand it, that the legislation under which the dance halls were driven out was the result of the desire of the government at Ottawa and not the result of the judgment of the Council of the Yukon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the contrary, I stated that it was the result of Mr. Commissioner Henderson's initiative—that he went to the Yukon and, having had his attention called to the matter by the Rev. Dr. Pringle, took steps which resulted in this change.

Mr. KNOWLES. Very well, let it go. The charge is so flat that I felt disposed not to speak at all. I was willing, however, to say a few words; but really, the attack is dead, and it seems almost like abusing the dead to go on with this discussion.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Even the father of it has run away.

Mr. KNOWLES. It is further to be observed, as you will see by reference to the file, that Dr. Pringle has stated that he has charges only against two men. Mr. Pringle informed the commission to this effect, as you will see in the commissioner's letter, addressed to Hon. Frank Oliver, dated September 23, 1907.

He says:

He informed me that he had no charges to make against any person in the employ of the government other than Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow.

In regard to these two gentlemen, and these are all that a royal commission could deal with, one of them is out of the service of the government and I do not see anything so very urgent about his case that the public supply should be stopped to deal with it. With regard to Mr. Lithgow, he

is a gentleman who was brought into the public service by hon. gentlemen opposite, he has been kept in the public service by this government because he is a good official and I do not think that any one in the Yukon or out of it will say that he has ever been guilty of neglect of duty or malfeasance in office. He is a very superior man, a good official and the public service has not suffered by the fact that this gentleman has been kept in the employ of the government. The fact that he has been kept in the public service is no reason why the supplies should be held up and the public servants should lose their monthly pay. Mr. Lithgow, Mr. Girouard and Mr. Pringle sat for years together in the Yukon council, and Mr. Pringle never raised any objection when they stood as equals upon the floor of the local legislature. It is very strange that it took him all these years to find these things out about Mr. Lithgow and Mr. Girouard.

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) spoke with regard to the Governor General's letter. He seemed to say that the Governor General's letter was instrumental in bringing the government to a condition of action. It is very clear that the Minister of the Interior received a communication from the secretary of the Governor General and from Mr. Pringle at the same time, that is the first communication he ever had from Mr. Pringle, so that it is impossible that he or the government should only have been stirred to action by the receipt of a communication from the secretary of the Governor General. It is not fair or worthy of the hon. leader of the opposition to advance the argument that it was the letter of the private secretary of the Governor General that stirred the minister up. If that were so it would be very easy to get anything done because any man, upon writing to the government, could also drop a note to the Governor General and the Governor General's secretary could say that such and such a letter had been received. I want to read the opening part of the letter of the 28th August, written by the Minister of the Interior to the Rev. John Pringle:

> Your letter of July 31, was brought to my attention on my return from an extended trip to the west, which began on July 19th and ended on Monday, August 26.

Only two days before this letter was written.

> I was, therefore, not in Ottawa when your letter arrived, and was consequently unable to reply to it before. Since my return I have received a letter from the Governor General's secretary informing me that His Excellency had received a copy of the same letter. The premier had also informed me that on receipt of the copy of the letter sent to him he communicated with Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow the allegations made by yourself against them.

Showing that the point that was made by the hon. leader of the opposition, that the Minister of the Interior was moved to action by the fact that Mr. Pringle saw fit to write to the Governor General was not quite fair.

There has been a good deal said this afternoon about the lax way in which justice is administered in the Yukon and these statements have been made upon a very feeble foundation, such as the letter which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) read, signed by 'Bona fide.'

Mr. FOSTER. That is a good name.

Mr. KNOWLES. It is a good name, and it is a name that any rascal can make use of.

Mr. FOSTER. That is rather an imputation on 'Bona fide.' You should not do that.

Mr. KNOWLES. If 'Bona Fide' would write in a little wiser mood there would be no occasion to make a remark of that kind about him. I wish to give a quotation from a lecture given by Mr. Justice Craig, who is one of the judges in the Yukon, a report of which appears in the weekly issue of January 17 of the 'Dawson Daily News,' the organ of the Conservative party in Dawson. Mr. Justice Craig, to whom no person will take any exception, delivered a lecture which occupies three pages of this paper. I will read only his closing words:

> Before I close I just want to mention a matter—a matter of some delicacy—which I should mention. Judges are not generally allowed to defend themselves and I have never done that and never will, although I have had occasion to perhaps sometimes.
>
> I see lately by the outside press that it is stated broadly—and without qualification, mind you, without qualification, don't forget that—that law is not enforced in the Yukon territory. Besides being a judge of this territory I hold the position of police magistrate and have been acting in that capacity for the past four months.

I should explain that the position of police magistrate in the city of Dawson is always held by the junior judge. It is usually held by Mr. Justice MacAulay, the junior judge, but he was absent and the next junior judge is Mr. Justice Craig. Judge Craig continues:

> There has never been a case submitted to me in all those four months which has been refused prosecution but one—and it may be that which the committee were thinking about when they made their report. That is a case where a man wanted a warrant to arrest his co-partner in a cabin, to get his latch key back. I refused the warrant.
>
> I may say that in all the eight years I have been here the law in the Yukon has been enforced in precisely the same way as the law in every other part of Canada has been enforced. There is no distinction, the same laws prevail, the same rules for enforcing

them prevail, and citizens have the same right to complain and complaints, so far as I know, are listened to.

There has been no specific charge in the papers. I don't know what the complaint is. But I say that, speaking broadly and generally, it is unfair to the Yukon territory—I do not care about myself—and unfair to the officials that statements should go abroad that law generally is not generally enforced in the Yukon territory. I know of no mining camp where law is so well observed, where men and women are so safe in going about the streets as they are in this camp.

I regret to have to make these remarks, but I feel it to be my duty—not personally, mind you, but as an official charged with the prosecution of the law in this country—to say that I know of no case where the law has not been enforced, and I know of no case where the law has been asked to be enforced and refusal made.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I remind the hon. gentleman that I brought to the notice of this House, some few years ago, a specific case where two men were fined, and, I think, imprisoned for taking timber without a permit when the timber dues had been paid and when they desired to appeal and when they attempted to get the evidence which they had a right to get it was denied them over and over again, they could not get it and they have not got it to this day.

Mr. KNOWLES. I think I am familiar with the case that the hon. gentleman refers to, but if I understand that case, it was simply that the machinery of the criminal law was called in when it should never have been called in; it was such a trivial matter. I understand that the charge of hon. gentlemen opposite is that in important matters the criminal law is not called in. The hon. gentleman has gone back year after year; I do not know how many years he has gone back to bring these cases up. He told us this afternoon about a whisky contract twelve years old. That is getting pretty old and probably if whisky is that old it will be better than when they took it in. Our hon. friends opposite are fond of bringing up these matters of great age, and so we hear session after session of the 'Arctic,' the North Atlantic Trading Company, the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, the Yukon liquor permits, always the same old accusations. We have wasted this whole day upon a matter that is many years old, that has been before the public as an outstanding scandal during all these years, and it is only at this late date that they again repeat the story for the purpose of delaying the business of the House.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). Considering the eagerness of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) not to waste the time of the House he has delivered rather a long and pointless defence of what he calls a dead attack made by the opposition. Had he the courage of his convictions he would have said nothing, or else he would have said something to the point. The matter is in a nutshell. The first question is : Who makes this attack, and the answer is : The Rev. John Pringle. And Mr. Pringle is, as he says in his letter of the 27th of May, 1902 :

> I am the Presbyterian minister at Bonanza. I am a citizen of Canada by birth, a Liberal by conviction, believing that the triumph of Liberal principles is the triumph of might.

Is Dr. Pringle alone in his attack? Not at all. On the 13th November, 1907, at the regular meeting of the Young Men's Liberal Club, composed of what may be called the decent young Liberals of the Yukon Territory, a resolution was passed which unanimously confirmed the statements of the Rev. Dr. Pringle. Now, I have the honour of knowing the Rev. Dr. Pringle. I have been in the Yukon and I can say that I did not find there a man who was more highly respected and more generally revered by the people of the Territory than was the Rev. Dr. Pringle. When you find such a man simply committing the sin of being a Liberal of the old school attached to true Liberal principles, and when you find him supported by the decent young Liberals of the country, one would think that a good tactician and able statesman like the Prime Minister would be able to discern that the Rev. Dr. Pringle was telling the truth and not the man who wanted to retain office at all hazard. What interest had the Rev. John Pringle, a Liberal by birth, a man highly respected, one of the leading divines of the Presbyterian Church, what interest had he to tell lies? There can be no suggestion that he had the slightest possible interest in doing so. But the other men who contradicted him, the men who wish to retain office, the men whose living depended on their retaining office, they had an interest in refuting the statements of Dr. Pringle, and it is the statement of such men that the Prime Minister takes as against the statement of Dr. Pringle, supported as it is by the young Liberals of the Yukon. The right hon. gentleman says that in 1902 there was no charges of a specific character. It is a peculiarity of the Prime Minister and those associated with him that they never are able to find a specific charge when they don't want to investigate. But if the right hon. gentleman will peruse the letter of the 27th November, 1902, he will find there a charge sufficiently specific to warrant investigation. This document came to the Prime Minister from a Liberal by conviction, and it came from a reverend gentleman entitled to the highest respect, although it has suited hon. gentlemen opposite to-day to cast aspersions on the Rev.

Dr. Pringle. In 1902 Dr. Pringle brought to the attention of the Prime Minister the subject of hydraulic concessions, then a question of live interest in the Yukon, and because of which considerable ill-feeling was engendered against the government of the day, it being stated, and I believe truely, that a great many valuable concessions that could have been worked successfully by the miners themselves had been given to certain favourites of the Liberal party. It is true that the present Minister of the Interior has properly seen fit to cancel certain of these concessions, but the fact remains that as far back as 1902 this question was brought to the attention of the First Minister and this business administration went asleep until 1906 over a matter of such vital importance to the people of the Yukon Territory. The reverend gentleman goes on to say :

Concessions have been granted, I am convinced, not only carelessly, but iniquitously; the heritage of our people given to satisfy the greed of capital, without due consideration of the rights of the people in the ground, or of the character of the statements made to secure these concessions.

The government said this was not specific enough, and so they did not take the trouble to investigate it and to see whether the statement was true. The reverend gentleman complained of the dance halls in which some of the government officials were frequenters, and he says :

But the worst feature of the licensed houses here is that a very large percentage of them are houses of prostitution. Many of them run, it is true, by people of good character. But a large number of bawdy houses, with a government license to prey upon the public.

He says further :

The law is systematically manipulated, not to protect the public but to protect and nurse the gambler and shame honest men.

The government saw fit to take no action with regard to these charges. On the 3rd of January, 1905, another letter came to the First Minister, and the specific charges in that letter were such as to demand investigation at the hands of any well meaning government. Mr. Pringle's fairness is shown by the fact that he is glad to concede the part that Mr. Ross, as Yukon Commissioner, took in putting down the abuses referred to, and he points out that these abuses have again arisen and are in fuller swing than they were before Mr. Ross took means to mitigate the evil. But instead of investigating the matter the Prime Minister simply takes the word of the men charged against the statements of the Rev. Dr. Pringle, who could have no personal interest in the matter. And so it was allowed to rest until 1907, when charges were again made, and the Minister of the Interior on the 28th of August, 1907, wrote to the Hon. Alexander Henderson a letter which, although it has been already read, it is proper to read again, because in my judgment it is the key to the whole situation. The letter says :

Dear Sir,—I beg to inclose herewith copy of a letter received by me from the Governor General's office. As you will note from the address and contents, the original of this letter was adressed to the premier and to myself.

You will be good enough to investigate fully the specific charges made by Mr. Pringle against Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow, and will, of course, call upon Mr. Pringle to substantiate those charges. You are to investigate fully and report.

Should the Rev. Mr. Pringle desire to lay charges against any other persons in the employ of the government, or of the Interior Department especially, you are to investigate them as well.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) FRANK OLIVER.

The point of that letter is simply this. If the Minister of the Interior is to be taken at his word, if he is to be bound by that letter, he is of opinion that there were charges to be investigated, and if so, there was, as he knows only one proper method of investigating a charge of a public character. If those charges were charges against those gentlemen in their private capacity—and I am passing no opinion on the truth or falsity of the charges themselves—it was not the business of the Minister of the Interior to investigate them. He had a right to investigate the charges only if they came under part 1 or part 2 of chapter 104 of the Act respecting Public and Departmental inquiries. I agree with the First Minister that they do not come under part 2, and that if they come under any part of that Act they come under part 1, which provides :

Th Govenor in Council may, whenever he deems it expedient, cause inquiry to be made into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof.

Under that section the government could have investigated the concessions referred to, the abuse of the license system, the character of any of the officials of the government so far as it affected the good government of Canada. If there was any right to investigate at all, there was only one proper form of investigation, for an obvious reason. Does any sensible man in this House think, with the character of the material on which these charges are based, that any one would voluntarily come forward and give testimony before the commissioner ? They would not do so, for two reasons : they would have no protection at the hands of the court, and they would lay themselves open, whether they were

telling the truth or not, to a charge of slander; and that is what has happened, for an action for libel has been brought against the Rev. John Pringle. Furthermore, you could not compel witnesses to come forward and give evidence. It is years ago that some of the events charged took place. Witnesses to these events might not be in the Yukon at the time of the investigation; their conduct money would have to be paid, wherever they might be, and they would certainly have to be subpœnaed and if they gave their evidence under compulsion, it would have to be before a tribunal that could give them ample protection. If the Minister of the Interior really desired an investigation, he was in duty bound to have a proper investigation under the Act, as Mr. Pringle demanded. Well, what happened? Mr. Henderson, on the 8th of November, 1907, wrote to Mr. Oliver as follows:

Dear Mr. Oliver,—I am inclosing herewith a copy of the correspondence relating to the charges of the Rev. Dr. Pringle against Messrs. Girouard and Lithgow. You will see from Dr. Pringle's letter to me of the 23rd ultimo, he declines to appear as a party in what he calls an informal investigation. I would suggest, if agreeable to you, that I be appointed a commissioner to investigate the charges under the provisions of the Inquiries Act, chapter 104, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) ALEXANDER HENDERSON,
Commissioner.

In that connection, I want to call attention to a further letter written by Mr. Henderson to the Rev. John Pringle, as follows:

Dawson, Yukon Territory, October 30, 1907.
Sir,—In reply to your communication of the 23rd instant, in which you inform me that you must adhere to your decision contained in your letter of the 14th instant, not to take any part in the informal investigation into the charges against Messrs. Lithgow and Girouard, I beg to say that I am requesting from the government that authority be given to me to investigate the charges on the lines of a commission, which will enable me to issue summonses and to take the evidence of witnesses under oath. I trust this course will be deemed satisfactory.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) ALEXANDER HENDERSON,
Commission, Yukon Territory.

That was a letter from the commissioner of the Yukon and a lawyer to the Rev. Mr. Pringle, conceding his position that an informal investigation could not be satisfactory, but that the proper course was that Mr. Henderson should be appointed a commissioner under the Act. He writes to the minister suggesting such an investigation, and the minister says, no, I will not have it. And so, as the Minister of the Interior and the government did not desire any real investigation, but wanted to bury these charges in oblivion, the minister goes back on his original promise to have an investigation, and they do nothing at all but endeavour to cover up and conceal one of the worst scandals that disgraces the administration of this government.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) desired to avail himself of this matter as a convenient opportunity to occupy another day and thus prevent the progress of the very urgent and proper business of the House, the passage of the supplies which are necessary for the carrying on of the King's government, I must admit at once that he has quite achieved his purpose. But if he had any other object in view, I confess that I am utterly unable to discover it. Why the hon. gentleman should bring this matter up at all at this moment, if he had any other purpose in view, is difficult to understand. The matter is not new. This story of Yukon difficulties has been before the country a considerable time. My hon. friend has suggested that the Rev. Mr. Pringle is the first man who has had the courage to refer to these dreadful things that occurred in the Yukon. That was hardly just to a very distinguished member of this parliament who a few years ago made a speech of seven hours in making accusations of a general character with reference to Yukon affairs, and, finding that he had omitted one or two things, made another speech of eight or nine hours to make up the deficiency. Perhaps the fact that that gentleman, though a very able man, failed to accomplish very much by his attack, may have been the reason that from time to time we heard less and less about these Yukon scandals.

Nor do we forget that, in connection with a discussion of that kind, the distinguished leader of the opposition of that day, making charges of a general character, such as those made to-day—in which my hon. friend wandered over the whole history of the Yukon—went so far as to mention the name of one of the citizens of Canada and accused him of graft. But when that citizen took action in the courts of the country to vindicate himself and bring his accuser to account, Sir Charles Tupper, promptly climbed down and made a humble apology to the person aggrieved. And I am inclined to think that if we were to pass from generalities and come down to particulars, the same experience would follow to-day as did then. In this matter one or two gentlemen, whose names are freely mentioned, are personally known to me. I refer particularly to Messrs. Congdon and Lithgow.

There is really little against Mr. Congdon although his name figures in Mr. Pringle's correspondence pretty extensively. When we come down however to specific statements, we do not find any accusation against him. What we find are statements of a personal character against Messrs. Lithgow and Girouard. If I heard the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) rightly a moment ago, he considered that there was nothing to investigate. I understood him to say that the Minister of the Interior could only have the right to investigate matters affecting the official conduct of persons in his employ, and that it would be no part of his duty to have an investigation into their private character. Unless, therefore, there is a charge made against them in their official capacity, the Minister of the Interior had no right to order an investigation at all.

Mr. BRISTOL. I was not expressing an opinion on the charges but was simply commenting on the fact that the minister had ordered an investigation, and I was pointing out that the investigation would not be into charges merely of a personal character but into charges with respect to conduct in the performance of a public duty.

Mr. FIELDING. That is quite right. If the charges were of a personal character and had no relation to public duties, the Minister of the Interior had no right to order an investigation at all.

Mr. BRISTOL. But he did order one.

Mr. FIELDING. I am giving the view which the hon. member for Centre Toronto expressed. The public records show that although there were general charges and statements covering the whole administration of the Yukon, when we read the correspondence and sift the whole matter down, it resolves itself into mere personal charges against the private character of these gentlemen and nothing more. And according to my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), those are not proper subjects for an official inquiry. I have here the letter of the 2nd October, 1907, written by Mr. Pringle to Mr. Henderson, in which he specifies his charges against Mr. Lithgow and Mr. Girouard. Mr. Pringle says :

> I am prepared for the investigation which you have been instructed to hold into the charges which I have made of scandalous living on the part of J. T. Lithgow and J. E. Girouard, prominent public servants in the Yukon.
> I am prepared to prove——

And then he goes on to state his charges in clauses 1, 2 and 3. These clauses I do not wish to quote because I am not anxious to needlessly advertise the very improper charges made. But every one of these paragraphs has reference to the personal and private life of the two gentlemen named.

Mr. BRISTOL. But if the personal character of an official of the government was such as to create the conviction that he was unfit for the position, would not that be a matter for investigation ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not discussing the purely legal question as to whether these accusations would come under the term of any particular Act. But what right would the Minister of the Interior have to appoint a royal commission to investigate unless the matter to be investigated were one affecting official conduct ?

Mr. tBRISTOL. But he did.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think he would have any right to appoint a royal commission and in my opinion the demand for such a commission was most absurd.

Mr. BRISTOL. The commissioner of the Yukon and an ex-judge thought it very proper.

Mr. FIELDING. I have known eminent judges to differ in these matters. I would not set my own opinion as a layman against that of a judge, but judges like doctors often differ. I take my hon. friend's opinion that the Minister of the Interior had no right, as a matter of common sense and reason, to investigate a mere charge against the private character of any man. Suppose that in Montreal or Ottawa some good citiezn—even a christian minister of the high rank of Mr. Pringle—should write a letter to the Minister of Customs in which he expressed his belief that a certain collector of customs or other customs official in some district was leading an immoral life, would it be reasonable to demand that a royal commission should be appointed to investigate into such a charge? It may be a question whether the minister would be justified in taking any notice of such a letter. If he thought the matter sufficiently serious, he might send some official down to call on the man accused and give him an opportunity to explain and then make a report, but no one would seriously contend that it was a proper matter for an investigation by a Royal Commission. Suppose some Toronto officer—especially a good Conservative appointed many years ago—were accused of improper conduct in his private capacity, and the government were to appoint a royal commission, on the strength of such an accusation, to investigate into this man's private life, my hon. friend from Centre Toronto would be the first to complain that the investigation was a case of political persecution. Putting aside for a moment this idea that there is something extraordinary about this Yukon affair, and treating it as we would any other case that

might arise any time in the public service, it will be at once seen how unreasonable was the demand for a royal commission. The curious part of it all is that what Mr. Pringle tells us was so notorious does not appear to have been notorious in the mind of anybody else. He says that the conduct of these men was for years a matter of public notoriety. Well, the commissioners of the Yukon have been men of undoubted high character, honesty and repute, and they have not reported any such terrible condition of affairs. The Minister of the Interior himself went out to the Yukon to ascertain the facts and find out for himself what were the conditions existing there. Surely if this matter were of the great notoriety described by Mr. Pringle, when the minister arrived at the government office or his hotel in Dawson city, he would have been met by men in that city who would have told him the true condition of things. But while he receievd complaints concerning a good many other matters, not one word did he hear against the reputation or the conduct of these men, whose conduct Mr. Pringle says was a matter of public notoriety and great scandal to the community. Do not imagine for a moment that I am questioning the zeal or the good motives of Mr. Pringle. But we know that often well meaning men, animated by the best intentions, allow their zeal to outrun their discretion. Any one who reads Mr. Pringle's letters will find that, whether he was influenced by personal motives or not, he has made remarkable statements and used very strong language. For instance, in one of his letters he takes the trouble to repeat the story that one of the Christian ministers of the city of Dawson accepted contributions from the dance halls and other places of ill repute upon the condition that he would keep his mouth closed.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like my hon. friend to give the quotation. I have read that letter carefully and I do not think it bears that interpretation.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Pringle states: I have not the report but I made the extract —that one of these disreputable people told him that

A gift bestowed upon one of our Christian churches was given by him with the understanding that it was to close the minister's mouth; that the church should not disturb the gambling den and the dance hall.

Mr. FOSTER. That is just the reverse of the way the Minister of Finance put it at first.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. FOSTER. He said that a Christian minister of one of the churches had accepted the gift on the understanding that he was to say nothing about the dance hall.

Mr. FIELDING. An understanding requires two parties.

Mr. FOSTER. I merely wish to call attention to the difference in the statements.

Mr. FIELDING. It does make a difference. I quote again from Dr. Pringle. He repeats the statement that one of these infamous people to whom he refers told him that

A gift bestowed upon one of our Christian churches was given by him with the understanding that it was to close the minister's mouth; that the church should not disturb the gambling den and the dance hall.

An understanding implies agreement between two parties. I cannot have an understanding in a matter of that kind alone. If my hon. friend and I engage in a certain transaction on an understanding that is an understanding between us and therefore the Christian minister must have accepted the gift on the understanding, otherwise this has no meaning.

Mr. FOSTER. The Finance Minister says the two had an understanding and that a Christian minister received the gift on that basis.

Mr. FIELDING. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. And that Dr. Pringle quoted the statement of one of these people that it had been so.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not quote it as Dr. Pringle's statement.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend said the Christian minister received the donation on the understanding that he was to say nothing about the gambling den.

Mr. FIELDING. I say that is the only inference. I did not quote Dr. Pringle as the author of the statement; I said he repeated a story which had reached him and to which he attaches sufficient importance to include it in his letter to the Prime Minister. In that letter he repeats that story that he was informed, and evidently believed it and thought it so important as to put it in his letter, for if it was a mere passing report and he did not believe it, what shall we say of his discretion in inserting it in a letter to the Prime Minister?

Mr. FOSTER. There was enough in it to show what an interested party thought he had done and thought he could do.

Mr. FIELDING. There can be no understanding except between two parties and when he says that

A gift bestowed upon one of our Christan churches was given by him with the understanding that it was to close the minister's mouth; that the church should not disturb the gambling den and the dance hall.

I say that was an accusation that the Christian minister accepted it on that condition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for East Grey inquired eloquently : What will the ministers of the gospel think of these things. I would like to ask what the ministers of the gospel in Dawson and throughout the Yukon will think of the wisdom of Dr. Pringle in sending that accusation against them, for it is against them, in a letter to the Prime Minister of Canada.

Dr. Pringle in that letter had a good deal to say about concessions and mentioned particularly what is known as the Bronson and Ray concession. He said that in the Bronson and Ray concession none of the conditions upon which it was granted have been fulfilled. He said it was easy to cancel it. I do not know whether Dr. Pringle's information was what influenced my hon. friend but when the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) came into office his attention was drawn to some of these concessions in the Yukon, he thought the conditions had not been fulfilled and he cancelled the very concession to which Dr. Pringle here refers. I regret to say that the Minister of the Interior has not been sustained in that. Dr. Pringle says the conditions were not fulfilled and it was a great scandal that these concessions were not cancelled. That consession was cancelled but the Supreme Court of Canada decided yesterday that the cancellation was improper and that there was not sufficient ground for it.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me, I think he had better give a little of his advice to the Minister of the Interior. He had exactly the same information and he expressed the same view with a great deal more force because he absolutely cancelled the concession. You must not find fault with Dr. Pringle for having no better information about the legality of the cancellation than the minister himself who was familiar with all the circumstances.

Mr. FIELDING. There is this difference that Dr. Pringle brings it into his letters and makes a great scandal of it ; he says that every one knew in the Yukon that the conditions were not fulfilled and the Minister of the Interior, acting I am sure with the best of his judgment, decided to cancel the concession.

Mr. FOSTER. He must have been led away by Dr. Pringle.

Mr. FIELDING. And the Supreme Court of Canada according to the report in the newspapers, yesterday, has decided that the Rev. John Pringle was wrong and that the Minister of the Interior was wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the Minister of the Interior have the legal advice of the government before he cancelled this ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know. For my present purpose it is not very important. I simply want to mention it as another illustration that my friend Dr. Pringle is zealous in making rash statements about matters as to which he has no better information than the rest of mankind.

I repeat that the interest I feel in the matter is largely a personal interest as respects the gentlemen concerned. I have already said that there is no accusation against Mr. Congdon, although his name is frequently mentioned. He was a very eminent barrister among the younger bar of the province of Nova Scotia, a man of undoubted ability and the highest character, and whatever may be said about his conduct in political matters in the Yukon, I must say that no man who ever knew him in Nova Scotia would have the slightest doubt that in everything that makes for a clean life and for a high moral standard and integrity of character he sustained his reputation in the west.

With regard to Mr. Lithgow I feel an interest because I had something to do with his appointment. In the early days of the Yukon, the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) came to me to discuss financial arrangements for the Yukon and we agreed that it was necessary to have a very capable and strong man in there to deal with that branch of the public business. Mr. Sifton suggested that I should recommend a man who would be satisfactory to the Finance department. I took time to consider it and selected Mr. Lithgow. In view of the suggestions that there is some political end to serve, that there was some favour to be done for our political friends, it is worth mentioning, although it is not important, that Mr. Lithgow was no political friend of mine. I have known him from boyhood and he has always been a Conservative. His father, a very eminent citizen of Halifax, who has recently passed away, was not only a Conservative, known to be warmly in sympathy with the Conservative party, but in one of the political campaigns of which I have a very lively recollection, he was one of the leading writers in the public press in the support of the Conservative party. The Lithgows, father and son, and every member of the family, so far as I have ever known, have belonged to the Conservative party. John T. Lithgow came into the service of the government when the Conservatives were in power. He was appointed to the Halifax branch of the Finance Department by Sir Leonard Tilley. He has been twenty-eight years in the public service. He had served there under several ministers and when I came into office I knew enough of him to value his character, capacity and service. When I had an opportunity of either promoting a man, for it was a promotion, or bringing a man from the outside, I selected

him, notwithstanding his known Conservative proclivities and recommended him to the Minister of the Interior, and he was sent to the Yukon. So I felt an interest in the matter. I am bound to say that notwithstanding all that has happened, I have never found a shadow of reason for regretting that I recommended the Minister of the Interior to appoint Jack Lithgow, as everyone knew him in Halifax. He is a man well known throughout the maritime provinces and I believe wherever he was known he was respected, irrespective of all consideration of politics or anything else. He went out to that country at a time when there were very great difficulties. He passed through that period when officials on all sides were being accused of wrongdoing—most frequently I hope without just cause—and Mr. Lithgow passed unscathed through all the stormy times of the Yukon administration. I never met a man, until this letter of Dr. Pringle's was presented, who knew anything about the Yukon who did not bear testimony to the value and faithful services of John T. Lithgow. I want to say that for him now. I believe that Mr. Lithgow has had his faults; I believe that, so far as I have been able to make inquiries, on one occasion he permitted himself to stray from the path of sobriety. I believe that on one occasion he did himself discredit. But it is but fair to say that there are but few men who can submit to have applied to them the severe standard that never on any occasion shall they have allowed themselves to depart from the line of propriety. Notwithstanding the fact that, on that occasion, the man was at fault, I say he has been a most faithful, useful and valuable servant of Canada, and it would be a scandal and a shame if he were dismissed for that one fault. And I want to emphasize the fact that this is purely a matter affecting Mr. Lithgow's personal character. Even Dr. Pringle does not allege that Mr. Lithgow has failed in his duty. True, he did, in one passage, make a reference to Mr. Lithgow, which, I am sure, he could not sustain and which, I am equally sure, will not be accepted by any friend who has known Mr. Lithgow. He spoke not only of Mr. Lithgow's personal character, but in a passage which I thought I had at hand, he stated that Mr. Lithgow had been working in the interest of the gang of thieves who had been having both hands in the public treasury. Mr. Pringle is the only man I have ever heard who would make any such accusation against Mr. Lithgow. The universal testimony of friend and foe is that, through all these troublous times, this man proved himself exceptionally qualified for his duties and performed his duties with great ability and fidelity.

Reference is made in the papers to a resolution said to have been passed by the Young Men's Liberal Club of Dawson, opposing a movement said to be on foot for the appointment of Mr. Lithgow as commissioner. If that Young Men's Liberal Club did pass such a resolution, it was pretty good evidence of the fact that the government were not dealing with the matter in a partisan way, for, whatever favour and consideration they gave to Mr. Lithgow, they did not give through the influence of the young Liberals of that territory. But there is this further communication:

Dawson, November 15, 1907.

Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Ottawa.

Sir,—A resolution was passed last evening at a meeting of the Young Men's Liberal Club, at which seven members were present, and of which I am president, strongly condemning Mr. John T. Lithgow, controller, as being unfit to occupy the position that he now holds. I beg to state that I am not in accord with said resolution and have refused to sign it.

I have the honour to be,
Your obedient servant,
JOHN GRANT.

So, the meeting to which reference has been made appears to have been a very small meeting, and the very chairman who presided over this deliberations took the trouble to write this letter to the Prime Minister explaining that he did not approve of the resolution and had refused to sign it.

Now, I want to press an argument referred to by others and to which in a word by the way this afternoon, I alluded. Hon. gentlemen have quoted from Dr. Pringle the statement that the election of Dr. Thompson in the Yukon was brought about as a vindication of the rights of the decent people of the Yukon and as a protest against dance halls, gambling hells and that sort of thing. If we accept that as true, then Dr. Thompson, when he came to this House was to be recognized as the interpreter of that sentiment. That hon. gentleman sat here year after year; he was personally familiar with this matter and was chosen especially to represent it; and yet not on one occasion did he venture to rise in his place and make any such accusations concerning any official as have been made in his absence by the hon. member for North Toronto. I think the public mind will regard that fact as important. It is only reasonable to suppose that, if the public conscience in Dawson had been so shocked, if these matters were of such public notoriety, if a great wrong had been done and the public service had scandalized the community, and if no remedy had been afforded for these things, surely the man elected by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, elected and sent to the House to remedy such abuses, would have stood up in this House, explained and denounced the

abuses and demanded a remedy. Yet that hon. gentleman sat in his place here year after year, even long after these papers had been brought before the House, and never raised his voice in condemnation. I venture to draw the conclusion that that hon. gentleman, who knew Mr. Lithgow and knew the facts, was satisfied that the public interest was best served, and would continue to be best served, by keeping Mr. John T. Lithgow in the office which he has filled so ably and so successfully.

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

Civil government—Department of the Interior, $190,012.50.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister of the Interior give us a statement of the increases and changes that have been made in the officers of this department?

Mr. OLIVER. The vote asked for civil government, salaries, is $190,012.50. The vote last year was $182,050, there being an increase of $7,962.50. This is made up by statutory increases, $4,925; promotions, $5,000; difference in estimating for the salaries of three third-class clerks, $137.50; then there is deducted $2,100, decrease in salaries occasioned by promotions and changes, and the $7,962.50 is accounted for.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has fourteen chief clerks whereas last year he had twelve. Have two been promoted to chief clerkships?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. J. M. Roberts and Mr. P. Marchand have been promoted from the position of first-class clerks to be chief clerks. Mr. Roberts is in charge of the registration branch and Mr. Marchand is deputy or assistant to the chief accountant.

Mr. FOSTER. Have these chief clerkships been created yet?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, these offices have been created by order in council and we are now asking for money to meet the salaries.

Mr. FOSTER. What is Mr. Roberts' salary at present?

Mr. OLIVER. $1,500, and we desire to make it $1,900.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has Mr. Roberts been in that branch?

Mr. OLIVER. Since 1900.

Mr. FOSTER. In what position and at what salary?

Mr. OLIVER. He came in as a temporary clerk at $900. He was employed at first in the timber and mines branch, afterwards removed to the registration branch and finally promoted to the chiefship of the registration branch.

Mr. FOSTER. When was he made a permanent clerk?

Mr. OLIVER. In 1903.

Mr. FOSTER. At what salary?

Mr. OLIVER. $1,100.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be a second-class clerk?

Mr. OLIVER. A senior second.

Mr. FOSTER. When was he promoted after that?

Mr. OLIVER. He was made a first-class clerk in 1906 at $1,500. I was in error in saying that his present salary is $1,500; it is $1,550.

Mr. FOSTER. What does he get as chief clerk?

Mr. OLIVER. $1,900.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister not think that has been pretty rapid progress?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, it is rapid.

Mr. FOSTER. What have been the influences which have been at work to make this rapid progress?

Mr. OLIVER. The influence is the ability of Mr. Roberts. I am not aware of any other influence.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did Mr. Roberts come from?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer that.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will see that this is a very rapid stride forward. Here is a young man who, seven years ago, was not in the service at all; he comes in as a temporary clerk in 1900 and gets $900; in 1903 he is made permanent as a second-class clerk at $1,100, not at the minimum of the second class; in 1906 he is up to $1,500, and now, in 1908, he is to go in as a chief clerk at a minimum of $1,900. He increases from $900 to $1,900. There must be some very pressing reason why Mr. Roberts has such rapid promotion as that over a great many clerks who have been in that department for a much longer period and who must have a great deal more experience without doubt. As to whether they have more ability will be for the minister to say.

Mr. OLIVER. We are not removing Mr. Roberts to any other position but we want to make him of higher rank in proportion to his work and responsibility.

Mr. FOSTER. His work will be just the same and this is a way the minister has of adding $400 to his salary and giving him a chance to get $500 or $600 more.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the idea.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is bound to tell the House what are the superior abil-

ities of Mr. Roberts which entitle him to this galloping speed upwards. There is no superhuman ability required to do that work. Can the minister say that the clerks in the department who have experience added to their abilities are not able to do that work and that Mr. Roberts must be jumped up ? His rapid promotion must be for some other reason that the minister has given.

Mr. OLIVER. I know of no other reason. Any one who is familiar with the operation of such a department knows that upon careful and reliable registration depends the proper transaction of the business. While the registration seems to be a matter of mere detail, in practice it has not been found so. Mr. J. J. Henry had been in charge of the branch for twenty years when his health failed, not because of his age but because of the onerous character of the work which broke him down, and it became necessary to give him some other employment. There are some forty clerks in the branch and there has to be most careful management and the work of the department depends on the work of these men being properly done. After Mr. Henry we tried one or two of the staff and found they were not able to cope with the work and at last we selected Mr. Roberts. Since his appointment we find the work is well and promptly done, that there is order and promptitude where formerly such was not the case. Mr. Roberts is in the full vigour of life and he seems to have special aptitude for organization and management. We recognize that it is due in a very considerable degree to the proper management of this branch that we have been able to carry on so well as we have the stupendously increased business of the department. It has already been brought to the attention of the House that men of higher abilities and higher responsibilities are not as a rule paid wages equal to what they could earn outside and we have lost several men from the department because of that. It is a fair business proposition that when we have a man who is able to take a responsible position and is in the full vigour of life we should pay him according to the work he does. It is on that principle I have asked parliament to increase Mr. Roberts' salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Did Mr. Roberts become a civil servant through the regular door or was he made a civil servant by Act of parliament ?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Roberts came in as a temporary at first; he afterwards passed his civil service examination and entered the permanent service in the usual way.

Mr. FOSTER. But not at the minimum of the second class.

Mr. OLIVER. He was made permanent at the minimum of the second class.

Mr. MONK. In what year did he pass the civil service examination ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer that.

Mr. FOSTER. You say you want to keep this official and give him a good salary but you must recollect there are at least thirty men in the department who are ahead of him and you may be doing a great injustice to some of these. Will the minister say that not one of these thirty men has the method and habits which would enable him to do the work of the registration branch ? Has there been any examination to test the ability of the others ?

Mr. OLIVER. When Mr. Henry unfortunately had to give up his position. I think attempts were made to fill it with one or two other gentlemen, but they were not able to meet the requirements. We did not go through the whole list, because when Mr. Roberts got the opportunity he filled the bill, and I admit that it was of more interest to us to get the work well done than to go through the whole list of employees to find out if more than one of them could do the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but the opportunity was given to the newcomer and the old hands were not given the opportunity. Then, what reason has the minister for making Mr. Roberts, who has been only a short time in the service, a chief clerk, where he is doing no more efficiently the same work that he has been doing since 1906, and adding $400 to his salary? Could he not have done the business just as well on the lower salary? Have his few years of service in the department earned him that promotion and that high salary, while others have been twenty years in the department, and have been doing faithful and honest and efficient work during that time, and do not yet receive as much? Is it not a fact that Mr. Roberts has been the nominee of the chief whip of the Liberal party, and that he owes his rapid promotion to that influence?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say what connection there may be between Mr. Roberts and the chief whip of the Liberal party; but I can say certainly that I have no knowledge of any such connection—that the chief whip never spoke to me about Mr. Roberts, and certainly Mr. Roberts never spoke to me about the chief whip. In fact, he has never spoken to me about his position. What has been done has been done upon the representations of the

deputy in the ordinary way and upon my own knowledge of Mr. Roberts' efficiency in the transaction of business. I might say that Mr. Henry, the previous occupant of the position, was receiving $2,300 a year, and I do not think it is unreasonable that Mr. Roberts, who is doing the same work —in fact, a great deal more work, because the business has increased very much— should be put in the position to ultimately get the same salary as Mr. Henry got. I do not wish to disparage Mr. Henry's work, but I am bound to say that the work is being better done now than it was under Mr. Henry.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been Mr. Marchand's course?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Marchand entered the service in 1899 as a second-class clerk at $1,100 a year.

Mr. MONK. Did he pass the civil service examination?

Mr. OLIVER. He informs me that he passed the civil service examination in 1899.

Mr. FOSTER. And when did his first promotion take place?

Mr. OLIVER. He was made a first-class clerk in 1904 at $1,500.

Mr. FOSTER. And he is now receiving $1,650?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. These are two examples of extremely rapid promotions, one of the men having been brought into the service in 1899 and the other in 1900, and in the short space of seven or eight years they have risen to be chief clerks. I am not in a position to rate the merits of either of these men, but it seems to me somewhat peculiar and somewhat unfair that employees of that department who entered the service at the minimum rate find after a service of twenty or twenty-five years that men are brought in and put right over them, commencing at high salaries, and being now chief clerks. It does not seem to me to be right or fair. Surely the minister is not going to make the confession that amongst all the horde of clerks that he has in the Interior Department, good and capable servants I believe, he could not find any two fit to be made chief clerks. There does not seem to be much incentive to a spirit of work and enterprise amongst the body of the civil servants if the prizes are to be bestowed in this way.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer for the reasons for the previous promotions of these two gentlemen; but for the present promotion, for which, of course, I am responsible, directly and indirectly, I may say that it is simply due to the recognition of efficiency, and a desire to retain that efficiency in the service by paying such wages as are in accordance with the service rendered. It is to be regretted that all cannot be at the top, and I am not prepared to say that there may not be other men in the department just as competent as the two mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister ought to be able to say that before he makes the rapid promotion of these two men.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the House will realize that in dealing with a department having 585 employees in the city of Ottawa, if the minister or his chief officers were to occupy the time that would be necessary to see that no injustice was done by promotions amongst all that staff of officials, they would hardly be giving that attention to the public business for which they are paid and which the country expects from them. It is an unfortunate situation, but I do not see how it can be avoided. When we are able to say that we have secured the men who can do the work, and do it well, I think we are fairly entitled to ask parliament to pay those men according to the work they do and the responsibility they have assumed. As to the other men who may have equal qualifications, it is to be hoped that in due time their turn will come.

Mr. FOSTER. That is small consolation.

Mr. OLIVER. It may be; but we think that the recognition of merit by rapid promotion does not tend to inefficiency in the service. I would think quite the contrary, and it is efficiency in the service which the country is particularly desirous of securing.

Mr. MONK. I think it tends to great inefficiency. Within the past few years we have had in this House frequent inquiries, in passing the estimates, why certain appointees have had their salaries increased in abnormal proportions and have been promoted over the heads of those much older in the service, and we have never had any other reason given than that advanced to-night, namely, that the men are efficient and that the object is to secure the services of efficient men by promotions of that kind. And we will never have any other reason until our civil service is reorganized on a proper basis, and the public are awaiting with much interest the Bill which is to provide for a reform. They are waiting to find out whether that Bill will incorporate the valuable suggestions and proposals of reform contained in the report of the Civil Service Commissioners, which has been so universally condemned by the friends of the government and the Liberal press. In the city of Montreal there are efficient civil servants, but examples are

frequent beyond number of appointees of the present government being promoted over old employees, not appointed by the preceding government particularly, but whose nominations frequently date back to the time of the Mackenzie administration. As a consequence our postal service in Montreal, which gives the second largest revenue of any city in the Dominion, is very largely disorganized. It is not because the men are not as a rule good men. They are of course very insufficiently paid, but the disorganization is due to the system of promotions, for which no satisfactory reasons can be given. Within the past few months a system has been inaugurated of putting comparatively recent postal employees—friends no doubt of the Postmaster General—thtrough a sham examination, and then promoting them over men who have given faithful service during a much greater number of years. That is one of the reasons why the postal service in Montreal is not at all satisfactory, and it never will be until we have the system established which has been in force in England since 1857 and is also in force in the Post Office Department in the United States. Appointments are there only made by a commission after an examination, and the question of patronage is eliminated altogether, and promotions are only made after examination and under certain conditions. I do not mean to say that the two men, to whom reference has been made, are not efficient, but they have been promoted over the heads of men who have been far longer in the service, whose salaries remain comparatively stationary and who get no chance to compete for the higher grades. The Minister of the Interior thinks that that system promotes efficiency, but the experience of the civil servants themselves and the public is absolutely in the contrary direction.

Mr. KEMP. What are the duties of Mr. E. H. Wright and what is his salary?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Wright is the chief assistant commissioner of Dominion lands and his salary is $1,550.

Mr. FOSTER. When did he get that? $1,250 is what is down here for the last year and that with the annual increase would mean $1,300 now.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that he was made a first-class clerk in 1906.

Mr. KEMP. What was his salary in 1901?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say. He entered the service in June, 1893, and was made permanent in 1894.

Mr. KEMP. He advanced very rapidly. I think his salary was $600 in 1901. Has he special aptitude for the work?

Mr. OLIVER. The Commissioner of Dominion Lands is of course the most responsible official in the department and Mr. Wright is his chief assistant. Mr. Greenway, the commissioner, handles a large number of land matters and requires some four or five men to assist him. Mr. Wright is the chief of those assistants.

Mr. KEMP. He went ahead very rapidly.

Mr. OLIVER. I need not say to the House how very important is the work he does. It is not routine work in any sense, but work that requires the exercise of the very best judgment and decision, as well as thorough familiarity not only with the Land Act, but also with the actual operation of homesteading upon the land. It seem that in the stress of work Mr. Wright has been able to show that of Mr. Greenway's assistants he was the better man.

Mr. FOSTER. How does he show it?

Mr. OLIVER. By reason of his ability in arriving at correct decisions promptly, I presume.

Mr. FOSTER. You presume?

Mr. OLIVER. I say by reason of his arriving promptly at correct decisions to the satisfaction of the commissioner and the minister. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that Mr. Wright had been appointed in 1903.

Mr. KNOWLES. As a member who perhaps has as much to do with that branch as any other member, if not more, I wish to take exception to what the member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) says. I think that the salary should be more. In the first place after fifteen years' service $1,500 is not out of the way when expenses have increased so.

Mr. KEMP. I was not taking exception to the amount of the salary, I was inquiring to the reason for the rapid advance.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have a great deal of correspondence with that department as well as personal intercourse, and I find that Mr. Wright has a wonderful grasp of its affairs, he has an ability for doing his work with great accuracy and I would consider that the government secured his services very cheaply at $1,550.

Mr. MONK. The difficulty is that there appears to be no principle upon which these rapid advances are made, which does not tend to the efficiency of the service. It is absurd to suppose that men who have been long in the service are inefficient, as they must have been efficient when they entered, for they passed the examinations, and they have since added experience. The explanation is that those who have recently entered the service through political influence have their friends still alive and influential and able to secure their advancement.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend's suggestion is absolutely gratuitous. The explanations that have been given are absolutely correct. These men were promoted because of their efficiency in the service and that was the only reason, not because they had any political pull. Length of service in a department does not necessarily tend to efficiency any more than in a private business. It must be apparent to any one that the man who has had to fight the battle of life in the world at large, has to take his chance with competitors in all lines on entering the department, other things being equal, is more likely to be efficient than the man who knows nothing except what he has learned within the four walls of a department. The suggestion that a commission should regulate the advancement of these men is another means of arriving at the same result. Working in the interests of the public and for the efficiency of the service they would take the responsibility of picking out the efficient men and passing them to the head of the list. The only difference is that now the minister takes that responsibility and so far as these men are concerned I accept the fullest responsibility.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very pretty theory of the minister, but it does not hold in this case. I watched the whole process, how it resolved itself——

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman say that what I said is not true?

Mr. FOSTER. I am going to say what I think is true and we can compare the two. He says take a man in the vortex of life, thrown hither and thither, his muscles toughened mentally and otherwise and when you get such a man you must promote him quickly. Let us take these two paragons. Here is Mr. Wright. How much of a vortex had he been in before he entered the department and became old and moss-covered? He entered the department as messenger in 1893, he was a third-class clerk in 1901, a second class clerk in 1905, a first-class clerk in 1907 and is still going upward. The fine theory does not fit in with this particular case. Mr. Wright was the nominee and favourite of a minister, the late Hon. Mr. Sutherland had him made a messenger and during his life carefully shoved him upwards.

In the case of Mr. Roberts, Mr. Calvert carefully shoves him upwards. Who is the good genius behind Mr. Marchand?

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to have this question settled first. I did not suggest that there was no way of getting good service except by taking men from the outside. I said that, other things being equal, you were more likely to get capable and efficient men from the outside. I did not suggest that you could not get good men within the service. Mr. Wright is one who has acquired his experience within the department but yet has proven himself efficient. I do not understand the suggestion that Mr. Wright entered the service as a protégé of Mr. Sutherland, the minister. Mr. Sutherland was not a minister in 1893.

Mr. FOSTER. But he became a minister afterwards, he was a member of parliament. He had a great deal of influence.

Mr. OLIVER. Then he must have had a great deal of judgment in the selection of a messenger in this case at any rate. I think the argument of my hon. friend falls to the ground in the case of Mr. Wright.

Mr. FOSTER. And is entitled to promotion ?

Mr. OLIVER. That may be. The House has the evidence that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) that in the position which he occupies to-day—and I wish to say the same emphatically and from my own knowledge of the case—he is a thoroughly efficient employee.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not saying he is not.

Mr. OLIVER. The proposal placed before the House is thoroughly warranted in his case. Mr. Marchand is assistant accountant of the department. The accountancy is held by Mr. Beddoe. The branch, of course, is a large one. I need not say to the House that the question of accounting is a very important question. There are nineteen officials in the accounting branch. The Department of the Interior has business scattered all the way from Ottawa to Dawson city, and, in the proper conduct of that business, it has been found necessary, ever since I have been minister, to employ the services of the chief accountant, Mr. Beddoe, at distant points on several occasions. At the present time he is in Winnipeg, attending to the accounting in connection with the seed grain. It seems to me necessary to the service that there should be not only a chief accountant, but, when that chief accountant is necessarily absent, there should be some one to take his place—there should be an assistant or deputy——

Mr. FOSTER. And he should be a chief clerk ?

Mr. OLIVER. —and he should have rank and pay according to his abilities and responsibilities. I have stated that point before; it does no harm to emphasize it; if we are to have efficient service and to retain men who have proven themselves efficient, we must pay those men fair and reasonable salaries. It is on that principle that I ask for the promotion of Mr. Mar-

chand to the rank and position and salary which I have asked.

Mr. MONK. For my part, I think that the observations of the minister about the 'vortex' and about the results of this 'vortex' and its qualifying effects upon the new appointees, is not taken seriously by anybody. For, the presumption is that those who have served faithfully for many years, are entitled to promotion and advancement rather than to have men taken out of the 'vortex' who have not had equal experience. Until we get a reform of the civil service, such as many people of this country have been looking for for many years—and we seem to be on the eve of it, if the government——

Mr. FIELDING. How long have the people been looking for that reform ?

Mr. MONK. For my part, I have combatted in favour of that reform since I have been a member of this House, and I have been a member as long as the Minister of Finance has.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I have not heard my hon. friend (Mr. Monk).

Mr. MONK. Not a single session has passed in which I have not pointed out the enormous difference between what is going on in this country and what goes on in every other civilized country of the world. As far back as ten years ago, I pointed out the improvements wrought in England and have named the books in which these improvements are clearly shown. I have shown the immense work, which, since 1882, has been going on in the same direction in the United States, while we have been steadily retrograding since twelve years. And a few days before the report of the commission was brought in, I used strong expressions in this House. I stated that our civil service at the present moment was rotten, worthless, and I hoped that the report which was then being worked out—and which, I fancy, was then a subject of some anxiety to the Minister of Finance—would give us relief. But this government, and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, resemble the Pharaohs of Ancient Egypt. Under those kings, messengers who brought bad news were condemned to death, while those who brought good news were covered with flowers. Take this very instance ; when cases of this kind come up the minister blames those who criticise the estimates as though they were trying to prevent the promotion and advancement of the particular civil servant whose case was being considered. Nothing has been said by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that would imply that. I do not know that these particular men whose salaries are up for consideration are unfitted for promotion. But I say it is strange that, in every case, in the last twelve years, where anomalies of this kind have been pointed out, the answer of the minister has always been that the officer was promoted for efficiency—'How is that efficiency as compared with that of other men in the service ?'—'I am the judge of it ; I take the fullest responsibility for what it is proposed to do.' And that is all the satisfaction we get. I think that the only way to bring about this urgent and absolutely essential reform is to point out the conditions in every case until the government finds itself obliged to promote instead of retarding that very essential reform. This Mr. Pierre Marchand was appointed on 12th of December, 1899. He came in at $1,100. At the present moment, he is first-class clerk and assistant accountant at $1,600. I find in the civil service list two other first-class clerks appointed before Mr. Marchand. There are Mr. Peter Robertson, appointed on February 27, 1877; and Mr. Geo. Dalrymple Pope, appointed March 31, 1884. There are also second-class clerks: Mr. James Dunnet, appointed April 1, 1878 ; Mr. Samuel J. Willoughby, appointed January 12, 1886 ; and Mr. Henry Hamish Turner, appointed June 20, 1883. These are old civil servants. Are they inefficient as compared with the more recent appointees ? Does it not seem to the members of this committee that these men, if equally efficient, on account of priority of appointment ought to receive promotion, or ought to be given the chance which any properly organized civil service should give of obtaining promotion, rather than promote more recent appointees ? My hon. friend would lead the committee to believe that, taking a new man and advancing him rapidly over the heads of old employees—whom we must presume to be efficient and capable men—is a valuable method of insuring the efficiency of the service. I think we are approaching a period of reform. I regret very much to see the spirit in which the government has received the most valuable suggestions made under the most favourable circumstances for the government by the commissioners. I await with anxiety the measure which has been promised and in which I hope to find the valuable suggestions referred to carried out. But, until that point is reached I will take every opportunity of pointing out to the committee and of making known to the public what I consider to be the cause of the insufficiency, as I find it, in the civil service in the province of Quebec in order to hurry up that reform.

Mr. WARD. The minister is not altogether consistent in this matter for at one

moment he pleads that the large number of employees in his department is some excuse why justice should not be done in all matters appertaining to these promotions. The next moment he pleads that it is owing to the efficiency of these particular clerks that they are promoted. I do not see what the enormous number of employees has to do with this question at all because the minister only has to consider seventeen men in attending to the promotion of these two clerks. You will find there are two of these first-class clerks who are already in receipt of a salary of $1,900, and there are two already in receipt of a salary of $1,850. It does seem rather hard that gentlemen receiving the lowest salary of first-class clerks should be promoted over those who have been so much longer in the service as to be entitled to larger salaries. Mr. Marchand is receiving $1,600 and Mr. Roberts is receiving $1,500. They are selected and placed above other clerks who are in receipt of larger salaries. These men of large experience are at the top of the tree, in so far as first-class clerks are concerned and can receive no more salary, while Mr. Roberts is given an immediate advance of $400 with the probability of next year receiving $2,300. It does seem to me that there is ground for the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto, and there must be some reason why this rapid advancement is taking place in the matter of these two promotions.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any other promotions? I see there are 26 second-class clerks, while last year there were 25. Who is the 26th?

Mr. OLIVER. This is to give promotion to the second class of Mr. A. R. Morrisset of the accountant's branch.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is he now?

Mr. OLIVER. He is a junior second-class clerk at $1,050.

Mr. FOSTER. When was he appointed, and at what salary?

Mr. OLIVER. He was appointed a temporary clerk in 1898 at $400.

Mr. MONK. Has he undergone the civil service examination?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. When was his first promotion?

Mr. OLIVER. He was appointed on the 1st of July, 1898, and he was appointed to the permanent staff on the 1st July, 1901. He is attached to the accountant's branch as a junior second-class clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. What was his salary in 1901?

Mr. OLIVER. $600.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary will he get as a second-class clerk?

Mr. OLIVER. $1,200. He was appointed on the 1st July, 1901, at $600 as a junior second-class clerk and in 1903 the salary of juniors was raised from $600 to $800.

Mr. FOSTER. We find in this case an exact parallel if not a little more than a parallel. In 1898 Mr. Morrisett was appointed a temporary clerk at $400; in 1901 he was appointed a permanent clerk at $600, and in 1903 there was an increase in his salary. He then got $1,050 and under this vote he will get $1,200. In less than ten years he has gone from $400 to $1,200. Here are four samples that we have unearthed by a little process of questioning, every one of these have been placed in office by the government at low salaries and have been rushed forward, two of them to be chief clerks and one to be a second-class clerk. The remarks made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) are altogether to the point in this respect.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the minister if Peter Robertson, George Dalrymple Pope, James Dunnet, Samuel J. Willoughby, Henry Hamish Turner, who are older employees than Mr. Marchand or Mr. Roberts are good and efficient employees? I do not know these men, but I would like to get that information from the minister. They have quite considerable salaries ranging from $1,300 to $1,600, and they occupy positions in the service as first and second-class clerks. Are they good and efficient men?

Mr. OLIVER. I will have to ask the deputy in regard to the qualifications of these men. It is impossible for me to have knowledge of the qualifications of all the members of the service. But while these men may be perfectly competent, trustworthy and reliable in every way in the positions which they occupy they still may not be competent to take part of the supervision of the transactions of the accountant's branch as we expect the assistant accountant to do. These gentlemen are being paid for work which they are able to do and do well, but that is no evidence that they are fit for a position of supervision.

Mr. MONK. It all goes to show that these promotions ought not to be in the hands of the minister but in the hands of a commission who would make promotions under certain changeable rules.

Mr. GEOFFRION. As it was before 1896.

Mr. MONK. That is a very small idea. There is no doubt this system has existed since confederation and like all rotten

systems it has become aggravated year after year. I do not care what was done previously, this is a question of essential reform that ought to be carried out. The Minister of the Interior is not able to tell us whether older and efficient employees are fit for the position, and yet he says this is an excellent mode of carrying on the civil service.

Mr. OLIVER. I said I thought this was an efficient way of getting an efficient service, but I did not say there could not be a better mode. Even if we had a most conscientious Civil Service Commission there would sometimes be occasion for such appointments where men would get rapid promotion because of special efficiency and there would be the same grievance on the part of men who were longer in the service, who were doing the work they were at efficiently, but who were not specially qualified for the more important duties. I am aware of the propriety of the appointments we are asking the House to sanction, I admit I am not aware of how good other appointments might be.

Mr. MONK. That is frank but it shows this is the worst possible system that could prevail. The effect of that system is to keep out of the public service good men and to chase out of it some of the very best men in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. Have the civil servants in the Interior Department been paid for the past month?

Mr. OLIVER. Sixty per cent of their salary was paid on the 16th.

Mr. MONK. What appears to be a little strange is that when the difficulty supervened which I regret had been caused by the government in regard to the voting of supplies, some method should not have been made to place in a distinct column separate from the rest of Supply, the necessary vote for the payment of civil servants. It is a great pity that is not done every year and it is a great pity it was not done this year when these grave difficulties at first appeared. For my part I think the civil servants should all be paid regularly and I would have raised no objection to that. The estimates have been made up in this form for years and I will admit for the benefit of my friend from Vercheres (Mr. Geoffrion) they were made up in that way before his party came to power, if he thinks that is any reason why we should check all progress. I regret very much that we are not in a position to vote the salaries of the civil servants as they should be voted, without difficulty, and I attribute that to the careless way in which the estimates are made up. When these difficulties first arose a division of the estimates should have been made so that the salaries of the civil servants would have been voted.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman is so zealous for these civil servants why has he been opposing this vote for the last half hour?

Mr. FOSTER. That remark is childish.

Mr. MONK. I am surprised at the Minister of Finance making such a statement.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Monk) professes zeal for the passage of the civil service estimates, but on the other hand he has been delaying them.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister of Finance in this age think he can induce people to believe that we are to pass estimates without the fair and reasonable questioning on them that we have had to-night?

Mr. FIELDING. The estimates have been held up all day.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is $190,000 being voted and we have spent 25 minutes asking proper questions, and the Minister of Finance rises in a temper to lecture us because we have dared in the face of his high mightiness to ask for information with reference to these inordinate galloping promotions. If the Minister of Finance takes that line he is most foolish.

Mr. FIELDING. I am responsible for what I said and not for what the hon. gentleman attributes to me. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier was indulging in sympathy for the civil servants who did not get their money, and I pointed out that the reason for that was because hon. gentleman opposite had been delaying these estimates, not for to-night, but for weeks and months.

Mr. FOSTER. And I have to state to the Minister of Finance that I pleaded with him and with his chief to take up these civil government estimates three weeks ago but he stuck up the Minister of Public Works before the civil servants and the opposition and voted hundreds of thousands of dollars for public works which are not necessary at the present time. That is what was done and that is what is on record on 'Hansard.' The minister has been playing to the gallery long enough. He is played out, perfectly played out. Small boys in debating societies play that sort of game ; the Minister of Finance ought to have wisdom enough not to play it.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall not undertake to speak of what took place between the leaders; I only speak of that which I know, and when the hon. gentleman says he offered to give the civil government estimates, I venture to say that the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. I venture to say that he is right, and 'Hansard' will prove it.

Mr. FIELDING. 'Hansard' will prove nothing except constant obstruction. If the hon. gentleman wants to give the civil service estimates, why does he not give them, instead of spending all day on a matter that has no bearing on the business of the House? The hon. gentleman must remember that the civil service is not confined to civil government at Ottawa but is scattered all over Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. And if the Prime Minister and his first lieutenant had shown ordinary political diligence, they would have had their large measures down before the sixth or seventh month of the session, and they would have had the estimates which they do not have now, from that very speeding of the business which they might well have done. The Minister of the Interior has all his civil government, now, including the Indian Department?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the business for to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Supply, with the estimates of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. FOSTER. When are we going to have the Civil Service Bill explained?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot give my hon. friend any definite statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it on account of the necessary absence of the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. FIELDING. The absence of the Minister of Agriculture is as necessary as that of many other hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. But he is a minister?

Mr. FIELDING. We are all members here, and we speak as members more than as ministers, and the absence of one member is not to be censured more than the absence of another.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 3, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I wish to present a motion calling for the cancellation of the resolution adopted the 20th of May last, by which the House adopted the fourth report of the committee appointed to supervise the official debates of the House. I beg to move:

That the resolution adopted by this House on the 20th of May last adopting the fourth report of the committee appointed to supervise the official debates of the House, be reconsidered and rescinded; that the said fourth report of the said committee be referred back to said committee with instructions to inquire into the necessity of and demand for said additional translator and the qualifications of said E. Charlier to act as such translator and to be appointed to such new position and to inquire also as to such additional measures as may be necessary to ensure the prompt and efficient translation of the official documents of this House.

I would have given notice to my hon. friend, the member of St. James division (Mr. Gervais) who is chairman of that committee, but he has not been in the House lately. In fact, I do not think he has been here since the adoption of the fourth report in question. Nevertheless, with the unanimous consent of the House, the motion may be disposed of now. I do not think there is any doubt, from what has transpired since that fourth report was adopted, that the report must be reconsidered. It was adopted under the erroneous impression that it involved no additional expense. I shall present the motion, if my right hon. friend consents, or leave it as a notice of motion.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I would prefer that it should stand as a notice. I can talk with my hon. friend during the day and perhaps fix a day for moving it.

Mr. MONK. As the matter has been some time in abeyance, it is urgent that the motion should be presented to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps. I shall see my hon. friend during the day.

RELEASE OF 'AGNES B. KUN.'

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). At the request of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I beg to lay on the table a copy of letter written by me to the city clerk of Sydney, N.S., with reference to the release of Agnes B. Kun.

QUESTIONS.

DREDGING CONTRACTS.

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD asked:

1. Does the Department of Railways and Canals let dredging contracts or pay for dredging on the basis of scow measurements?
2. Does the Department of Public Works let dredging contracts or pay for dredging on the basis of scow measurements?
3. If there is a difference in the policy of these two departments of the government in

this respect, what is the reason for such difference?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The Department of Railways and Canals, cross section all dredging work; and do not let contracts on scow measurement.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). For the Department of Public Works, I have a statement from the chief engineer. He says:

There are two ways of measuring the quantity of material dredged, one being measurement in situ and the other, scow measurement.

It has always been the custom of the department to adopt the latter, as it is considered that with faithful inspectors in charge of the different works, the quantities returned are as near as practicable absolutely correct and therefore fair and just both to the department and to the contractor. Moreover, the insitu mode of measurement necessitates extensive and most accurate surveys before the beginning of the work, monthly during its execution and after its final completion, which accurate surveys of course, would entail such a large expenditure in the way of additional staff, as to be, in my opinion, prohibitive. In fact, the expenditure for surveying would, in some cases, be as great as the cost of the dredging itself.

Moreover, I am of opinion, that it is practically impossible to return accurately, by this way of measurement, the actual quantity of dredging performed, as the surface dredged would have to be entirely covered with soundings, say every five feet apart, in order to arrive, even then, at only an approximation.

For these reasons, I am of opinion that the method adopted by the department is certainly the best, providing of course, that the inspectors be competent and thoroughly reliable.

Respectfully submitted,
EUGENE D. LAFLEUR,
Chief Engineer.

I should add that the dredging work in the two departments is entirely different. In the Railway Department it usually extends over but a narrow area, being mostly confined to canal work, while in the Public Works Department the area is very much larger, in connection with the dredging of harbours and rivers and the like.

BOAT HARBOUR AT TONEY RIVER, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. What was the amount of contract for the boat harbour at Toney River, Nova Scotia, who were the tenderers, what is the amount of each tender, and to whom was the contract awarded?
2. When was the work commenced, when was it completed, and what was the total amount paid under contract?
3. What extras, if any, did the contractor receive, for what were extras paid, and what were the several amounts paid as extras?
4. Since completion of work has any expenditure been made on the work? If so, when were the expenditures made, and what were the reasons for making each expenditure since completion of work under the contract?
5. What is the total amount to date paid since completion under contract?
6. Is any further repair or addition to be made to work in the current year? If so, what is the reason for such repair or addition, and what is the estimated cost of same?
7. Was any land purchased in connection with this work? If so, from whom and for what purposes?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. No contract; work was carried out by day's labour.
2. Commenced 12th March, 1906; completed 23rd October, 1907.
3. No contract, therefore no extras.
4. No expenditure made since completion of work.
5. Total cost of work, including purchase of land, $7,588.71.
6. Resident engineer has submitted a report regarding extension of channel protection works at mouth of river, estimated to cost $2,000. Matter under consideration.
7. Land purchased from Duncan Johnston for $474.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MR. JAMES A. STEWART.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Is James A. Stewart still in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway? If so, in what capacity, what is his pay, and what his hours of labour?
2. Why was he employed, on whose recommendation, and what were his special qualifications for the work?
3. What so far has been the net result of his labours, and how long has he been employed?
4. Is it still considered necessary that Stewart be retained in his present employment?

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

1. There is a James A. Stewart employed on the Intercolonial Railway as brakesman, at $1.75 per day.
2. As brakeman.
3. His services have been satisfactory to the railway. Employed since March, 1899.
4. Yes; as long as his services are satisfactory to the railway.

MILITARY CAMP AT GODERICH.

Mr. BRISTOL asked:

1. Is it the case that the camp for military district No. 1 is to be held at Goderich this summer? If so, what superiority does this camp possess over London?
2. Was the change made on the recommendation of the military authorities? If not, by whom?
3. Will the accommodation for target practice be sufficient to enable the troops assembled to complete their practice during the

continuation of the camp? If not, what arrangements will be made to remedy this?

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

1. Yes. It has a much larger area and better facilities for manœuvring.

2. Yes.

3. There are four targets for long distance firing, and a sufficient number of minature targets will be installed.

BIC WHARF.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. How many pounds of iron bolts were purchased for the wharf at Bic, province of Quebec, from the month of August to the month of December, 1906?

2. How much was paid for that iron; and to whom were such amounts paid?

3. During the same time, from the month of August to the month of December, 1906, what quantity of lumber and of timber was used for the same wharf?

4. Who supplied that wood, what price was paid for it, and in what amounts?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1 and 2. From E. Lavoie :

24,980 lbs. at $2.50	$624 00
7,900 lbs. at $2.65.	209 35
	$833 35

From J. Santerre : 12 bolts, 24 inches long, the cost of these cannot be given separately, having been included with account for repairing tools, &c., the whole charged at $12.10.

3 and 4. From :

O. Ouellette, 15½ planks, 3 by 9 by 12, at 38 cents. .	$	5 89
L. Leveque, 100 planks, 3 by 9 by 12, at 38 cents.		38 00
A. Parent, 187 planks, at 36 cents.		67 32
J. Blais, 198 ft. birch logs at 16c.	$31.68	
J. Blais, 45 ft. birch logs at 14c.	6.30	
		37 98
N. Durette, 2,380 ft. spruce fenders at 12 cents.	$285.60	
N. Durette, 2,250 shingles at $1.50	3.38	
		288 98
		$438 17

THE ROSS RIFLE—REPORT OF LIEUT. COL. GAUDET.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Did Major Gaudet, of Quebec, either as inspector of small arms or in any other capacity, ever make a report on the Ross rifle, which was not included in the returns laid on the table of the House of Commons in response to a motion for return of all reports, correspondence, &c., relating to the Ross rifle? If so, on what date was the report made, and what was the nature of the same?

2. If this report was not brought down, why was it not included in the returns?

3. Where is this report at present?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia) :

1. Yes ; the report is dated January 2, 1907, and is on tests on the Ross rifle.

2. The report was laid before the Militia Council by the Master-General of the ordnance, and subsequently it was referred to the Ross Rifle Company, who complained that they had not been notified that the tests were to be made, nor given an opportunity of being represented thereat. The company felt that this was unfair, and disputed the accuracy of the tests. It was considered that their view was sound. The report was, therefore, held in abeyance in order to give time for further tests which the company proposed to make, at which, it was stipulated, the department should be represented by Lieutenant-Colonel Gaudet or some other competent officer. The tests now being made at Quebec will probably determine the question at issue.

3. The report is on record in the Department of Militia and Defence as a confidential document.

CLAIM AGAINST NEW BRUNSWICK COAL AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

Has the Railway Department any claim against the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company or against the government of New Brunswick on account of the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company, other than that specified by the Minister of Railways in his answer to Mr. Ganong's question on May 27? If so, what?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Yes. There is an unadjusted balance for car service, freight balances, ticket sale balances, car repairs, &c., amounting to $9,459.94.

SEMAPHORES AT INTERLOCKING PLANT NEAR LONDON.

Mr. ELSON asked :

1. Is the construction of the semaphores lately erected at the interlocking plant on the railways near the London asylum such as to compel the employees to climb up a high, narrow and dangerous ladder to light and care for lamps?

2. If not so constructed, can the lamps be lighted on the ground and pulled up to their places by a chain, the same as the Pipe semaphores?

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

1 and 2. The chief engineer of the Board of Railway Commissioners, states that the semaphores lately erected at the interlocking plant near the London asylum are

equipped with iron ladders the full height of the semaphores, and the employees climb them to light the lamps. These ladders are high and narrow, but not dangerous. They are in common use in many places, and have received the approval of the board's chief engineer, he having tested them personally.

PURCHASERS OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. ELSON asked :

What are the names and post office addresses of the persons to whom $39,574.64 worth of twine, including $14.40 for a rope yarn, was shipped, as set out in first column of page M—33 of the Auditor General's Report for 1907?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The names of these persons, together with the names of persons to whom $10,855.78 worth of twine was shipped in 1905-6, which was paid for in 1906-7, appear on pages M—33, 34 and 35 of the Auditor General's Report. I should be happy to send to my hon. friend (Mr. Elson) a list of these names as appearing in the report, but I hope that my hon. friend will not desire the post office addresses of these purchasers. There are something over two hundred of them and the post office address of each appears on the files at the penitentiary in Kingston, also in the Auditor General's office here, but it is not published (as was the case formerly), because it was found that publishing the post office addresses of these individual purchasers prejudiced the interests of the penitentiary by reason of the access it gave to competitors of the industry to the purchasers of these consignments of binder twine.

ANGLO-AMERICAN TREATIES.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether or not all the correspondence with respect to the treaties between Great Britain and the United States has been brought down and is now being printed, or whether there are some additional documents to be brought down ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). No correspondence has been brought down, but it is ready. I should have had it to-day. It is an omission of mine, it will be ready to-morrow.

GOVERNMENT STEAMER 'MONTCALM.'

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is not here, but the right hon. Prime Minister will take the request that the report of the investigation with regard to the accident to the 'Montcalm' should be laid on the table of the House. I notice that the report has been given and we have seen just the bare results of it in the paper.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—COMMISSION ISSUED TO INSPECTORS.

Mr. FOSTER. I would also like to know if the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) has yet laid on the table of the House the commission issued to the inspectors that he is appointing along the Transcontinental Railway. I asked that one of the commissions be brought down so that we could see the general nature of the instructions.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I laid a copy of the commission to Mr. Pacaud, commissioner for Quebec, upon the table on the day following the inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the commissions are all the same?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Yes.

SUPPLY—WHARF AT PETIT ROCHER.

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

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) if he has yet completed the return that I asked for some time ago with reference to the wharf down at Petit Rocher. I moved for an order of the House which was passed asking for all the papers. A return was brought down up to 1905 and we had quite a discussion on it the other day. I asked the minister to complete the return, telling him that I had in my possession correspondence that took place since then and that I knew that there was more correspondence. I would like to ask the minister if he has yet complied with the order of the House. That was on 24th April, over a month ago and I have heard nothing further yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The order of the House was completely and thoroughly complied with. The return was brought down just as it was called for. I stated to my hon. friend at the time that if he desired any further information he had only to make motion and ask a question and the information would be cheerfully given if there were any further information in the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. I stated at that time that when a minister makes a statement in his place in the House it ought to be in accordance with the facts, it ought to be as true as gospel, because the people of the country expect statements made by ministers

to be absolutely correct. The statement made by the Minister of Public Works is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I ask if the hon. gentleman is in order in discussing the matter. I think not.

Mr. SPEAKER. No; the rule is that when a question has been answered the answer must be accepted without further discussion.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will accept the hon. gentleman's statement and I will read the order of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. We are going into Supply and if the hon. gentleman desires to discuss the matter he may do so now.

Mr. TAYLOR. I propose to do it now.

An hon. MEMBER. Move the adjournment.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will not move the adjournment; I have the right to discuss the proposition that the moon is made of green cheese if I see fit.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have ruled that the hon. gentleman is at liberty to go on if he desires to discuss the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I quite agree with you, Mr. Speaker. This order was made on the 5th March last, and it is as follows :

Return to an address of the House of Commons, dated the 15th January, 1908, for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, orders in council, contracts and tenders, with the names and amount of each, in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting the construction of a breakwater at Petit Rocher, on the southwestern side of Baie des Chaleurs, as detailed on page 74 of the report of the Minister of Public Works, for the year ended March 31, 1907.

That was the motion and it was carried by the House. The return that has been brought down does not go beyond the year 1905. There is no correspondence given since 1905. The discussion that took place on the 24th April is as follows :

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he has yet completed the return in reference to Petit Rocher?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On making inquiry of my deputy, I find that the answer given contained exactly the information which was asked for, that is, matters detailed on a certain page of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That should be the report of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. TAYLOR (reading):

If my hon. friend desires further information and will be good enough to put another question, I shall be glad to give him the further information.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was not a question at all but a motion for a return.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was for a return as to matters detailed on a certain page of the Auditor General's Report, and that return has been made and is complete.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is the minister's reply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. And he puts the onus on his deputy. I am acquainted with his deputy, and I am satisfied that his deputy would not put in anybody's mouth a statement not in accord with the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. That statement must have come directly from the minister. Now what are the facts? Here is the motion I made for that return, and in that motion there is not a word making any reference at all to the Auditor General's Report. Yet the minister says that my motion had reference to matter contained in that report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman kindly read it?

Mr. TAYLOR. I read it before and the minister went away and came back and tried to bluff me the second time. I shall read it now and ask the hon. gentleman to make an apology:

Return to an address of the House of Commons, dated the 15th January, 1908, for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, orders in council, contracts and tenders, with the names and amount of each, in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting the construction of a breakwater at Petit Rocher, on the southwestern side of Baie des Chaleurs, as detailed on page 74 of the report of the Minister of Public Works, for the year ended 31st March, 1907.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is there anything in that about the Auditor General's Report? That refers to page 74 of the minister's own report. Yet he comes here and will not give me the answer but tells me something that is possibly untrue. Here is the report. What does it say?

"Petit Rocher is a farming, fishing and lumbering settlement on the southwestern side of Baie des Chaleurs, twelve miles north of Bathurst.

To afford protection to the fishing boats and vessels trading in Baie des Chaleurs, for which there is no natural shelter in the vicinity, and to facilitate the shipment of lumber, a contract was entered into May 31, 1904, with Simon McGregor, for the construction of a breakwater, consisting of a main work, 209 feet long on the outer face, and a wing or 'L,' placed at an angle of 74 degrees 30 minutes with the main part, 160 feet long on the outer face. The width on top will be 30 feet. At its inner end the breakwater will be 480 feet from the shore. The depth along the inner face varies from 11 to 18½ feet at low water.

In 1904-5, a right of way, 860 feet long, from the public road to the shore was opened up, graded and fenced.

The contract work was begun on March 18, 1905, and by the end of 1904-5 two cribs, 96½ and 41 feet long respectively, had been built and sunk in place.

A crib to form the remainder of the work

was started on February 19, 1906, but on March 11, when it had reached a height of about six tiers, it was carried away by the ice. It was, however, recovered on May 14. The outer section, which was intended to complete the main part of the breakwater was found to be intact and work on it was resumed. By the end of the fiscal year this crib had been built to a height of nineteen tiers and the two cribs sunk in 1905 had been filled with ballast and built up to half tide level, and the upper ballast floors were laid.

During the fiscal year 1906-7, the crib forming the remainder of the main work was sunk in place and a crib to complete the 'L' was begun and placed in position. The building of the superstructure was continued on the main part up to about high water level, when two storms, on November 12 and 16 carried away nearly the whole top, the break being about 9 feet in extreme depth.

Work was resumed on March 7, and by the close of the fiscal year the remains of three damaged tiers of face timbers had been removed, and a part of the wrecked superstructure near the southern end rebuilt, the interior being filled with ballast.

The expenditure for the fiscal year 1906-7 was $5,029.60."

Here in his own report he shows that work was going on up to 1907, and the last correspondence brought down in the return moved for was in 1905; and the minister tells me again to-day that he has complied with the order of the House asking for correspondence up to 1907, including contracts, tenders and everything else. Now I have from the department a notice that they issued calling for tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the date of the notice?

Mr. TAYLOR. June 14, 1907, I will read the whole document for the minister:

Sealed tenders addressed to the undersigned, and endorsed 'Tenders for Petit Rocher Breakwater Extension,' will be received at this office until Monday, July 15, 1907, inclusively, for the construction of an extension from the Breakwater to the shore at Petit Rocher, Gloucester County, N.B., according to a plan and specification to be seen at the offices of E. T. P. Shewen, Esq., Resident Engineer, St. John, N.B., Geoffrey Stead, Esq., Resident Engineer, Chatham, N.B., on application to the Postmaster at Petit Rocher, N.B., and at the Department of Public Works, Ottawa.

Tenders will not be considered unless made on the printed form supplied, and signed with the actual signatures of tenderers.

An accepted cheque on a chartered bank, payable to the order of the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, for two thousand five hundred dollars ($2,500.00) must accompany each tender. The cheque will be forfeited if the party tendering decline the contract or fail to complete the work contracted for, and will be returned in case of non-acceptance of tender.

The department does not bind itself to accept the lowest or any tender.

By order,
FRED. GELINAS,
Secretary.

Department of Public Works,
Ottawa, June 14, 1907.

Newspapers inserting this advertisement without authority from the department will not be paid for it.

Now that will prove to the minister that there has been correspondence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will you allow me to see the notice?

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no notice. Several tenders were received, and I have in my hand other correspondence from the department, which I will not read at present until I see whether the minister will comply with the order of this House. But I have here a letter from the department, proving completely that there was correspondence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. To whom was the letter addressed?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will not tell the minister. I want him to obey the order of the House. When he gets up and tells the House that there is no further correspondence, I tell him that there is, and I know whereof I am speaking, because I have the correspondence in my hand. I have given the minister enough to convince him now that there has been correspondence, because there was an advertisement for tenders and tenders came in. I know of tenders coming in, and I know of correspondence going on in the department. Now surely the minister will make an apology for all he has said. I have read his report showing that there was an accident, that the wharf was carried away, that the work was going on, and an expenditure was made of $5,029 for the fiscal year of 1906-7. Surely this work has not been going on without some correspondence, and the correspondence is brought down up to the crucial point; July 12, 1905, is the date of the last document brought down, although the order of the House asks for everything up to the 31st of March last. Now I want the file completed, I think it is high time. I have given him lots of time from the 24th of April, I have brought the facts all before him, I have made my statement, and I ask the Prime Minister to see that his Minister of Public Works obeys the order of the House. I have always understood, when an order of the House was passed, it had to be complied with, no matter what department or what minister is affected. I have proved conclusively now to the Prime Minister that an order of the House was passed calling for all the papers, and the papers come down up to the time when it is discovered that there is a nigger in the fence, and then they are cut off.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You mean a nigger in the wharf, this is not a fence.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend is acquainted with the nigger in the fence, he knows what it means, he knows there is a job behind this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I do not.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have correspondence in my pocket which proves it. Now I want the minister to obey the order of the House and complete this file up to the 31st of March, so that I may see what has taken place. I know there was a second tender called for, for I have given the minister the notice, and I want him to say when I may expect the order of the House to be obeyed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not fully persuaded by the remarks of my hon. friend that the order of the House has not been obeyed, in fact my deputy informs me that it has been completely obeyed. I am rather inclined to think my hon. friend is more anxious to find fault with me than he is to get information, because a month or so ago I told the hon. gentleman if he would be good enough to tell me what further information he desired I would be only too happy to bring it down. I want to say further, that coming here new to the House and new to the department I am only too anxious to receive any information in regard to any departmental matters which might require attention. If there has been any job in connection with this breakwater I have no knowledge of it, and if the hon. gentleman has any information to give I shall only be too happy to look into it with the utmost care. I repeat that if my hon. friend will tell me what further he desires I shall bring all that information down without a formal order.

Mr. TAYLOR. The order of the House calls for it, and I want the minister to comply with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The order of the House has been complied with. The order of the House asked for papers connected with matters which were detailed upon page 74 of the report of the Public Works Department. I saw my deputy and told him what the hon. member had said on a former occasion, and my deputy assured me that everything which was called for by the order had been furnished. There is no doubt tenders were called for in 1907, but that would be for additional work which is not referred to, so I am told, on page 74 of the report. There is no necessity for introducing any technicalities about it; without questioning whether my hon. friend is right or whether I am right, I say I will have any further information in the department brought down so as to carry the matter forward to the latest possible date.

Mr. SPROULE. When a member of this House asks for certain correspondence or for tenders, that member is not supposed to know what the correspondence is or what tenders there may be, and so he asks for all that is in possession of a department of the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This motion was limited to a certain date and to what was detailed on page 74 of the Public Works report.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister is not justified in saying that because a member does not specify exactly what he wants the order is complied with when only certain correspondence is brought down. How can a member know what is in the possession of the department; he expects the minister and the deputy to attend to that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the order of the House were to bring down all papers connected with a certain work to the 30th June, 1906, would the hon. member expect the papers to be brought down to the 30th June, 1907?

Mr. SPROULE. This order calls for everything in connection with the construction of a breakwater at Petit Rocher as detailed in page 74 of the report of the Minister of Public Works for the year ending the 31st March, 1907.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would not take in the work done up to June, 1907.

Mr. TAYLOR. It would; the report refers to it.

Mr. SPROULE. It asks for everything in connection with the breakwater.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As detailed on page 74 of the report, and that would not take in the new work.

Mr. SPROULE. The work was under construction and correspondence must have been going on all the time. A substantial compliance with that order would be the bringing down of all correspondence up to the date of the order. I will read what is said at page 74 of the report of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend permit me to interrupt him to say that upon the intimation of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) that he desires further information I will cheerfully bring down everything right up to the date of the order. That ought to be satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. But the minister has said that he brought everything down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said I had brought down everything in reference to what was detailed upon page 74 of the Public Works report which the order of the House was limited to. Now, I say that at the desire of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) I will

give direction to place on the table of the House everything right down to the date of the order.

Mr. SPROULE. Less than that would not be a substantial compliance with the order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will do it.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister should not shield himself behind his deputy and say that he has literally complied with the order when it has not been complied with in fact.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is nothing to keep back I can assure you.

LETTERS DELAYED IN TRANSMISSION.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). On Sunday night or Monday morning of last week an accident occurred by the derailing and immersion in a lake of a mail car near Kenora, and on the Wednesday following I asked the Postmaster General if he had any information about it and he replied that he had not. Since then the Postmaster General has been good enough to inform me that the information had reached the department on the 1st of June, that a portion of the mails had been rescued and had been spread out and dried and forwarded to their destination with a note stating what happened to them. The fact remains that a portion of those mails may not yet have been delivered, and I was expecting letters myself about that date. I have since received two letters. One of them was inclosed in a wrapper from the Ottawa post office stating that it had been received in a damaged condition, at Ottawa, Ontario. That is all the information I got to account for the damaged condition in which this letter, which was posted on the 23rd of May at the town of Moosomin, reached me. The other letter had a note across it stating that it was damaged by water owing to a railway accident near Kenora, Ontario. Of course, I realize that that is practically all that the Post Office Department could do at the moment; but it would be much more satisfactory to me if I had known at the time the accident happened that the mails coming from the Northwest had been delayed in consequence of an accident. It would have been still more satisfactory if I were aware that the persons in the Northwest who had addressed letters to me knew that an accident had happened to the mail car on which their letters had been conveyed. Last year I saw a very brief item in a paper stating that a mail car had been destroyed by fire in the Northwest several days before, and I had no idea whether some important letter of mine might not have been in that mail car and had not reached its destination. It seems to me that when accidents of this kind happen, the proper course would be for notices to be sent to all the post offices from which bags had been sent by the destroyed mail car, so that people sending important communications would have the earliest possible notice if their communications had been destroyed or damaged or delayed in transit. It must be evident to everybody that accidents of this kind may be fraught with very serious consequences to private individuals using the mails. A good many years ago I suffered a great deal of inconvenience from the fact that a letter disappeared, and I could only guess that it must have been destroyed with a mail car that had been burned, as some time later I heard had been the case. When such a thing happens I think the Postmaster General should give notice to the post office from which letters conveyed on the mail car were despatched, stating that it had been burned.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I am glad that my hon. friend has called my attention once again to this accident which occurred on the Canadian Pacific Railway a few days ago. Since I wrote to my hon. friend giving him the particulars which had reached me after the accident, I think further details have reached the department, which I shall be glad to communicate to him. I quite understand that it is very annoying to have letters lost or damaged; but after all an accident is an accident. I take note, however, of the advice which the hon. gentleman gives as to what should be done. As a matter of fact, I think that it is done—that as soon as an accident takes place, notice is sent to the different offices affected; but my hon. friend will understand that when a fire destroys a mail car, with the mail bags, the result is a considerable state of confusion in the department. However, the advice given by the hon. gentleman is very reasonable, and I will see what is being done in these cases.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are the notices which are sent to the post offices posted up, or are they merely sent for the information of the postmaster?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The duty of the postmaster is to post the notice in his office.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any instruction to postmasters to that effect?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the postmaster instructed to notify all parties sending registered letters for instance.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the case of registered letters it is easier to reach the

parties sending them, because their names have been entered in a book ; but in the case of ordinary letters it is very difficult to reach the correspondents, but immediately after the accident the department notifies each postmaster affected, and it is his duty to post the notice up in the post office.

Mr. LAKE. I have never seen such a notice.

Mr. SPROULE. When a postmaster is notified that a mail from his office has been destroyed, is there any instruction to him to notify all parties who sent registered letters by that mail ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Those who have sent registered letters have the receipts in thier hands and they will know whether the parties to whom the letters were addressed received them or not, and they can themselves make complaint to the post office if they have a complaint to make. I am not aware whether or not instructions are given to the postmasters to notify the parties who sent registered letters ; but I will inquire as to that.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—INVESTIGATION BY MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the motion passes I would like to bring to the attention of the government two matters that are more or less connected with the report of the Civil Service Commission. The first thing that I desire to do is to ask information from the government as to when it is likely that Mr. Justice Cassels will resume his inquiry. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will recollect that the report of the Civil Service Commission was placed in the hands of the government on the 17th March last, nearly three months ago, and that it was presented to the House on the 26th March, after inquiry had first been made of the commission for certain memoranda which were referred to in the report, but which did not accompany it in the first instance. On the 26th March the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) announced the determination of the government that a searching inquiry should be prosecuted with respect to the allegations of the commissioners in regard to his department. Later, on the 6th day of April, Mr. Justice Cassels announced to the Prime Minister in a letter that if he undertook the work of this commission he could only do so upon the understanding that his judicial duties should occupy his attention in the first instance and that he should give only such time to the work of the commission as would remain after he had properly discharged his judicial functions. Mr. Justice Cassels, in the same letter, made suggestions as to the appointment of some person as his deputy to perform his duties as judge during the time in which he was engaged in the work of this commission. No action however was taken by the government, although a Bill had been placed on the Order Paper early in March and upon that Bill being presented to this House on the 14th May it was passed immediately with very little discussion and with some slight amendments and has gone from this House to the Senate. I do not know what its fortune has been in the Senate, nor do I know whether it is in a position to receive the assent of the Governor General. At all events it left this House on the same day that its second reading was brought on ; that is to say, on the 14th day of May last. Now, the allegations of the commissioners with respect to the Department of Marine and Fisheries were of a sufficiently serious character to evoke from the government, on the 26th day of March last, the statement that an immediate and effective inquiry would be made. Nearly three months have elapsed and nothing has been done except the examination of two of the commissioners before Mr. Justice Cassels, and possibly the examination of one or two other persons. It seems to me that this is a matter of some urgency. The opposition in parliament would be justified, without taking a very extreme position at all, in insisting that the work of that commission should be prosecuted to a conclusion and its report presented to parliament before the conclusion of this session and before any further supplies should be granted to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I think that would be a perfectly proper and constitutional position for the opposition to take. We have not announced any such determination up to the present time, but I think it is only fair and right for me to say to the Prime Minister that this is a matter of urgency, that the government themselves have recognized it as a matter of great urgency and that the very slight progress which has been made in the prosecution of the inquiry does not reflect credit upon the administration of the government, nor does it indicate any great desire on the part of the government to facilitate these proceedings. That is all I have to say as to that particular subject. It might be elaborated at much greater length, but I think the Prime Minister will understand thoroughly, from the few words I have spoken, my view with regard to the matter.

There is one other subject in connection with the report of the commission to which I also desire to call attention. Two of the commissioners were examined—Messrs. Fyshe and Bazin—and I believe that very little was elicited from them beyond the statement that they stood by the report and that they did not consider themselves subject to cross-examination with respect

to the grounds upon which they had made that report. They took, in effect, the position that all the information which they had obtained was available to the commissioner himself, that it could be procured by him and that it was not very consonant with the position which they had occupied as members of a royal commission that they should be cross-examined before another commissioner as to the grounds upon which they had reached their conclusions. But there was one officer, not a member of that commission, but an officer of parliament, who might very well have been called and called at the earliest possible stage before Mr. Justice Cassels, and I am at a loss to know why it was that the counsel acting for the government in this inquiry failed to have their attention directed to the necessity of calling Mr. Fraser, the Auditor General. As an example of the service that he might have been able to give in the prosecution of the inquiry, let me call the attention of the government to the evidence which Mr. Fraser has already given before the royal commission upon the subject of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The evidence which I shall quote is at page 1309 of the evidence reported to parliament and printed :

Q. The Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries was here last Friday and he told us, among other things, that he had arranged with you about the system of certificates in use by the department. Is the system of certificates now satisfactory?—A. Not any more so than it was before.

Q. The certificates are either 'according to contract' or 'according to agreement,' or 'prices fair and just'?—A. Yes.

Q. And in regard to the Marine and Fisheries Department how far are they still satisfactory?—A. Well, they are just about as unsatisfactory as they were last year, or two years ago. I mean we have to be continually taking up accounts and going back of the certificate. The certificates they are giving us are not reliable—I mean they may be good, and they may not. There is a case now down on the ship channel where they have a lot of men employed by the day, and they also board these men on the vessels.

If there are any officers in the service of the government, whether in the Department of Marine and Fisheries or in any other department, whose certificate is not regarded as reliable by the Auditor General, I think it is very important that the circumstances should be inquired into. We have an inquiry proceeding with regard to one department, and one department only, in respect to which the Auditor General has stated upon his oath that the certificates which are given are not reliable. Then the witness is taken in hand by Mr. Fyshe and the evidence is resumed at page 1310:

Q. You told us about that before?—A. Well, we find it very difficult to check that and see whether the men that are employed by the day are the men whose board is paid for in the boarding house. The captain, or the man in charge of the work there, gets 75 cents per day for boarding them.

We asked them, for instance, to make out the two lists, that is the pay-list and the board list in the same order so that we could see that the names would correspond, because there are a great many men, particularly down in that section of the country, who bear the same name. There is a recurrence of the same name frequently; it may be all right.

Q. But you cannot tell?—A. We cannot tell.

Q. Do they not sign for it or give a receipt?—A. The men give receipts for their own pay, but the man who has boarded them gives a general receipt for the board of the whole list. We are trying to get the original books from him, to see whether he kept some record, a daily record, but we cannot get that. He says: 'Well, I did not keep it.' Of course you get the certificate from the man that these men were boarded there.

Q. But that is all you get?—A. Yes, but I want something back of that. That is why I say the certificates are unsatisfactory. I say a man ought to be able to back up his certificate with some other evidence.

Q. Instead of having proper vouchers you have only a bulk certificate?—A. Yes, the man receiving the money is practically certifying that his own account is correct.

Q. In fact that is not a proper receipt at all?—A. No, it is not.

By the Chairman:

Q. Are there any other cases in which the certificates are unsatisfactory?—A. Well, I put it generally this way, that when you find a man makes a certificate in one instance that turns out to be wrong I have no confidence in his certificate afterwards.

By Mr. Fyshe:

Q. If he does the wrong thing once you cannot take his certificate again?—A. I have these certificates presented to me time after time. I mean certificates that are no guarantee the account is correct. It is unsatisfactory in that way.

Q. Have you had any correspondence with the Deputy Minister pointing out what you want?—A. Yes, I haven't any doubt that in the last year's accounts we had correspondence asking for further corroboration of the accounts. Take, for instance, the matter of travelling expenses—take an officer of the department, where I thought his travelling expenses account was too heavy and where he had to admit it and make a refund.

Q. He made a refund?—A. Yes, of course he said that his accounts got mixed up, that was the only excuse he gave, but the man's certificate is of no value to me ever since.

Q. Of course not?—A. And he is travelling still, and furnishing accounts, they may be right or they may be wrong.

I do not wish to add anything to what Mr. Fraser has said in his evidence, except that it is exactly the point that we had raised in respect of the investigation concerning the 'Arctic' expedition. In that case there were certificates as to quantities and as to prices. It was urged by the Conservative members of that committee that we should go behind and investigate the cor-

rectness of these certificates and that the committee should hear evidence of persons who had made an examination of the stock remaining in the vessel after the expedition. The certificates were, so far as I recollect, considered to be prima facie evidence at least of the amount on board and there was not much investigation of the actual accuracy of the certificate. It is true that some persons were called who testified that certificates were given and they were all right so far as they knew, but I am making the same point that the Auditor General makes in his evidence that there as well as in the every day business of the government, the certificate is not good unless the officer certifying actually knows that the goods were supplied, that the prices are fair and that the expenditure is therefore a reasonable one.

There is another matter which concerns, but not so closely, the report of this royal commission. I shall not again refer to the parts of the report in which the commissioners point out that some better system should be devised with respect to the statistics of the country. It is pointed out in this report that the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Customs both prepare blue-books containing reports of the trade and commerce of the country, and other important statistics. It is suggested by the commission that this work should be done in a more thorough and uniform way and they make several suggestions. Among other things they suggest that the publication might be supervised by the joint committee of parliament entrusted with the printing of parliamentary documents.

Certain correspondence has been forwarded to me by the government of British Columbia. I shall not quote it in full but shall merely state its purport. On April 2, 1908, the assistant secretary of the Bureau of Provincial Information of British Columbia asked the Department of Customs for a statement of the total exports and imports of British Columbia for the last fiscal year. The details were asked for if it was possible to give them, but the totals were asked for in the meantime. No answer having being received, on April 27, more than three weeks afterwards, a telegram was sent to the Department of Customs to which, on the same day, a reply was received from the Department of Customs stating that the letter of April 2 could not be found and asking that a duplicate should be sent. A reply to that telegram was forwarded on the same day from the office of the secretary of the Bureau of Provincial Information of British Columbia repeating the request for the total of the imports and exports of British Columbia for the last fiscal year. On April 28, the Department of Customs telegraphed to the provincial secretary of British Columbia that the report had been mailed on the 21st of April and the letter of the 21st of April, which arrived shortly afterwards, contained the information as to the exports and imports of that province during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908. That letter was acknowledged on April 28, and a further request was made for the details of these statements, it being alleged by the secretary of the Bureau of Provincial Information of British Columbia that people were constantly asking for the quantities and values of imports and exports of different classes of goods. On May 7, that letter was acknowledged by the Department of Customs and it was stated that some time must elapse before the figures would be available, but that a note had been made of the matter and the department would endeavour to comply with the request at the earliest possible date. On May 14, a letter was written by the Commissioner of Customs to the assistant secretary of the Bureau of Information. The letter is as follows :

Ottawa, May 14, 1908.

Frank I. Clarke, Esq.,
Assistant Secretary Bureau of Provincial Information, Victoria, British Columbia.

Sir,—On the 7th instant I wrote you in reply to yours of the 28th ultimo, in which you ask for a detailed statement of the imports and exports of British Columbia for the fiscal year 1908, as follows:

'I beg to inform you that some time must elapse before these figures will be available, but a note has been made of the matter and I will endeavour to comply with your request at the earliest possible date.'

Upon looking further into the matter and consulting the chief clerk in charge of statistics, I am advised that the preparation of such a statement would entail a great amount of labour and consume considerable time in its preparation, necessitating the withdrawal of clerks from their regular duties while so engaged, and as the staff is fully engaged in the preparation of the annual report and other parliamentary papers, it is impossible to prepare such a statement unless by assigning the work to special officers to be done after regular office hours, for which they would expect to be compensated.

In the circumstances, I am writing to state that if you are willing to compensate these men while so engaged in overtime work, the statement will be got ready as soon as possible. I estimate the cost will be about seventy-five dollars.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner of Customs.

To this on May 21, 1908, the following reply was transmitted :

John McDougald, Esq.,
Commissioner of Customs, Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 14th instant, and I am

authorized by the hon. Minister of Finance to request you to furnish a detailed statement of the imports and exports of British Columbia for the fiscal year of 1908, on the terms which you name, that is an expenditure of $75.

It is regrettable that the statistics are not so compiled as to permit of the exports and imports of the various provinces to be got at without a large amount of extra work.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

FRANK I. CLARKE,

Assistant Secretary.

I am not disposed to minimize the difficulties in the preparation of these statistics directly after the close of the fiscal year, but it does seem a matter of regret if information of that kind cannot be furnished to the government of a province who asked for this reasonable public information, without imposing upon them a certain charge for furnishing it. I dare say the same system has been carried out in the past, indeed I am disposed to believe the Minister of Customs has made some improvements in the preparation of statistics, but it is an unfortunate condition of affairs that figures of that kind should not be available at the very earliest possible moment; and without desiring in any way to unduly criticise the record of the government in this respect I would submit to the Prime Minister that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Trade and Commerce should undertake a reorganization of this statistical branch at the very earliest possible moment so that not only for the provincial governments but for all the citizens of the country who may desire reasonable information of that kind such reasonable information would be forthcoming without the necessity of imposing a tax or charge upon either the provincial government or any person or corporation who may desire information of that character with regard to an important public subject.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). With regard to the latter part of the information sought by my hon. friend, I have only to say that it is a purely departmental matter as to which I am sure the Minister of Customs, as soon as he is in his seat, will be able to give some answer to my hon. friend. I am sorry to say that personally I could not say anything at present upon this point.

With regard to the other matter, that is to say the inquiry of my hon. friend as to the investigation of the Civil Service, my hon. friend is aware that Mr. Justice Cassels has adjourned his inquest, I think to a certain date in the present month.

Mr. FOSTER. To a certain date?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, without any date. At all events he is coming back to Ottawa during the present month, and I daresay will be prepared to resume the investigation directly on his return, provided, as he has stated, that some one else is appointed by the government to take charge of his general judicial work. A Bill has been passed to that effect some time ago. That Bill is now before the Senate, and I do not know in what condition it is at the present time, but it will be ready for the sanction of His Excellency the Governor General as soon as we call upon His Excellency to sanction a Bill of Supply which we hope to be ready to present to His Excellency early in the coming week. At that time if the Bill which has passed this House receives the sanction of His Excellency, as it will, I have no doubt, the government will be prepared to make the appointment provided for in that Bill.

PRINTING OF TRADE RETURNS.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). There seems to me to be an expensive and unnecessary reduplication of publications with reference to the trade and other statistics. There is also a lack of agreement between the publications as they are issued by the different departments. The Trade and Navigation reports are issued by the Minister of Customs and the Trade and Commerce reports by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Any person taking these up and arranging a series of comparative statements or reports from one of them finds when he refers to the other that for the very same year and the very same period there is a disagreement in the total figures, and in order to be accurate and save himself he has to state from which of these returns he takes the figures so that he may not be confronted with a statement for the same year which he cannot substantiate from the report he has used. Besides that there is a complete reduplication of matter in the Trade and Navigation report and the Trade and Commerce report in certain particulars. Both of these are very bulky and costly volumes, and I do not see why it is necessary to have a reduplication of the very same information in these two large volumes issued by different departments of the same government and simply issued by different departments. The Trade and Commerce Department issues a series of monthly reports. They call them bulletins. They are large reports, they are costly, but the trouble about them is that when you receive them they are two, three or four months late. To whom are they distributed? They may come to the members of parliament but they are practically of no use to them, the member of parliament may occasionally use some figures from them if he is preparing speeches, but a member of parliament depends upon the yearly reports. It is with yearly statements that he is particularly engaged. Then where do these go? It is supposed they are distributed to boards of trade and merchants, &c., but there again

the trouble is they are two or three or four months behind the time, and the information they give is, I think, of very little practical benefit, at least I have talked with people who get them who say that. Now, these cost a lot of money. Again you have the abstract which is now issued. Your census report is made up and is distributed in complete form and also in bulletin form. These figures come to the members of parliament, to the men who make a study of statistics and to all those who propose to use them. Then again there is the statistical abstract, the Year-book of Canada as it is called. The statistical abstract for the last two years has been very largely an extension of the figures that have been published in the census report. It is, I was going to say, absolutely useless for the purpose for which a Year-book is compiled. Any man who wishes to study these figures gets them in the reports of the Census Department and then he takes up the Year-book thinking he is going to get fresh information but finds that a large portion of it is available in other forms. A very large proportion is taken up with a reduplication of the census returns. Another very large part is taken up with holus bolus transfers from the Trade and Navigation Report or from the Trade and Commerce Report and the figures of Trade and Commerce in their different forms. You get absolutely nothing that you do not get in the Trade and Commerce Report, and you get it not in its full form but in a necessarily imperfect form. Then you get certain statistics with reference to some of the other departments which are culled from their reports. A condensation of some of these may be useful but my contention is that in the first place there is a large amount of statistical work done by different departments, each doing it separately, and that there is a useless and expensive duplication. It seems to me to be perfectly useless to publish a Year-book which is merely a duplication of parliamentary reports which have already appeared. Your Year-book does not give anything fresh because it is a year or a year and a half behind the times. The Year-book ought to be fresh and up to date, which I am sorry to say the present Year-book is not. The kind of statistics we want we don't get, and the kind we do not want we get measured up in two or three different forms. It would be a good thing for the government to appoint a commission of three or four competent people who are in the departments and let them look up the whole question of statistical reports so as to provide that there shall be no duplication, and if possible that they shall be brought up to date. When we compare our statistics with those issued in the United States the disparity in usefulness and efficiency is very apparent.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). Sometimes I send these monthly reports of the Department of Customs back to the distribution office as I find them of no practical value. The last report for March, the end of the fiscal year, was placed in my desk yesterday and as that report gives a return for the full twelve months of the year I found it quite useful and a moment ago I forwarded it to a manufacturer in my county who I knew would be interested in it. But I would not trouble him by sending him the reports of the previous months because they would not give him an opportunity of ascertaining how the trade of the country was. I have often been confused myself with the superabundance of statistics we have. The report of the Trade and Commerce Department and the Trade and Navigation returns vary very greatly and are very confusing. I understand that the report of the Trade and Commerce Department gives the entire imports regardless of whether they are for home consumption or not, while the Trade and Navigation returns classify the imports. I do not think the members of this House would be one whit worse off if the entire reports of the Trade and Commerce Department were ignored for it is only a useless expense to print and duplicate the information they contain. I rarely find any good use for the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce although I am very fond of studying the Trade and Navigation returns in which I generally get all the information I want. I regret that the Minister of Customs is not in his place to-day—I am not finding any fault with that because I was absent myself last week, and I presume he is absent to-day for the same reason—but had he been here I would point out to him that the monthly reports of his department would be very much more useful if they included another column giving the amount of duties paid under the general tariff, the preferential tariff, and the surtax. I do not think it would add to the trouble or expense if that information were supplied, and I would ask the minister were he here to direct his officers to set out in these reports what duties had been collected. More especially would I like to see that information in the last monthly report for the fiscal year, for then it would answer all the purposes of the complete volume of the Trade and Navigation returns which will not be published for perhaps six months after the end of the fiscal year. This would enable the members of the House during recess to study these matters so as to be able to intelligently discuss them when parliament meets again. With regard to the Year-book.

Mr. TAYLOR. It's no good.

Mr. HENDERSON. It may be useful to some, but when I get it, it is too old to be

of any use to me, and hence I probably do not refer to it once a year. Frequently it may be used to compare one year with another, but generally speaking I have found it very useless.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Trade and Commerce might repudiate it as he did two or three years ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of course, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has practically nothing or very little to do, and if we were to deprive him of the publication of that volume, his department might be rendered almost useless, and there would then be no justification for paying him a salary of $7,000 a year and keeping a highly paid deputy minister.

Mr. KEMP. The question of the duplication of statistical reports is one which I have referred to on a previous occasion, and like the hon. member for Halton, I am sorry that the Minister of Customs is not here to-day. If the reports of the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Trade and Navigation returns were intelligently consolidated, they would be very much more useful to the members of the House and to the public than they are at present. I cannot understand why it is necessary to go to the expense of issuing two reports so nearly alike. Besides these reports, there is the Statistical Year-book. This book, in its present form, is less useful than it formerly was. There has been omitted from it seventy-two important subjects which appeared in the former Year-book, and in order to get this information one has to go over the reports of various departments of the government and to search the books, periodicals and governmental reports published in foreign countries. I suppose that the object in reducing the size of the Year-book of Canada was to have members and the public refer to the reports of the various departments of the government; but as a matter of fact that is not practicable. People will not look through such voluminous reports. Most people want information in more convenient form. It seems to me that we have gone a little further than is necessary in the way of governmental publications. The whole question should be reviewed, by a commission or otherwise, and the reports made of more practical service than they are at present. In the Statistical Abstract of the United States there are very many subjects which are not to be found in the Year-book of Canada, but which were previously contained in it. I had a return brought down showing the various matters which are omitted from the present Year-book. Some of these are very important, such as imports and exports and duties per head of the population, imports and exports of foreign goods via Canada, imports and exports of foreign goods via the United States, imports and exports of foreign countries, drawbacks allowed, aggregate trade of the Dominion, average value of imports in three year periods, public debts of foreign countries, provincial debts, &c. I think it would be well for the government to consider whether these subjects should not again be included in the Year-book, and whether the statistics of the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Trade and Navigation Returns cannot be consolidated.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been in the habit for many years of sending copies of the Dominion Year-book to Public school teachers and to men in commercial life, who found that it contained valuable information. But since the change has taken place I have been reminded by several that the book has become practically worthless. This book was originally compiled by Mr. George Johnston, who was the best statistician we ever had here; but objection was taken that the book was too large, that it dealt with too many subjects, and some gentlemen were of opinion that Mr. Johnston should be supplanted, and that the book should be compiled by some one else on narrower lines. The government heeded these representations and made a change, and with what result? That the book has become almost useless. I agree entirely with what the hon. member for East Toronto has said. The book was formerly a valuable compilation of statistics, and it might be so again if it were properly compiled.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It was my intention to have taken up a matter relating to the Customs Department, but the Minister of Customs is not in his place. I sent him notice yesterday of my intention to take that matter up. Apparently, from what his colleagues say, he has left the city. I find that in my absence the other evening, he took the opportunity of criticising me for being absent. Well, I know of no argument he could apply to myself which would not apply with equal force to the minister. If he has gone to my constituency, as reported, I do not think he was justified in his criticism of me with regard to that same matter. I came down early in the week purposely to take up matters in connection with customs. I had made a personal request to the minister that he would reserve one item in his estimates on which we might have a general discussion of the affairs of his department. This he did not do and I judge from what I see in 'Hansard' that it is not the intention of the minister to give me the opportunity I asked for when going away. I shall take the earliest opportunity when he is here to criticise certain acts done in the department and certain parts of its administration. I shall therefore defer the remarks I was going to make until such time as the

minister is here attending to his duties. I thought it was well to explain the situation to the House because I sent him a letter yesterday saying that I was going to make some remarks.

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

Dominion Astronomical Survey—salaries of technical officers and clerks, $17,192.50.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The explanation of the increase is as follows: Mr. J. H. Labbe gets an increase of $300 from the 1st July next. Mr. Labbe has proved a competent assistant secretary to the chief astronomer and has besides charge of the library.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is the library?

Mr. OLIVER. At the experimental farm. Then there are the annual increases of $50 each.

Mr. FOSTER. What force have they there?

Mr. OLIVER. Eleven men. Mr. Plaskett is the astronomer. This is a special vote for these officials of the astronomical survey who are not included in the vote for civil government which went through last night.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Dr. King the only one under civil government?

Mr. OLIVER. No, there are besides Otto Klotz, J. J. McArthur and C. A. Biggar. These come under the civil government vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there are eleven besides these?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the work in which these fifteen high class men are engaged.

Mr. OLIVER. As this is strictly a scientific branch, it would be better to let the matter stand until I can have Dr. King here. I intended having him here but was not sure when this item would be reached.

Mr. FOSTER. If Dr. King would prepare a succinct memo. showing what this branch is designed to do, what it has done and what it proposes to do, that would be very useful to parliament and the country as well. I understand that we must have such a branch and, so far as I know, we have an efficient one, but it might be popularized a little by a statement of that kind.

Mr. OLIVER. I will have such a statement prepared, so that in case he should not be here I will be able to present it. Or I can have Mr. King here at three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be more satisfactory.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). The purely scientific facts that are gathered at this observatory are not understood by a large number of people, and I think that the expenditure would be more popular if the people at large were informed as to the work which is done at the observatory. For instance, the nearer nebulae and the fixed stars——

Mr. FOSTER. They are first cousins, like, are they not?

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Wait a moment, my hon. friend has not studied astronomy as I have for forty years. I may say that popular information is now given in the newspapers by means of diagrams and there are also articles written by eminent astronomers at the Lick observatory and the Yerkes observatory which are familiarizing the popular mind with that species of information which deals with the movements and phenomena of the celestial bodies. Now, the professors at our observatory could write say monthly a popular article on the approximate distances and magnitudes, &c., of the nearer nebular and largest fixed stars and could obtain additional information concerning the most remarkable objects which are to be seen in the heavens, and this information could be published in a popular form and thus become useful to the schools and to all the people who are interested in that magnificent study. It could be done without much expense, and it would be copied in the newspaper periodicals all over Canada. Of course allowance would have to be made for the difference in latitude between the Lick observatory in California, for instance, and the latitude of Ottawa in Canada. But the objects which are most visible could be described, and this popular information could be communicated in that way. I know that I would have the support of my hon. friends opposite in advocating any expenditure for improving the instruments at the observatory, because I am satisfied that this expenditure if made more useful to the public would meet the approval of the Canadian people.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. KEMP. Does the item we are now considering cover the boundary survey?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, the second item.

Mr. KEMP. What boundary surveys are now being carried on?

Mr. OLIVER. There is the survey of the 141st meridian between Alaska and the Yukon Territory, the coastal survey between Alaska and British Columbia, the 49th parallel between the United States and the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the boundary between the state of Maine and the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. KEMP. The boundary between Canada and the United States, from the St. Lawrence east, has been completed as far as the state of Maine, I understand.

Mr. OLIVER. As far as the state of New Hampshire.

Mr. KEMP. And is being continued east and north at the state of Maine.

Mr. OLIVER. They are working from the other end now.

Mr. KEMP. In the survey between the Yukon Territory and Alaska how many weeks in the year can they work and how many miles are they able to do in the season? How many men are there on the survey?

Mr. OLIVER. They are able to work about five months in the season. Last year they did 130 miles of the line.

Mr. KEMP. How many parties are there?

Mr. OLIVER. There are three parties at work, one actually running the line and the second taking the topography of the country adjoining the line and the third cutting a way through the woods along the line.

Mr. KEMP. How many men are employed altogether?

Mr. OLIVER. Our party works in conjunction with the party of the United States. I am informed there are probably about sixty men in the party.

Mr. KEMP. Is that line being surveyed right through to the Arctic ocean?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the ultimate intention.

Mr. KEMP. Is there necessity for this work going on up in the Arctic circle?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course the question of boundaries may at any time become important and it is generally considered better to have such questions settled at a time when they are not attracting attention rather than to await the time when they may be attracting attention. A dispute is much more easily settled if it is not allowed to arise. That is the principle we are going on in the case of the 141st meridian. As my hon. friend is probably aware there is a part of that meridian which must be very accurately defined because of the gold mining operations which are going on on both sides of the line. That is a highly mineralized country and we have hopes that gold discoveries may be made in other places, we do not know where. but we think we should be preparing at a reasonable rate of speed and with a reasonable expenditure so that should it at any time be necessary to absolutely know where the boundary is we will know it. It is one of the responsibilities attaching to the ownership of vast territories, and having assumed the responsibility it must be discharged.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. KEMP. As I understand, part of the territory is allotted to the United States survey parties and part to the Canadian, they do not work jointly but in alternate positions.

Mr. OLIVER. They work jointly so that their work is checked. Each checks the work of the other as it proceeds.

Mr. KEMP. I understood they had separate camps and came together at certain points, that we accepted their line for nine or ten miles and they accepted ours for nine or ten miles, that they did not work together.

Mr. OLIVER. The system of which my hon. friend speaks is that which prevails on the Alaska coast boundary, an irregular boundary line which divides the strip of Alaska along the Pacific coast from the interior of British Columbia and the Yukon. In that case each country accepts the work done by the party of the other country; they work in alternate sections, but in that case it is a question of delimitation according to physical features. In the case of the 141st meridian it is a case of accuracy of scientific establishment and in such a case it is considered that the only correct way is that the work of each party should be checked by the other as it is being done.

Mr. KEMP. Is the minister sure the parties can survey as much as 130 miles in a season?

Mr. OLIVER. My information is that the work done last season was about 130 miles south from the point where the 141st meridian crosses the Yukon river.

Mr. KEMP. The reason I asked was that in going to the experimental farm the other day I met a man who had been working on that Yukon survey who told me that they were able to do about nine miles a year. I do not know his name but he was one of the men going out there.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid my hon. friend has derived his information from an unreliable source.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this item for surveys cover the delimiting of the boundary under the treaty recently signed with reference to which we have not yet received the correspondence?

Mr. OLIVER. We will have to ask for a supplementary vote for the work of delimiting the boundary under the new treaty. This vote will cover part of that work but it is not sufficient to cover the expenditure caused by the treaty recently signed.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the House is treated with scant courtesy in being asked for votes to delimit a boundary under treaties when we have not the treaties or the correspondence referring to them in our possession. Surely parlia-

ment ought to know under what conditions they are going to delimit this boundary. Parliament ought to be informed as to what has taken place between the imperial government and the government of the United States in regard to these treaties before it is asked to vote money for delimiting the boundaries. It is going it blind to a great extent and I think somebody ought to make a statement to explain to the House what has been done so that we could know the exact provisions of these treaties. We are voting money and allowing men to go and delimit the boundary without knowing upon what authority beyond the statement that there has been a treaty passed which is binding on Canada but which has not yet been laid upon the table of the House.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The boundary line between Canada and the United States was fixed at the 141st meridian six years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. We are talking about the whole boundary between Canada and the United States. As I understand they are going on to delimit the boundary westward from the St. Lawrence river under a treaty that we have not even read in this House and as to which we have no information. I think it is a very unbusinesslike way for parliament to do especially with respect to a matter that concerns the country so much.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I think the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has possibly not been paying as close attention to his duties as he might have. Otherwise, he would have found that the treaty has been laid before parliament. I got it in my desk. I sent several copies out to people in British Columbia who were anxious to see it.

Mr. SPROULE. When ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The day before yesterday.

Mr. SPROULE. All I can say is that the minister said that it would have to be printed. He laid it on the table of the House, but it was not printed or distributed and in so far as I know it is not printed or distributed yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not received a copy of it yet.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I got mine from the distribution office in the regular way.

Mr. WARD. You got some advance copies.

Mr. MACPHERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. You must be the white headed boy.

Mr. MACPHERSON. May be I am. Perhaps I am like the man who was born blind and who was cured; he could not say how it happened but he was cured just the same. I have been informed and I have also read in the coast papers that the Canadian and American Alaska boundary survey parties are held up on the coast due to the fact that there is no money voted to cover the cost of the delimitation of this boundary line. I would like to know if that is correct.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend's information is only partially correct. The Canadian parties in question have not yet left Ottawa. We have not felt justified in sending them out without an assurance of the funds necessary to pay them. Of course the United States survey party cannot proceed under the agreement that has been made without our survey party being on the ground.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that they have had one meeting in Buffalo and that they intend to have another at Toronto. We are providing for the delimitation of the boundary without seeing the treaty under which this is to be done. Parliament ought to be informed of its details before being asked to vote money.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would like to know what the facts are, Statements are made in the coast papers and it is common talk there apparently that the United States survey parties are at Juneau awaiting the arrival of the Canadian parties both of which were to have met some time in the early part of May to begin the work, but they cannot proceed because of the non-arrival of the Canadian party. When the Alaskan boundary award was made five or six years ago, was it not accepted by both governments that the 141st meridian would be the boundary line between the two countries ?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is absolutely correct. The parties should be on the ground, but the United States party, of course, cannot proceed with the work without our party being there. We cannot send them until we get the sanction of parliament. The delimitation of the boundary on the 141st meridian which is the subject of their work is not the subject of the treaty recently signed. The treaty of 1906 provides for a survey of the 141st meridian as the boundary between Alaska and Canada. The exact point at which the meridian crosses the Yukon was determined by astronomical observation in 1906; therefore, the vote which we are asking for now in that particular part has nothing to do with the treaty that is under consideration. The whole of this vote which is now before the House in these main estimates is apportioned amongst the boundary surveys which have been already arranged for.

Mr. FOSTER. Between what points?

Mr. OLIVER. The 141st meridian between the Yukon and Alaska; the boundary

between the coast strip of Alaska and Canadian territory : the 49th parallel between the Northern States and the Canadian west, and the boundary between New Brunswick and the State of Maine, coming westerly. The work in these four sections of the boundary is now being done under an agreement and under treaties entered into.

Mr. FOSTER. Taking the New Brunswosk portion, how many miles are to be delimited there and how many miles have been delimited ?

Mr. OLIVER. There have been delimited about 65 miles between New York and Quebec and 100 miles between Vermont and Quebec. That part of the line is completed. We are proposing to begin now at the other end of the line between the State of Maine and New Brunswick and it is for that work, commencing at the other end and coming easterly, that we are asking for the money.

Mr. FOSTER. How many miles will that be ?

Mr. OLIVER. Between 350 and 400 miles remain to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. Of the New Brunswick portion ?

Mr. OLIVER. Between New Brunswick and Maine and the remainder between Quebec and Maine and Quebec and New Hampshire.

Mr. FOSTER. How many miles altogether have to be delimited ?

Mr. OLIVER. About 550 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Of which how much will be done ?

Mr. OLIVER. 165 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. And of the New Brunswick portion none has been done ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, they are commencing that now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems a pity that the treaties between Great Britain and the United States were not laid on the table of the House and printed earlier. As I understand it this vote is for the delimitation of the boundary provided for by the Alaskan treaty.

Mr. OLIVER. The only concern this vote would have with the recent treaty is that if there were a surplus from this vote it would of course go to the delimitation under the new treaty. It could be used for that but we are not asking the vote for that purpose. We will have to ask a supplementary estimate for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not had a copy of this treaty and I should think the distribution of public documents should be a little more uniform than it appears to have been in this case.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I sent and got it in the distribution office.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know why it should remain in the distribution office when there have been so many inquiries in the House for it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Is the survey going on at present ?

Mr. OLIVER. The parties for the coast boundary have left but the parties for the 141st meridian have not because we did not feel justified in sending them to extreme points where expenses would be great unless we had the sanction of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And this is the first time this vote has been asked for.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The United States survey parties are cooling their heels in Juneau, Alaska, and our survey parties are doing the same thing around Vancouver and other coast cities. The United States have their men financed and we have no money for our men and so this parliament has placed itself in a ridiculous position.

Mr. FOSTER. This parliament which is in that position has never been asked for a dollar of this money until half past 12 o'clock on this the 3rd day of June, 1908.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman has any fault to find let him pitch into his minister.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I make no captious criticism, but if parliament has not before been asked for this money it is because day after day this parliament tried to get into Supply and Supply has been blocked. The hon. gentleman from North Toronto knows it, everybody knows it. It is particularly annoying in an international matter of this kind that such should be the case. For weeks our newspapers in British Columbia have been discussing it and the people on the coast understand the reason for it.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an important matter ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. It is an important matter.

Mr. FOSTER. More important than anything else ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not say it is more important than anything else, but it is more important in the delimitation of the boundary between Canada and the United States in Alaska it should be gone on with because there are gold discoveries taking place all the time, and if Canadian governments for the last 50 years had been

alive to their duty Canada would to-day own Skagway and Lynn canal.

Mr. FOSTER. If your Prime Minister had not made the assertion he did in parliament we might have had a great deal more.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am endeavouring to treat of this question above party politics and I say we should have the international boundary line delimited because there is a rich country to the north and gold is being found and will be found for years to come and we want to have our flag floating over our own land so that marauders cannot come as they have in the past and take a considerable portion of our country, backed up by men like Lord Alvestone. I think it is time the House got this vote through.

Mr. FOSTER. So do I.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It should be put through at once.

Mr. FOSTER. I agree with you.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It is time also that our good friends opposite should realize the condition they have placed the country in by blocking the supplies.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You placed it in that position.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Day after day Supply has been blocked and this is only one instance of the result.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson) has not looked up the record or he would not have made his speech. If this is an international matter and of so much importance why did not the government bring the vote to the attention of parliament on the 15th day of May when they asked us to vote $600,000 for Public Works in Manitoba and the west? More than double the amount asked for in this vote to-day was voted by this House on the 15th of May. The timber discussion took place on the 19th. On the 20th $1,104,895 was voted for the Mounted Police, the Militia and the post office. Two days afterwards the post office estimates came up again and they were passed, amounting to $5,479,110, with the usual discussion. If this vote was so important a matter, why was it not asked for at that time? On the 29th of May a considerable portion, nearly a million and a quarter, of the estimates for the Customs Department were passed, and on the 1st of June the balance was passed, making a total of $1,815,187 for that department. When the hon. gentleman talks about obstruction, why does he not make plain to the House the reasons which induced the Minister of the Interior to refrain from asking us for this vote on the 15th of May last, when we passed double the amount for public works in Manitoba which were not so urgent?

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend has taken that line of argument——

Mr. FOSTER. Meet it fairly.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It can be met fairly in this way. This House has been in session close on seven months, and its work could have been got through a month ago. There is no necessity for my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, for whom I have every regard, attempting to draw a red herring across the trail. There is no deliberative assembly, made up of business men, not even a county council, that would not have got through the business a month ago if it laid aside party politics.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is your Civil Service Bill, where is your Hudson Bay Railway Bill, where is your Land Bill, where is your Manitoba Boundary Bill?

Mr. MACPHERSON. If every member of the House of Commons took up the amount of time taken up by the hon. member for North Toronto, who seems to be obsessed for talking——

Mr. FOSTER. I object, Mr. Chairman, to any such language as that being applied to a member of this House. I do not exactly know what the meaning of that word is: but from the fire in the eye of my hon. friend and the way it tripped off his tongue, it is a bad word, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My good friend is like the fishwife whom Daniel O'Connell called a parallelogram.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am not like the fishwife, and if the hon. gentleman wants to have a committee of investigation he can have it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. There are some things I would rather not have a committee of investigation on, because some horrible details might be spread on the records of this country. If all the members of the House of Commons took up as much time as the hon. member for North Toronto, we would require to be here twelve months. If our hon. friends would simply come to the conclusion to put party politics aside—and I am not saying that all the fault is on one side—we could finish up the business in a very short time. Here is a case in which the United States government have their men in the field waiting for our people to come alongside and do the work. This House met in November last and got into Committee of Supply a week after, and the Supplies have been blocked by our hon. friends opposite from that day to this, and they know it.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked my hon. friend to meet fairly the circumstances detailed by

the leader of the opposition. Does he think he has done it ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Of course I have.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose there has been a large amount of talk ; suppose the member who is at present speaking has done a great deal of it ; he did no more and no less up to the 15th of May, and on the 15th of May the government, which was supposed to know what was most pressing, got the House into Supply, and instead of taking up this international business of great importance, took up a number of dispersed public works in cities represented by Grit members in Manitoba and the Northwest, and we passed, with all the obstruction, as it is alleged, votes amounting to $533,000. Does my hon. friend think that if the Minister of the Interior had foreseen the circumstances and put his vote before the House, he could not have carried it when we voted more than double the amount for these public works ? On the 20th of May we voted $1,104,895, about five times as much as the Minister of the Interior is asking for to-day. Is it reasonable to say that if the minister had taken this international question up on that date he could not have got his $330,000 as well as the other departments got their $1,104,000 ? On the 22nd of May we voted $5,479,110 for the Post Office and on the 1st of June we voted $1,815,000 for the Customs ; and yet we were not asked for this vote. There is nothing but wind in what my hon. friend said. He declares that it is because the opposition obstruct—because a righteous, far-seeing government are not allowed to work their will in any particular —that they are cooling their heels in particular places, and British Columbia knows the reason why. British Columbia is inhabited by intelligent people, and I am not bound to maintain that the most intelligent of its population have found their way into this House ; and the people of British Columbia, when that state of facts is placed before them, will ask the question : If these gentleman had any foresight as to what was more important, why did they not bring this vote on one of these dates ? Besides, the Minister of the Interior has had one-eighth of that amount for nearly two months.

Mr. MACPHERSON. After this excellent lecture from the hon. gentleman I will trust that he will apply a little of his own sophistry to his own case.

Mr. FOSTER. Why does my hon. friend use the word 'sophistry ?' Is it a fact or is it not what I have quoted? Does he deny the statement? If he does not, it is not sophistry, but plain, hard facts.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I have not been in the House so long as my hon. friend, and he has more liberty to interrupt than I have and he has more skill in suiting the rules of debate to his own purposes. But I want to tell him in reply to his satire, that nobody in the province of British Columbia has made use of his intelligence on the floor of this House to abuse his opportunities as my hon. friend has. I do not think that anybody from that province has ever attempted, for my part I have never attempted, to belittle any member of this House. I always try to play the game fair. I am a new member compared with the hon. gentleman. He is an old timer, he has sat around the council board of His Majesty and is a Privy Councillor, and I think he should be above making a statement like that.

Mr. FOSTER. Like what?

Mr. MACPHERSON. A statement reflecting upon the intelligence of any member from the province of British Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not do that. I could not do it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I want to tell my hon. friend that although in his opinion those coming from the province of British Columbia may not be very intelligent, we know how to hold our own, and we have never had to leave that province to find a seat in another one.

Mr. FOSTER. Your experience has not been so long.

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, and my planks are not very thin and I have not had to run so far as the hon. gentleman. I have not been obliged to run about looking for a seat, and consequently have not had the same experience, but I tell my hon. friend that he should be above that kind of thing. Let me tell him, in all fairness, that we should come down to business and forget party politics for a while and get through with it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I came in a few moments ago and have been since wondering what the item before the committee is. Judging by the speech of the hon. gentleman, the subject before us must be a very varied one because he has adverted to many things. What surprises me is that when he complains of our not getting the work, he should waste so much valuable time in talking of something not at all pertinent to the question. He has no right to make any complaint when he himself is using up the valuable time of the House by obstructing its business. I hardly think he can find fault with my applying that word to his own conduct, because, so far as I could understand, he did not appear to be addressing himself to any particular question before the committee at all, and I was surprised that you, Mr. Chairman, did not call him to order and refuse to allow him to air his eloquence in telling us about the fine people who come from British Columbia. We know that there are lots of

fine people in that province and that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) is one of the finest. No doubt he represents his constituency very well, but this is not the time for him to raise his voice on behalf of Vancouver. That surely cannot be an item in the estimates, and I trust that when he again rises in his place to delay the committee and call its attention away from the practical question before us you will draw his attention to that fact. Self laudation is not what we are here for. I am anxious that we should go on and I hope we shall do some business this afternoon. We are anxious to give the Department of the Interior and some of the other departments some money. Some of the ministers are complaining that they have not got money, but they have not asked for it. Here is the Minister of Militia complaining when he has not asked for a dollar. It is time for ministers to find fault with the opposition when they bring down their estimates. We cannot vote their estimates through until they are placed before the committee. I fail to see the point of the hon. gentleman's criticism, and I trust, Mr. Chairman, that you will watch him this afternoon in case he should rise again and take such another stand as he has done. In such an event I hope that you will keep him down to the point and force him to confine his discussion to the question before the committee. I may be called to order because I have not been discussing the question, but, as a matter of fact, I do not know what the question is and consequently I am not able to discuss it. May I ask what is the item before us?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. S. J. Jackson). It is the salaries of the technical officers of the Dominion Astronomical Observatory.

Mr. FOSTER. Now that the hon. member for British Columbia (Mr. Macpherson) has ceased his obstruction, I hope to get some information. I have now traced the boundary lines—New Brunswick and the United States, Quebec and New York, Quebec and Vermont. What other boundary line is it that we are delimiting?

Mr. OLIVER. The forty-ninth parallel. At present the party is working on the international boundary between Montana and Alberta, eastward from the summit of the Rockies. The work was completed in previous years from the summit of the Rockies westward to the Pacific coast.

Mr. FOSTER. About how many miles?

Mr. OLIVER. About 410 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. And the two sections now being worked are Montana and Alberta?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, the line between Montana and Alberta now being run will be continued eastward between Saskatchewan and Montana, Saskatchewan and Dakota, Manitoba and Dakota, and Manitoba and Minnesota to the northwest angle of the Lake of the Woods. That is the forty-ninth parallel. From there the line follows a certain described boundary.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of the line of the forty-ninth parallel which has to be delimited altogether?

Mr. OLIVER. Between 750 and 800 miles?

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been done?

Mr. OLIVER. Four hundred and ten miles in British Columbia, and they have just started this way.

Mr. FOSTER. As we have it, there are 390 miles between New Brunswick and the United States, 60 miles between Quebec and New York, 100 miles between Quebec and Vermont, and 750 miles on the forty-ninth parallel. Then we come to the northern trend. What is the delimitation in British Columbia and north?

Mr. OLIVER. The Alaska coast survey is about 500 miles altogether, of which about one-half has been done. It has been done in sections rather than continually from end to end.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the whole?

Mr. OLIVER. Of the 141st meridian between Alaska and the Yukon, which is about 500 miles in length, of which 130 miles has been completed. There is water delimitation beyond the 49th parallel. The 49th parallel commences the water delimitation at the Lake of the Woods.

Mr. FOSTER. Take all of these first lines which seem to have been sufficient in time past to prevent troubles, what has arisen to make it necessary that there should now be undertaken a new delimitation?

Mr. OLIVER. The line between New Brunswick and Maine, in fact the line generally from the Ste. Croix river to the St. Lawrence, was surveyed many years ago. Since then many of the survey marks have become obliterated through age; besides, the boundary at the time the survey was made was not very well defined. During more recent years, owing to the lack of definite boundaries, there have been facilities for smuggling and defrauding the revenue on both sides of the line, chiefly by means of building houses on the boundary line itself, and where that line is not well defined, this leads to a good deal of difficulty in suppressing the practice. This accumulation of circumstances necessitated a new survey of the boundary from one end to the other and that has been agreed upon.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the United States bearing its share of the cost of this delimitation?

Mr. OLIVER. Each country has to make its own survey. We make our survey and their survey checks ours; they make their survey and our survey checks theirs. They would not accept our survey, nor would we accept theirs. So the two parties work together, checking each other as the work progresses. That is the reason why, as the hon. gentleman said, that the United States party was held up until our party could get in the field. That was the case with regard to the survey of the 141st meridian, and is also the case with regard to this survey between New Brunswick and Maine. The survey has to be made jointly by parties of the two countries, and unless and until our party is in the field, the United States party cannot go on with their work.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it in the end cost twice as much for the two countries as it would cost for a single survey?

Mr. OLIVER. Approximately it does cost twice as much, but not actually; because, even if Canada were making a survey alone by our party, its work would have to be checked by another party, which would mean a certain amount of expense.

Mr. FOSTER. But that is not equal to the first survey?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I say the fact that the two countries do not absolutely trust each other does practically double the cost of the survey, but not altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me this could be done: Supposing Canada undertook to delimit 100 miles. Its men and methods are known, and it is understood that approximately they are going to make a true and honest survey. Is it not possible for the checking to be done by the United States in the case of that 100 miles that the Canadian survey is doing; by the appointment of one or two of their men to accompany our party and act as a check over the work of the Canadian survey? And would it not be possible for Canada to do the same with reference to a hundred miles that the United States survey was carrying out? I should think they could act as an almost positive check on each other, and thereby the cost would be almost one-half of what it is going to be under the present system. Is that impossible?

Mr. OLIVER. No, that is not at all impossible.

Mr. FOSTER. Why can't that be done?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman would have to address at least one-half of his inquiry to the government of the United States. In the case of the Alaska coast survey, the system the hon. gentleman suggests is followed, as I have already stated; that is, one country makes a survey of a certain portion of the boundary and the other country checks that survey. But in that case the boundary is absolutely irregular, being fixed by the summit of the mountain ranges; in these other cases the boundary is scientifically accurate.

Mr. FOSTER. Would not that make it more easy?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer that question. I may say that many years ago the Canadian government did provide for the delimitation of the boundaries of the 141st meridian where it follows the Yukon river between Alaska and the Yukon. Many years afterwards it was found that there was a small error in the survey, and owing to the fact that gold mining was going on in that locality, that error led to what might have been serious complications. It is considered that where the question is one of accuracy, it is important that there should be absolute confidence on the part of both countries that the survey shall adequately protect the interest of each country, and for that purpose each country is willing to pay the cost of its own survey parties.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course neither country wants to spend money uselessly and it would seem to me as a layman that the most difficult part would be that of the Alaskan boundary where you have to keep the contour of the mountains in view and place your line in accordance with it. That would be much more difficult than where it is a straight line, say on the 49th parallel of latitude, where there is nothing of that kind to be taken into account. If the two countries can come to an agreement to save expense and do the checking by superior officers in the more difficult case, why is it not possible for them to do it on what appears to be the easier sections? This work has only been commenced and the minister will see that it is going to cost a vast amount of money. There are 2,700 to 3,000 miles altogether to be delimited and at the present rate this will run away up into the millions. It should not be too late yet to see whether the two countries cannot agree to adopt that system of checking by superior officers so that the gangs would do the work separately. In that way half the time would be saved, the work would be completed at a much earlier date and nearly one-half the expense would be saved.

Mr. OLIVER. I was in error in stating that the system of having two parties prevailed along the whole line. That is the system on the 141st meridian where an absolutely new survey is being made in a new country, but my information is that in the New Brunswick-Maine survey a single party made up from the two countries carries on the survey and in the case of the 49th parallel in the prairie section which is

now being surveyed the system suggested by my hon. friend is in force. It is divided into 100 mile sections and one section is done by each country with the checking of each such section by surveyors of the other country.

Mr. FOSTER. The checking is not nearly so expensive as the first survey.

Mr. OLIVER. No, it involves some expense but not so much. The reason for the difference in expense is the difference in the conditions in the different sections. On the 141st meridian it is an absolutely new survey in a new country where the ownership of gold mines is in issue so it has been thought advisable that there should be two parties although it is a very expensive country to keep parties in. In other sections the system varies according to the conditions and the difficulties of the situation.

Mr. FOSTER. Could the minister from the experience they have had and the present cost of this work, give an approximate estimate of the total cost of this work ?

Mr. OLIVER. Just at the moment my information is that it is expected to, if not altogether, at least nearly, complete the work in three years at a cost of about $400,000. That would be in addition to the $125,000 here asked for, making $525,000, including this year.

Mr. LANCASTER. A dispatch appeared in last night's newspapers stating that the International Waterways Commission is meeting in Buffalo in regard to the international boundary between Canada and the United States through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence river. This is a very serious matter and I would like to know if the dispatch is at all correct.

Mr. OLIVER. The information might be correct. The new treaty provides that the delimitation of the boundary through the St. Lawrence river and the Great Lakes to the mouth of the Pigeon river on the north shore of Lake Superior shall be made by the International Waterways Commission. In that connection the dispatch may be correct.

Mr. LANCASTER. That part of the boundary which passes through the Niagara river, connecting Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, is of very vital importance. Every foot of it is of very great value to either country and a determined effort has been made by the United States people to make out that the boundary should be in the middle of the river. There may be, I am afraid, a disposition on the part of the Canadian members of the Waterways Commission to concede a sort of compromise. In these deals between the United States and Canada the American people generally manage to ask something extreme and get a compromise which in itself is more than they are entitled to. They are very good bluffers in that respect and the people in the Niagara district are very much worked up on account of this disposition of the Americans. They apparently feel they have an easy crowd to deal with and they are attempting to get the boundary line there, where it is of great value, over into the river much nearer the Canadian side than it should be. The report of Dr. Spencer, lately published, gives a great deal of information and these people are more or less attacking it. I am afraid that if the government is not very careful a report will be made by the Waterways Commission agreed to by the Canadian section—I do not suggest that they would intentionally sacrifice Canada's rights—without having gone into all the facts as they ought to go into them before making a recommendation to this House. The boundary line between Niagara Falls and Niagara on the Lake and Buffalo, particularly along the part known as the Falls section in which the falls occur, is of the greatest importance, every foot is valuable and the question is one that will produce a great deal of difficulty hereafter if it is not very carefully dealt with. I would really think that at this moment, until they get more complete information, it would not be wise for the International Waterways Commission to undertake to say where the boundary should be.

I do not believe that they have proper data from our side of the case, and I do know that the Americans have been assiduously, for two or three years, working up evidence in the most careful way, surveying our side of the river, and I am afraid they will put professional men in the witness box who will, of course, give evidence on the side they are called upon. These American surveyors would not tell anything in favour of Canada. They have been allowed to survey the river on both sides, a free hand has been given them and they will be able to fortify their theories by what they will call corroborative evidence, and they will go into the witness box and give evidence in a way that I do not think is quite fair to Canada. I am afraid the Waterways Commission has not the evidence or information that it should have to deal with this question. I thought it was wise, as the question of boundaries is before the House, to draw the minister's attention to it, to sound a note of warning as to the matter and to indicate that the Waterways Commission ought not to be allowed to go very fast in deciding that question on the evidence it has at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think that anybody could take any other view than that which my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has taken, that the question of the boundary, particularly at that point, is one of the very highest importance, and that it is necessary that the interests of Canada should be properly protected. However, this is not a

matter under the administration of the Department of the Interior. The Waterways Commission is appurtenant to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. LANCASTER. It was under your department, was it not ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. I thought this was the proper place to mention it.

Mr. OLIVER. The director of the geological survey was a member of the Waterways Commission. However, I am indebted to the hon. gentleman for mentioning this point, and I have no doubt that attention will be paid to it.

Mr. SPROULE. This treaty that we have before us specifically provides that the Waterways Commission shall do part of this work. Article 4 reads :

The high contracting parties agree that the existing International Waterways Commission, constituted by concurrent action of the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and composed of three commissioners on the part of the Dominion of Canada and three commissioners on the part of the United States, is hereby authorized and empowered to ascertain and re-establish accurately the location of the international boundary line, beginning at the point of its intersection with the St. Lawrence river near the forty-fifth parallel of north latitude, as determined under Articles I. and VI. of the treaty of August 9, 1842, between Great Britain and the United States, and thence through the great lakes and communicating waterways to the mouth of Pigeon river, at the western shore of Lake Superior, in accordance with the description of such line in Article II. of the treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United States, dated September 3, 1783, and of a portion of such line in Article II. of the treaty of August 9, 1842, aforesaid, and as described in the joint report, dated June 18, 1822, of the commissioners appointed under Article VI. of the treaty of December 24, between Great Britain and the United States, with respect to a portion of said line, and as marked on charts prepared by them and filed with said report, and with respect to the remaining portion of said line as marked on the charts adopted as treaty charts of the boundary under the provisions of Article II. of the treaty of 1842 above mentioned, with such deviation from said line, however, as may be required on account of the cession by Great Britain to the United States of the portion of Horse Shoe Reef, in the Niagara river, necessary for the lighthouse erected there by the United States in accordance with the terms of the protocol of a conference held at the British foreign office, December 9, 1850, between the representatives of the two governments and signed by them, agreeing upon such cession; and it is agreed that wherever the boundary is shown on said charts by a curved line along the water, the commissioners are authorized in their discretion to adopt, in place of such curved line, a series of connecting straight lines defined by distances and courses, and following generally the course of such curved line, but conforming strictly to the description of the boundary in the existing treaty provisions, and the geographical co-ordinates of the turning points of such line shall be stated by said commissioners so as to conform to the system of latitudes and longitudes of the charts mentioned below, and the said commissioners shall, so far as practicable, mark the course of the entire boundary line.

The commission, which is appointed under the present treaty, is laying down the line of demarcation. It is all to go on at the same time. There is first the portion starting at the mouth of the Ste. Croix river down at the Atlantic ocean and crossing Passamaquoddy bay. Then the work proceeds westward from the mouth to the source of the Ste. Croix river, then to where the 49th parallel crosses the River St. Lawrence, westward through the great lakes to Pigeon river, from Pigeon river to the northwest angle of the Lake of the Woods, thence to the Pacific ocean and finally to the boundary between Alaska and the territory of Yukon. I take it that it is all mixed up together. The commissioners already appointed must jointly do this work and it does seem to me that this House is scarcely as well informed as it ought to be with regard to these provisions where it interests us above all other things to know what provision is made for delimiting this boundary and what precautions have been taken by the government to see that it is carried out in accordance with the provisions of these treaties, and that we have eminent men appointed to look after Canada's interests. I still think that the House ought to have from some minister of the Crown a comprehensive statement as to what is contemplated to be done and what we commit ourselves to before we commence the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there any map presented with this treaty or is there any map which shows the general outline of what the old boundary was and what the new boundary is as it has been laid down ?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no map that I am aware of accompanying the copies of the treaty which have been prepared for distribution. The treaty is not a matter appertaining to my own department and therefore I am not in a position to give the information in regard to it that I otherwise would. We are only dealing with the parts of the boundary which have been provided for by previous treaties and which are confirmed by this treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, this includes all the previous treaties and makes a final definite agreement ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will this money be used in regard to what I spoke of ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the money we are asking for is simply the delimitation of the land boundary. Our department has nothing to do with the water boundary. This money is required to carry out the work under agreements entered into and treaties made on a previous occasion. We will have to ask for money to enable us to do our part of the delimitation under the new treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the general purpose of this astronomical branch which has 16 high class officials? What have they done so far and what do they propose doing in the future?

Mr. OLIVER. The modern science of astronomy represents the accumulated learning of all the ages since the world began, and, therefore, it would be impossible for me—not being acquainted with that science—to give the House any very full account of the operations of the observatory. It is possible to locate definitely any certain point on the earth's surface by knowing the location of certain points in the heavens. The stars are studied partly because of interest in the stars, partly from a purely scientific or speculative point of view, and chiefly in the practical application of their study to defining the location of any point in our country. The work of the branch is divided into several classes. One is purely scientific and speculative; the other is for the purpose of applying the knowledge acquired to the location of fixed points in the geography of our country so that delimitations which have been or may be made upon the ground may be accurately fixed upon the maps. From this feature of the work comes the delimitation of the boundaries of our country which is specially the work of the officers of the astronomical branch who have the scientific knowledge which enables them to absolutely fix any point on the earth's surface. They are the officials upon whom depend the delimitation of our boundaries when a treaty is made which states that a certain line of latitude or longitude is to be followed. We depend upon the practical application of the scientific knowledge of these gentlemen to be sure that the boundary is correctly given. The fixing of geographical points within the country is in the hands of the geodetic survey and the purely scientific work is entirely in the observatory.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that we are equipping an observatory and employing a staff of astronomers whose sole idea is to carry on the study of the heavens with the idea of original research so as to advance the science of astronomy purely as a science? What number of officials have we set apart for that work? The thought that comes to one's mind is that this is chiefly the work of great universities and scientific institutions endowed by private benevolence, as is the case in other countries. What is our equipment for this work which requires such very accurate and costly instruments?

Mr. OLIVER. The question my hon. friend asks is difficult to answer in accuracy and detail; but, speaking generally, the answer must be to a certain degree, yes. We are carrying on that original study of the heavens of which he speaks, and which he thinks should be relegated to educational institutions.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not so sure that the government should not have something to do with it.

Mr. OLIVER. It is incidental to the necessary practical work of the branch. There are very few countries in the world which have a longer boundary line or greater area requiring geographical expression than Canada. It is therefore necessary that Canada's equipment for dealing with questions of boundary or geographical location should be large and efficient, in proportion to the wealth and population of the country. Being under the necessity of maintaining an establishment with an equipment on a comparatively large and expensive scale in order to do the practical work, we do in addition and in conjunction with it some part of the educative work—not merely with the idea of adding to the sum of human knowledge of astronomy, but in view of securing greater efficiency in the handling of the practical work. We believe in having what may be called the educative and speculative side of the science in hand in our observatory, because this will enable us to assure the people of Canada better work in the actual delimitation of boundary lines and in the establishment of geographical points, than would otherwise be the case. In this, I am informed, we are following, I suppose at a very great distance, the example of the British Government in the case of the Royal Observatory at Greenwich. There is room for argument that in Canada, where the needs of this special scientific knowledge in its practical application are so great, and where our educational institutions of the higher class are not so amply provided with resources as those of more populous and vastly richer countries, we cannot expect to rely on these educational institutions to the same extent that these other countries do; and therefore, Canada situated as it is, may fairly do rather more in a national way for the purely scientific side of this science, in which the country has such large practical interests, than is done by the United States, whose circumstances are vastly different.

Mr. FOSTER. It strikes me that, when it comes to the practical use you are going to make of your astronomical knowledge and your astronomical equipment, it is not necessary to carry on original researches. For instance, the question whether or not

an additional ring can be discovered in some far-off planet, does not have any relation to your fixing a point geographically on the boundary line. I suppose you fix these points from known data, about which there is no variation. I suppose it is over and above the question of practical utility that you make original researches with your instruments to discover new conjunctions of planets, or new nebulae, or anything of that kind. What you want are the instruments and the men to make fair use of the knowledge you have at your command at present. It is a matter for argument whether we ought to use our staff or our instruments to advance astronomical knowledge in competition with other countries, or how far in that direction we ought to go. I am in favour of Canada taking a leading part in all such matters. I suppose it is well to have different points of view of the heavens, and you probably do not get all the knowledge you should have by taking all your observations from one country, but get better results by having different points of observation; and that is a fair part of the work for Canada to take part in. But I would think that the practical side of the work would simply require good instruments and good men and accuracy in your calculations. We have extensive boundaries, of course, but we are settling these now, and when they are once settled we are not apt to have them disturbed. In four years time we shall have this whole round finished, and then we shall be pretty clear, so far as international boundaries are concerned.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite appreciate the view that my hon. friend takes. I have no doubt that it will appeal to a large number of people, and I am bound to say that it appeals to myself in some degree, that we have not any money to throw away on purely scientific enterprises; and I would not like to encourage going beyond a very reasonable limit in regard to purely scientific research in connection with our astronomical branch.

Mr. FOSTER. How would your instruments compare in power and intensity with those of large observatories?

Mr. OLIVER. They do not compare at all with those of the extraordinary class, but very favourably with those of the ordinary class of observatories. We do not go in for original research in the same degree as those entirely scientific and educational institutions in the United States and some other countries, but we are doing a fair share in the collection of data and the increase of accurate knowledge with regard to the heavenly bodies. No doubt we should be careful not to expend a very large amount, but for the educative value to our own institutions for our own purposes we are warranted in incurring a reasonable measure of expenditure in order to keep up the work of original research in the observatory.

Mr. FOSTER. How far is the astronomical branch utilized in meteorological research?

Mr. OLIVER. It has no connection with the meteorological survey. The only purely industrial service it accomplishes is the regulation of the time within the range of its operation.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Wm. Roche) suggested before recess that it would be well for the government to popularize the knowledge gained by its astronomical staff. Does the minister think that we are getting sufficient new information from this staff to popularize it?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Wm. Roche) is a good one, but we have not taken any steps in that direction yet. The measure of research carried on might very well be given publicity. At present during the winter months a lecture is given every second week by one of the officers of the observatory to which the public are invited, and these lectures excite a great deal of interest.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very local.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but it shows that there is some appreciation of the propriety of the suggestion to publish the work of the observatory. There is quite an active appreciation of that work by the local public.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the observatory?

Mr. OLIVER. The observatory cost about $110,000. The buildings are very substantial and complete. The equipment cost about $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the yearly cost of keeping it up?

Mr. OLIVER. Salaries, contingencies, books and other matters, about $30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the librarian give the whole of his duty to that work?

Mr. OLIVER. He attends to the library and assists in the correspondence.

Mr. SPROULE. This may be an admirable institution, and ought to be from its cost. We are asked to vote $230,000 in connection with it, a large portion of which will probably be taken to help in delimiting the boundary between Canada and the United States. How is the information obtained to be turned to practical account? The minister's explanations remind me of an old professor's demonstration of chemistry. He said: Take an effervescent, add

a deliquescent, there will be a precipitation, that is a conglomeration, and that is a demonstration, and is therefore chemistry. The only definite purpose in view seems to be to fix some accurate point on the earth by means of some observations in the heavens. And for that we are spending $130,000 on a building and $30,000 a year to keep it up.

Mr. OLIVER. The delimitation of a boundary must start from a point on the earth fixed by observation of the heavens. The work you do on the survey is useless unless there is accuracy in the delimitation.

Mr. SPROULE. I admit you have to fix your post to start from. But I wish to know the return that the country is going to get from this expenditure in a practical way. We wish to know what work is being done for which this large expenditure is asked. Is it a school for educating people in astronomy, or astrology, or experimentation in any scientific direction? I think some person ought to write out an intelligent account of the work that is being done, and how it is likely to benefit Canada, so that it could be read to the House by the minister. We are much like what the minister says of the survey, we want some point to start from.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman does not know where to start from, why does he not stop?

Mr. SPROULE. I am depending on the minister to give us the information, because he is supposed to be the source of knowledge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am sure we appreciate the necessity of having men of scientific knowledge and with the necessary scientific equipment to enable us to meet the experts of the United States in the delimitation of these boundaries. I presume that is absolutely essential, and I have no doubt the gentlemen who are connected with that survey are doing good work for the country.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the ultimate practical purpose of the survey.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another matter that might be mentioned just now, although it is more by way of suggestion. I observe on page 44 of the report of the Civil Service Commission, this paragraph:

> Another important matter which is worthy of consideration is the preparation of maps required by the several departments of the Dominion government. Under the system at present in vogue, maps are prepared by the Departments of Railways and Canals, Marine and Fisheries, Public Works, Militia and Defence, Post Office, Geological Survey and the Department of the Interior. Much praise has been given to an atlas of the Dominion lately prepared by the geographer of the Department of the Interior. Your commissioners would suggest whether it is not possible to group the several officials engaged in this one object under one department and one responsible minister.

It seems to me that is a suggestion which ought to be taken into consideration by the government, more especially by the Department of the Interior, because one would suppose that the gentlemen connected with this particular branch of the Department of the Interior would be those to whom some work of that kind might fittingly be conducted. Then there is another subject I might mention, that is the desirability of having the surveys which are made by the several departments brought under some uniform system, and carried on upon a scientific basis. I believe that every civilized country in the world has a system of what are called geodetic surveys, which are carried out according to very precise and scientific methods, and which are of great value, not only to the government, but to the people who are engaged in various ways in developing the country. I understand this subject has been under the consideration of scientists throughout the country, and I presume it has been under the consideration of the gentlemen who are occupied with this subject in the Department of the Interior; and I have reason to believe that its desirability has also impressed itself upon the gentlemen who are connected with some of our great educational institutions. I would like to know whether the subject, not only of a uniform system of maps, but of a uniform system of precise and scientific surveys, is engaging the attention of the government, and whether anything is likely to be done along that line in the near future.

Mr. OLIVER. The two questions of surveys and map making are not, of course, intimately connected, although they are cognate. The question of combining the map making of all the departments under one department has been under consideration, but so far no conclusion resulting in the combination of the work has been arrived at. I am not altogether clear that there is all the advantage in such a proposal that the civil service commissioners seem to think. A railway map is compiled for a specific purpose, it has in view a certain object and with that object the employees of the Department of Railways are thoroughly and especially familiar. A map of the same area of country for the Geological Survey would be very different; that department would be interested in different details and it would be only the general scheme map that would be the same. So in any case, as the greater part of the work upon the map is in the details and as the detail work would necessarily have to be done in the department interested in the particular map, there is not a possibility of combining the work of the departments to the extent the commissioners seemed to think. It is possible to combine it to a greater ex-

tent than at present, it is possible that a certain part of the general work on the maps common to all maps covering the same area of country might be done in one branch instead of in several branches, but that would be only a small part of the total work, and would not be the very great advantage that the Civil Service Commissioners seem to think.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There may be, and I have no doubt there is, a great deal in what the hon. gentleman observes with regard to the necessary difference of details in maps intended for different purposes. But nevertheless if you had a uniform scientific survey for the whole country in connection with that proposed map-making department, so that the results of the surveys could be made available for the purpose of all the different departments, you would have a system of maps, whether issued by one department or the other, which would be based upon scientific accuracy. It seems to me that this is of very great importance in Canada. The system to which I allude has, I understand, been carried out in most European countries and has been carried out to some extent at least in the United States. It would seem to me that the services of this particular department ought to be utilized as far as possible towards bringing about that very desirable result.

Mr. OLIVER. The astronomical survey is under way. A section of its work is called the geodetic survey. A part of its employment is as my hon. friend has suggested. We have made a small start in establishing fixed points in different parts of the country by which the surveys already made can be checked up and so more accurate maps can be made than has been possible up to the present time. To make such a geodetic survey for a country of such vast area as Canada within any comparatively short period would cost a stupendous amount of money. In discussing this matter, comparison has been made with England or Belgium or some small European country where there is a large tax-paying power and a small area ; but to attempt to apply to the vast area of the Dominion of Canada the same geodetic survey that has been carried to completion in Belgium, would involve a cost possibly much greater than the advantage to be derived, although everybody must admit that it would be an advantage if we could have it We have started a geodetic survey which is at work in the settled parts of the country and which, as I said, will have the effect of making possible a more accurate system of maps and having more accurate knowledge of the surveys that have been made than we have at present. We are asking parliament of course from year to year for supplies with which to carry on this work, but we are not going into it to the extent of undertaking to cover the country within any moderate time The work is so limited in its scope because of the large requirements of money to carry it on that we are subject, I suppose, to criticism from those who think we should have a geodetic survey of the whole country. This is essentially a part of the work of this scientific branch. It is another application of the scientific knowledge which particularly belongs to that branch, which is improved by the scientific research I have mentioned. We expect to have the boundary surveys completed within three of four years, but we will still have need of the same scientific knowledge in carrying forward the work of the geodetic survey, in which all parts of the country are interested and which sometime, no doubt, will be extended over the whole country and the whole country will get the benefit of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose the geodetic survey will be able to go on more rapidly after these boundaries have been delimited ?

Mr. OLIVER. We would then feel justified in asking more money for that purpose, but at the present time, when we are asking so much for the boundary survey, we do not feel justified in doing so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the nature of the survey which has been conducted in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories ?

Mr. OLIVER. The land survey in the west is called a linear survey ; it is merely for the establishment of roads and the setting apart of the country in blocks suitable for settlement. It is approximately astronomically correct but not absolutely. Astronomical correctness is, I might almost say, a secondary consideration, the main thing is to get the country laid out so that people can settle it and use the roads. The geodetic survey will come later and absolutely establish the fixed points in that survey.

Mr. LAKE. I cannot agree with the minister that there is no necessity for an accurate topographical survey of Canada. I think the very example which he has quoted of the two departments having to work over the same ground is in itself an argument in favour of having some organized survey made and the Dominion topographically surveyed. He has merely spoken from the standpoint of the public departments but outside of that of course there are a great many others, the public who want to build railroads or canals who want to get their water supplies or to find out where the timber areas lie, or what parts of the country are capable of irrigation, have now to undertake independent surveys. All those have at the present time to start out on their own account and undertake individual surveys. They have to examine large tracts of country in preliminary surveys and when they find that their first

attempts are of no use they have to cast them aside and in this way they sustain a great deal of unnecessary loss. They have to undertake experimental surveys until they find a country that is suitable for their undertaking. The whole of that would be obviated if a topographical survey were instituted and carried on methodically. There appear to be six different departments which are carrying on systems of survey. Those systems of survey must overlap in many particulars. A great deal of the work which the department itself is doing must be lost and there must be a considerable duplication of work. I understand that some of the important bodies which occasionally meet, such as the Royal Society and the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, have strongly recommended to the government that there should be a topographical survey. It would mean an immense saving to the people as well as to the government. I would like to ask the minister if he could give any idea of the amount of money which is spent on surveys by the different departments of the government.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the faintest idea.

Mr. LAKE. I presume that the surveys approximate very nearly $1,000,000 a year.

Mr. OLIVER. The surveys of the Interior Department alone amount to more than $1,000,000.

Mr. LAKE. The surveys of the Interior Department alone ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. We asked for $800,000 last year for land surveys and something over $200,000 for astronomical surveys.

Mr. LAKE. What is the approximate cost per mile of making a topographical survey of country such as we find in Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. A geodetic survey has been in operation for two years and this has cost the country over $50,000. We have run a belted triangulation from Quebec to London, Ont. This triangulation would be the basis of a topographical survey. It will take another year to cover the ground between Quebec and London in order to perfect the triangulation and then the work of the topographical survey will go on. The triangulation fixes the points and the geographical survey fills in the details.

Mr. LAKE. I imagine that a topogragraphical survey cannot be exceedingly expensive. We have had maps supplied to us which were drawn up by the Department of Militia and Defence, very excellent maps, which gave all the natural features of the country and I imagine that such a topographical survey as that would be all that would be needed for this country. I cannot imagine that that could be so very expensive because I do not think that the estimates for that survey in the Department of Militia and Defence are very great. It seems to me that a great deal of the money which we spend on the duplication of surveys is being wasted. How much have these surveys in the Northwest, for which we are paying $800.000 a year, cost per square mile?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that question at the moment. If my hon. friend wants to know what is the total number of acres surveyed in the Northwest by this linear survey I will tell him that it is 120,000,000 acres.

Mr. LAKE. All that country will have to be gone over again some day with a topographical survey. Of course, I agree that it is necessary to get the work done at once by this rough and ready survey which probably will have to be very frequently corrected and which may lead to a good deal litigation. I think that under the present system we are liable to have a great deal of litigation in many parts of Canada from not having a very accurate survey. I cannot help thinking that the minister is making a mistake in not using his influence with the rest of the members of the government to have one general survey department established which would carry on a complete topographical and geodetic survey of the Dominion. It would be a great saving to the government and to the public generally.

Mr. OLIVER. The question my hon. friend raises has been under consideration. The difficulty in the way is the immense area of country the immediate requirements of which in regard to surveys have to be immediately provided for. It is desirable to build a railway in a certain locality and we cannot wait for a geodetic survey in order to build that railway. We have to make a linear survey to provide for the settlement of the country. Although we asked parliament last year for $800,000 and we are asking this year for an equal, or possibly a larger amount, we still owing to the enormous territory and the rapidity of settlement, are unable to provide, in all cases, for the requirements of the people who desire to push out into the farther and farther country. I would be afraid to ask parliament for the money that would be necessary to cover that country within a reasonable time with a triangulated survey such as we have been carrying on in eastern Canada. We could not keep settlers waiting until such a survey could be made to accommodate them. Our area is so great and our needs are such that we must meet these needs as they arise without waiting for a survey which in itself is entirely desirable, but which our circumstances do not admit of our having.

Mr. LAKE. I frankly admit there is necessity for going ahead with the linear survey in the Northwest and that if you want to build a railway into a remote district you cannot wait to have a topographical survey made. But if a topographical survey had been going on for some years past the probability is that the location of the Grand Trunk Pacific in the maritime provinces, for instance, would have been already surveyed and the general route of the railway derived from it so that the necessity would have been obviated of striking out several different experimental lines before you could locate the exact line on which you are to run your railway. In that way the duplication of work would be avoided.

Mr. SPROULE. Article 1 of this treaty provides that an expert geographer or surveyor shall be appointed by each country without delay to more correctly define the international boundary between the Dominion and the United States in the waters of Passamaquoddy bay, and Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 provide for a similar commission. Is it intended to appoint separate commissions for the different sections or will the same commissioners do all the work ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is outside the work of my department, but should think that under the treaty the appointments should be made forthwith. The second last paragraph of article 9 provides :

It is understood that under the foregoing articles the same persons will be appointed to carry out the delimitation of the boundaries in the several sections aforesaid.

Therefore it would appear that one man from each country shall constitute the commission for the whole boundary line, with the exception mentioned in section 4.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister give any idea of how long it will take two men to fix that boundary which is, I suppose, 4,000 miles long?

Mr. OLIVER. I presume that commission would direct the workings of different parties in the different places.

Mr. SPROULE. Would they have subordinate surveyors to do the actual surveying ?

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought we were told that one of the most eminent surveyors in the country was actually engaged with his assistants in the work of surveying through the mountains.

Mr. OLIVER. Was that said to-day ?

Mr. SPROULE. No, some years ago.

Mr. OLIVER. As I understand it the intention is that the whole of the boundary line, except that part which has been assigned to the Waterways Commission, shall be adjusted by the two commissioners who shall direct the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they remain at headquarters ?

Mr. OLIVER. If in case their personal presence was required at any point I suppose they would go there, but otherwise I presume they would be at headquarters.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not the information that was given us some years ago. The member for Vancouver told us the Americans had their surveying parties out there already, but I saw it stated some time ago that the American parties remained there all winter as it was too expensive to bring them out and that the Canadian parties would join them in the spring.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is perfectly correct in regard to the work of making the surveys ; but under this treaty the commissioners are to see that the work is done and the boundary properly located.

Mr. SPROULE. What surveyors are being sent out to do this work ?

Mr. OLIVER. We are not sending any surveyors out on the surveys that will be necessary under the terms of this treaty. We have not yet asked parliament for the money to enable us to send them out, and we are not of course prepared to send them until parliament votes us the necessary money.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by the demarcation of the boundaries ? Is not that surveying ?

Mr. OLIVER. The surveys for which we are now asking parliament for money are not the surveys to be decided upon by the commission. The surveys now going on are not because of this treaty, but because of a treaty made in former years.

Mr. SPROULE. Who are making those surveys ?

Mr. OLIVER. The names of the surveyors whom we propose to employ under the vote we are now asking the House for are: On the 141st meridian boundary, A. J. Brabazon, D. H. Nelles, F. Lambart ; on the Alaska coast boundary, J. D. Craig, W. F. Ratz, George White-Fraser, F. H. Mackie ; on the 49th parallel, J. J. McArthur, N. J. Ogilvy ; on the New Brunswick and Maine boundary, G. C. Rainboth.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the supervising commissioner ?

Mr. OLIVER. The commissioner to be appointed under the treaty has not been appointed yet.

Mr. SPROULE. Under whose supervision is the work being done that has been going on for some time ?

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. King is directing that survey on behalf of Canada. If a dispute arises, that dispute is to be settled under the terms of the treaty by two commissioners to be appointed.

Mr. SPROULE. They have been working for years, and surely there have been differences of opinion.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what the treaty is for—to adjust those differences of opinion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the minister for an explanation of the decrease of $14,000 in this vote.

Mr. OLIVER. It is due to slackening up the work a little on the 49th parallel.

Salaries of agents and employees, in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries, $200,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, in the absence of the Minister of Militia, whether or not it is intended to hold militia camps in the month of June ?

Mr. FIELDING. In the absence of the Minister of Militia I regret I cannot give an answer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the minister available ?

Mr. FIELDING. He is in the city and was present to-day. I do not know where he is at the moment.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Who is the government immigration agent in St. Paul ?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Holmes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Is the government aware that charges have been made in the public press to the effect that certain Dominion lands agents and immigration agents were acting as selling agents of lands for certain lands companies. I have heard that some of the agents in the United States were acting for the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company and directing homesteaders to the lands particularly owned by that or some other companies, in whose behalf they were acting. Has the hon. minister any information on that subject ? I brought this matter to his attention some time ago.

Mr. OLIVER. I think I remember my hon. friend bringing that matter to my attention and I made inquiries, but so far have not been able to substantiate the charges made.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Since I brought the question up last, I have received a clipping from the Minneapolis 'Journal' of April 26 containing this advertisement :

Fifty thousand acres of Southern Alberta land for sale in blocks of 5,000 acres up. Canadian office, St. Paul.

That would look as if the immigration agent in St. Paul were acting as selling agent for this Southern Alberta Land Company. At any rate the party who sent me this is fully convinced that he is, and he thinks it would be entirely unwise for immigration agents of the Canadian government to be acting for land companies and throwing the weight of their official position in behalf of any particular land company, a position I heartily concur in.

Mr. OLIVER. Would my hon. friend kindly send me over that clipping ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Has the government as many agents in Great Britain and Europe this year as last and is it the intention to continue having as many ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, the same number as last year.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. How many are there?

Mr. OLIVER. Twenty-seven employees of all classes in Great Britain and Ireland and four on the continent.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Are there not in addition agents specially sent on temporary engagements for three or six months and how many are there ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, something over twenty such agents went last year and we expect to send a similar number this coming fall.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Are they subject to the agents already there ?

Mr. OLIVER. They are subject to the orders of the resident agent. Their business is to give personal experience of the desirability of Canada as a field for settlement. So far we have selected successful farmers who came originally from some part of the old country, as we think that the appearance of such and their statements are the best argument we can offer in favour of Canada as a field for settlement.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. On what basis are they paid?

Mr. OLIVER. They are expected to account for their actual expenses in addition to the salary we pay them. We pay them $100 a month for the time they are absent and their actual travelling expenses.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Prince Edward Island). I note that Mr. McLaughlin, who was sent to secure immigrants to the maritime provinces, has only sent one so far to that section, although he has been on the other side two years. The probability is that he is working to promote emigration to western Canada. Have the government changed their idea of having him represent the maritime provinces? What instructions were given Mr. McLaughlin regarding the territory he has to represent when sending immigrants to Canada? The maritime

provinces should receive some consideration. I do not think that immigrants should be exclusively sent to western Canada. The government should take some steps to promote settlement in the maritime provinces and Quebec. The agent in the old country is likely to exaggerate the advantages of the western country and to neglect eastern Canada. If the government send these maps to the different schools and other places in the old country to be exhibited, they ought to give due importance to the maritime provinces on those maps, and instruct their agents to send immigrants to eastern Canada as well as to western Canada. I think there should be a more equal distribution of the immigration to this country, and that the immigrants should be told that they will receive just as good treatment and will find just as great advantages in eastern Canada as in western Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to Mr. McLaughlin, he was employed two years ago especially to represent Prince Edward Island in the old country. It was believed that there was in the island a field for immigrants by reason of the rush of the native inhabitants to the west, and that there might be people in the old country who would wish either to become purchasers of farms in the island or tenants. Mr. McLaughlin did work in the old country for about two years, and I regret to say that his efforts have not been successful. At the present time I think he is no longer connected with the Immigration Department. We are considering the subject of dealing further with the question of immigration to Prince Edward Island, as well as to the other maritime provinces. I would like to say that so far as my knowledge goes, the maps we send to the old country or anywhere else give an equal share of prominence and publicity to the island, and give its area according to the best knowledge we have of geography. Recently we have published a further edition of our map of Canada for the use of schools in which we give special prominence to the maritime provinces.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not think it would be fair to Mr. McLaughlin to allow the statements of the Minister of the Interior to pass without remark. I do not think it would be fair to any representative of the maritime provinces to say that he did not do his duty.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say Mr. McLaughlin did not do his duty; I said he was not successful.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Supply, in the same department.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, June 4, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

TRENT CANAL—WATER LEVEL OF CAMERON LAXE.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. J. D. Reid—asked:

1. Is the government, or any member thereof, aware that the lockmaster at Fenelon Falls is keeping the waters of Cameron lake considerably higher than the legal datum point?
2. Is this action of the lockmaster done by authority of the Department of Railways and Canals?
3. Is it the intention of the government to reduce the waters to datum level?
4. Will the government compensate land owners along the shores of Cameron lake for damages already done?
5. Is it the purpose of the government to further purchase lands on that lake so as to raise the water still higher?

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

1. Owing to the unprecedented rainfall during the month of May the water is at present six feet ten inches on the lock-sill at Fenelon Falls; two inches higher than it was at this time last year.
2. The lockmaster's instructions are to the effect that as soon as the flow of water is normal the water is to be held at six feet on the lock-sill at Fenelon Falls.
3. The government proposes to hold the water at the usual level, viz.: six feet on the lock-sill.
4. The government is not responsible for damage done by spring freshets and abnormal rainfall.
5. At the present time the government does not intend to raise the water level at Fenelon Falls; therefore the government does not require any additional lands adjacent to Cameron lake.

IMMIGRATION REGULATION AS APPLIED TO BRITISH SUBJECTS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked:

1. Would a British subject, born in Great Britain, but having resided in South Africa since 1900, where he served in the war, be liable with his family for deportation from Canada in case he should ticket first from South Africa to Great Britain and then second, to Canada?
2. Are residents of South Africa, being British subjects, but born in South Africa, liable to deportation from Canada; in case they came first to Great Britain and thence to Canada and on through ticket?
3. Is the government aware that many such are desirous of coming to Canada via Great Britain, the usual steamer route, and after

remaining some weeks in Great Britain, come to this country?

4. Is such permissible under the Canadian regulations?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. and 2. No, not if otherwise admissible as an immigrant.

3. No.

4. Yes.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked :

To whom were homestead entries granted for each of the four quarters of 10—17—17, west of the fourth meridian, and on what dates?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

N.E. ¼ of section 10, township 17, range 17, west 4th meridian, Andrew T. Albertson, 18th June, 1907.

N.W. ¼ 10-17-17, west 4th, Oscar F. Herrick, 18th June, 1907.

S.E. ¼ 10-17-17, west 4th meridian, Ronald R. J. Whittaker, 18th June, 1907.

S.W. ¼ 10-17-17, west 4th meridian, Alfred R. Herrick, 18th June, 1907.

LEAD BOUNTIES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to enact that the provision of chapter 31 of the Acts of 1903, 'An Act to provide for the payment of bounties on lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada,' shall, subject to the modifications herein set forth, be extended until the 30th day of June, 1913; that the standard price of pig lead in London, England, referred to in the said Act be hereafter fixed at £14 10s.; and that the provision of the said Act limiting the payment of such bounty to $500,000 in any fiscal year be removed: provided, however, that the total sum to be paid by way of such bounties under the said Act of 1903 and under any Act to be founded on this resolution shall not exceed the sum of $2,500,000.

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

Motion agreed to.

DREDGING CONTRACTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Before the orders of the day are called I ask the Minister of Public Works whether tenders have been accepted for dredging contracts and if so what are the contracts ?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Tenders have been accepted for certain dredging in Ontario and Quebec. There are some works in Quebec in respect of which tenders were invited and the tenders for which have not been accepted but are under consideration. The tenders for dredging in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are still under consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister lay on the table of the House to-morrow a statement of such tenders as have been accepted ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could do it to-day if the hon. gentleman wishes but he had better leave it until tomorrow.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. J. D. REID.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I rise to a question of privilege. On my arrival here this morning I noticed in last night's issue of the 'Ottawa Free Press' the following headings on an article :

A Conservative member of parliament got yacht repaired at country's expense.

Dr. Reid of Grenville has received favours from the Marine Department at Prescott—Merwin paid on the repairs to his tug 'Victor' but Conservative member has not made good.

I want to say that this is absolutely untrue. So far as I am concerned the government works at Prescott never did any work on my yacht so far as I know that I have not paid for. I never used their men in any shape or form. But with the characteristic sense of honour of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. J. D. REID. I withdraw it if it is out of order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is an insinuation.

Mr. J. D. REID. If it is an insinuation I withdraw it. I want to say that with the characteristic sense of honour of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries——

Mr. SPEAKER. Am I to understand that the hon. member rises to a question of privilege to explain something personal to himself ?

Mr. J. D. REID. Exactly. This matter has been before the Public Accounts Committee for the last six weeks and I have urged the hon. member for Lunenburg who has charge of it——

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is referring to proceedings before the committee which have not been reported to the House.

Mr. J. D. REID. I asked that this matter be brought up and the Minister of Marine staved it off until I was not present.

Mr. BRODEUR. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker I have no objection to the hon. gentleman making a statement, but as he wishes to be offensive in his remarks I take the point that this matter is under investigation before the Public Accounts Committee and has been postponed until next week.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for Grenville is referring to a statement in the public press.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am denying a statement in the public press. This matter will come up in the committee on Wednesday next when I shall be present and I hope the Minister of Marine will be there too so that the question can be gone into thoroughly. In the meantime I state that I deny the whole matter absolutely.

SUPPLY—CALGARY TOWN SITE.

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

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY (Calgary). I desire to bring briefly to the attention of the House a question as to the disposition of certain government town sites in the new provinces of the west. The history of these government town sites so far as I can gather is that about the year 1882 the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway entered into a partnership and had joint town sites. Some years after the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway in these town sites was relinquished to the government and the government have gone on transferring from time to time their interests in these town sites to the respective town and city corporations. For example, in the city of Regina the government town site consisted of four sections. A very small portion of this land was used by the city for city purposes and some years ago the government handed over to the city of Regina the balance of the town sites which were not then occupied. The same thing was done in the case of the city of Macleod. So far as I can understand this property was transferred to these corporations as a free gift and without requiring any money to be paid by the municipal corporation in each case The same applies to Moosejaw, to Qu'Appelle, and to Battleford. In the case of Regina this appears to have been a very handsome gift from the government. Some few years ago I saw it stated in the Manitoba 'Free Press' that up to that date the city of Regina had realized over $1,000,000 by the sale of this property. Now, I am not objecting that the government should transfer the interest they have in these town sites to the respective cities, but I would like to know from the government whether the transfer was a sale or a gift. My information is that the respective cities received this property as a gift from the government. I desire to point out to the Minister of the Interior especially that in the city of Calgary in section 14 there still remain in the hands of the government some sixty acres of these old town sites, and if similar property has been transferred to these other cities, then I urge upon the government and upon the Minister of the Interior that the sixty acres in section 14, township 24, range 1, west of 5th meridian, be handed over to the city of Calgary. I make that request on behalf of the city of Calgary. The government some years ago had a special survey made of this property and it was divided into villa lots. In 1902 another survey was made and it was divided into city lots. There are about 243 of these lots and the valuation placed upon them by a government official was from $50 to $250 each. I desire therefore to be informed by the government if they have surrendered their interest in the town sites to Regina, Macleod, Moosejaw, Qu'Appelle and Battleford, and on what terms ? If the land was given as a gift to these cities, I ask the government to grant my request to transfer to the city of Calgary the undisposed of government property in section 14. If the Minister of the Interior desires any further information from the view point I have of the matter I will be very glad to send it to him so as not to take up the time of the House now.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). If the hon. gentleman wants the question properly considered it would be only fair that he should have given me notice that he was to bring it to the attention of the House and to ask a question. As he has not done so he will have to be content with such answer as I can make.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I thought this matter was before the minister for some years, and that applications had been made to the department with respect to it. On the 21st of January, 1907, I asked what property was still undisposed of and the minister answered as reported in 'Hansard': that the villa lots in section 14 remained with the government. Deputations from the city of Calgary have waited on the Minister of the Interior and a great deal of correspondence in reference to this question has passed between him and residents of Calgary.

Mr. OLIVER. I will not dispute that my hon. friend asked a question in January, nor shall I dispute the answer he got, nor am I going to dispute that possibly there is a large amount of correspondence in the department in regard to it. But I humbly submit that if the hon. gentleman wanted his question fairly considered to-

day he would have given me reasonable notice of his intention just as he had to give notice in January of the question he then asked. While this particular question is certainly of importance and requires attention, it is a recognized rule of the House that if an hon. member desires information, or to precipitate a discussion in regard to any matter he shall give notice of his intention so to do. I take it that my hon. friend is not anxious to get an answer to this particular question at this particular time. I can only say that so far as my memory goes the city of Calgary has not communicated with the department asking that these lots be handed over to the city. When the city does make such a request, it will receive every consideration at the hands of the department.

FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to bring to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals a communication which has been made to me this morning by a reputable person to the effect that the Intercolonial Railway employees in the county of Temiscouata are being coerced and intimidated to vote for the Liberal candidate in the provincial elections there against their will. This is not the first intimation we have had of federal activity in this election. I have already brought to the attention of the Prime Minister the use that has been made of the government steamer 'Champlain'; and while very plausible excuses have been made for the courses taken on two different occasions in the use of that steamer, it can nevertheless be proved that on one occasion Conservatives were refused admission to the steamer for the purpose of attending a political meeting, and that on another occasion it passed a point where there were a number of Conservatives, without calling and where a call would have been made in the usual course. The Minister of Railways and Canals gave me a very frank and satisfactory answer in regard to pressure which had been brought upon the Intercolonial Railway employees in the city of Halifax, and I would like him to take such steps as may be necessary to inform the employees of the Intercolonial in the county of Temiscouata or in any other county, whether in Quebec or anywhere else, that there is no authority for putting or attempting to put any pressure or coercion upon them, that every one of them is entitled to exercise his franchise according to his conscience and his opinion, and that in doing so he has no reason to apprehend any unpleasant results to himself.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Of course, the information given to the House is vague. I can assure my hon. friend that so far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned, there is no foundation whatever even for the thought that there is any intervention in the provincial election, from a federal source. This is the first I have heard of it. I do not know who is using the influence or upon whom it is being used. The only suggestion that is ever made from the department in regard to any election is that the management want to inform the employees that they are at perfect liberty to vote for whomsoever they like and to take part in an election as voters and enjoy their citizenship as any other citizens.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). With regard to the statement concerning the 'Champlain,' I may be permitted to explain that some days ago we were asked to have the steamer make a trip from Murray bay to Baie St. Paul. We decided that there was no objection to that, provided that a certain deposit were made, in accordance with the rules of the department, and that a charge of I think 5 cents per mile was made to each passenger. I was surprised to hear that somebody was refused admission, because the trip was to be for every person who wished to take it. I may say that after the statement was made in the House some days ago, I made inquiries as to whether or not any persons were refused admission, and the report made to me was to the effect that no person was refused admission. In view of the statement made by my hon. friend to-day, I would ask him to be kind enough to give me the names of those who have complained in order that I may investigate the matter more fully.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not the names. The name of my informant, however, I may give to the minister. It is Mr. Rodolphe Forget, the member for Charlevoix.

Mr. BRODEUR. The statement made by the agents at Quebec is that no person was refused admission. As to the other statement, that the 'Champlain' refused one morning to call at Ste. Irenée, I may say that the wharf there is very hard to make in bad weather, and on that day the steamer was unable to go to the wharf, which is the reason it did not call. I do not know whether there was a meeting or not, but it is mentioned in the timetable that if that wharf cannot be made on any day on account of bad weather, it will not be made. There was no intention on the part of the officers of the boat to prevent any person from going on board.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I give the facts exactly as they were given to me by the gentleman mentioned, who is my informant as to what took place on both occasions.

THE MILITIA CAMPS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia whether it is the intention to hold militia camps in June this year.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I observed in 'Hansard' the report of my hon. friend's question yesterday, and I asked the adjutant general to send me a memorandum this morning as to the present situation with regard to the camps. I am sorry to say I have not yet received that memorandum. However, I may say that it is our intention to hold the camps as usual. In one case, I forget which, the local militia desired to have a postponement, which of course was agreed to, because it is the rule to consult the convenience of the different regiments in the matter of holding the camps. In another case, that of Kingston, it was discovered that the water supply was doubtful, and therefore a postponement of that camp was ordered until we are thoroughly satisfied as to the condition of the water supply. With regard to another camp, that of Laprairie, a report has been received from the officer commanding in the province of Quebec that the ground at that place is largely covered with water owing to the fact that the St. Lawrence river is unusually high, and that it would be impossible to hold a camp there in the very near future ; so that there is a postponement there. Otherwise, so far as I know, there has been no postponement.

Mr. MacLAREN. Can the minster say whether the Goderich camp on the 16th of June is likely to go on?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So far as I know, it is. I know nothing to the contrary.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is the large camp at Niagara likely to go on?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have given all the information I have at present. I hope to have the report of the adjutant general later in the day, and will give it to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the minister will be good enough then to give fuller information. Can he inform the House what the definite arrangements are as to the assembling of any considerable body of the militia at Quebec in July?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot give that information to-day; but arrangements are being made by General Otter with a view to having a very considerable number, a sufficient number of troops attend at Quebec and take part in the proceedings of the tercentenary celebration. I think I can make a definite announcement on Monday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

REPRESENTATION OF THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John city). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, to go into Committee of Supply, I wish to bring up the subject which I think of importance, more especially to the people of the maritime provinces. I refer to the subject of representation in the House of Commons. In speaking on this matter, I wish to refer more especially to the position in which the maritime provinces are to-day with regard to their representation in this House. This is a matter which has been up before this parliament on two or three occasions already. On each of these occasions it was very ably debated, but so far these debates have not been productive of a decision. The more I have looked into the matter, the more convinced I have become that grave injustice has been done the maritime provinces by the amendments which have been made to the original British North America Act, by reason of which the plan on which confederation was arranged was changed without the people of those provinces having been consulted or having had any opportunity to object. I might remind the House that before confederation this matter was up before the four provinces for a long time. It was discussed on all the public platforms of the country and was the basis on which those, both in favour of and opposed to the proposed plan of confederation, presented their views to the public. That controversy resulted in a certain charter or bond of union being adopted, but that bond has since been changed on two or three occasions without any opportunity having been given the maritime provinces either to object or assent to those changes. As a consequence the time has arrived when the people of those provinces are beginning to realize the position in which they now find themselves. They begin to realize that they are no longer under the bond of union under which they originally entered confederation. The terms of that bond having been changed, the maritime provinces are now liable to a decrease in their representation to which they would not have been liable had those changes not been made. Consequently they feel that they have been deceived and that they are suffering, through no fault or their own, from a grievance which this parliament should remove by seeing that the wrong is no longer permitted to exist. The matter is a serious one. There is no doubt that the feeling of unrest now prevailing will increase rather than diminish and finally develop into an agitation, the end of which no one can possibly foresee.

As regards the campaign which resulted in our adoption of the British North America Act, I have taken some pains to look up that part of it relating to the province

of New Brunswick, and I find that at that time the question concerning which the greatest fighting took place was the question of representation in the House of Commons. It was on that question that the anti-confederates founded their strongest arguments and it was concerning it that the fiercest debating took place. In that connection I may say that the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) in a speech last session on this matter, rather took too much for granted when he said that the Quebec scheme had been adopted by the people of the maritime provinces. I think he hardly put that matter in an exactly fair position, and in order to be exact, I shall quote the words he used :

If we are, the moment the balance of representation, as determined by population shifts—if we are, the moment the representation of any particular province is consequently reduced, to have from that particular province a claim for the readjustment of the original terms of union, the principle of representation by population, which was solemnly adopted by the Quebec conference, is at once set aside. It is impossible that the terms of the union can be in that respect retained when upon such special and altogether unusual and unique circumstance, such as I have sought to describe, in the distant future with regard to Prince Edward Island, you are to have the whole terms of the Confederation Act set at nought and have everything left to further negotiation and determination between the parties.

I have two objections to make to that statement. The first is that the Quebec scheme was not adopted by our people as stated. The second is that in making our appeal for a readjustment of the original terms of the union, we say that these terms have not been acted up to and that on that ground we have the right to claim just treatment. No doubt the speech of the hon. minister was a very able one, but in my opinion he argued the case rather as a lawyer than a legislator ; and of course, with the law as it stands, we would have to go out of court. Both the Supreme Court and the Privy Council have given adverse decisions, but they gave them based on those amendments which were made to the original charter or bond of agreement and therefore did not adjuciate the case on its merits. With regard to the Quebec scheme, so far as the people of New Brunswick are concerned, the scheme was laid before the electors of that province in 1865 and was voted down by a very large majority. Afterwards in 1866, as I see by the 'Morning Telegraph' of the 20th of March of that year, Mr. Smith, the Auditor General of the day—subsequently I believe the Hon. Albert J. Smith, Minister of Marine and Fisheries—said he would not vote for any scheme which involved the possibility of the interests of New Brunswick being swamped by the rest of Canada. On the 22nd of that month the same hon. gentleman said :

I will go down in the ship rather than consent to representation by population as contained in the Quebec scheme, but I have no objection to supporting it, provided there is a check furnished in the upper House or otherwise which will serve to protect the interests of New Brunswick.

Subsequently in its report of a public meeting held in the city of St. John, when there was a general election pending and when this subject was of course the principal one under discussion, the 'Morning Telegraph,' in its issue of the 21st of April, said :

The Hon. Peter Mitchell at last night's public meeting said the government would not insist on the Quebec scheme of confederation, they would accept such improvements as could be had, and would be willing to allow delegates chosen from both political parties, to go as delegates to the British government to urge such changes and alterations as might meet with the views of the maritime provinces.

All these statements, taken in connection with the fact that the Quebec scheme, as such, was absolutely defeated at the polls, go to show that the people of New Brunswick, at all events, did not accept the Quebec scheme as a basis under which they would join the confederation. The legislature of New Brunswick, on June 26, following, had the suggestion which Hon. Peter Mitchell had made, and which I have just read and passed the following resolution :

Resolved, that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Excellency will be pleased to appoint delegates to unite with delegates from the other provinces in arranging with the Imperial government for the union of British North America——

Not on the Quebec scheme, but

—upon such terms as will secure the just rights and interests of New Brunswick accompanied with provision for the immediate construction of the Intercolonial Railway. Each province to have an equal voice in such delegation. Upper and Lower Canada to be considered as separate provinces.

I believe that an almost identical resolution was passed by the province of Nova Scotia, with the exception that the Nova Scotia resolution made no reference to the immediate construction of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, the result of all this was the meeting of delegates at London in the conference which is known as the London conference. At that conference certain terms of union were drafted which were afterwards crystallized into law in the form of the British North America Act of 1867.

I do not wish to endeavour to make anything of a legal argument, but it will be necessary for me to refer to one or two sections of the British North America Act

in order to show this House and the country the reasons we have for objecting to the present status of the representation of the maritime provinces. The first section I wish to refer to is section 3 of the British North America Act, which is as follows :

3. It should be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's honourable Privy Council, to declare by proclamation that on and after a day therein appointed, not being more than six months after the passing of this Act, the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick should form and be one dominion under the name of Canada, and on and after that day those three provinces should form and be one dominion under that name accordingly.

I draw particular attention to the wording of this section, as it proves that the original confederation was formed of four provinces and of four provinces only. Now, section 5 provides :

5. Canada should be divided into four provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Section 6 relates to the province of Canada and is as follows :

6. The part of the province of Canada (as it exists at the passing of this Act) which formerly constituted respectively the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada should be deemed to be severed and should form two separate provinces. The part which formerly constituted the province of Upper Canada shall constitute the province of Ontario, and the part which formerly constituted the province of Lower Canada shall constitute the province of Quebec.

Now, in addition to these sections, which, I think, show plainly that the Act of Confederation was to bind in one union four provinces and four provinces only, I will read a portion of section 51, for, one subsection of that section is the string, as you may say, attached to the representation by population scheme. In other words, this section shows that the scheme which was adopted at confederation for the representation of the provinces was not an out-and-out scheme of representation by population pure and simple, but a scheme of representation which had a string attached to it. This is the first part of the section :

On the completion of the census of the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and of each subsequent decennial census, the reprensentation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rule.

Then it goes on to give the number of members that Quebec shall have, and the fourth subsection reads as follows :

4. On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

That means that there shall be no loss of representation unless the proportion which the population of the province bore to the population of the four provinces forming the union should be diminished by more than 5 per cent. Now, I wish to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of hon. members and of the people of this country to the fact that by passing certain amendments to the British North America Act, bringing in the added population of British Columbia, Manitoba and later the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the benefit of that clause was entirely done away with, it became of no effect whatever ; whereas, if this Act had been carried out to its full and proper extent, the province of New Brunswick would not have lost the representative which it did lose. According to our claim, the population of these other provinces should not be added in the interpretation of this British North America Act of 1867, which is the bond and charter under which we entered the union. By adding these in, we lose a representative, and the bond under which we entered the union is discarded and made of no effect. I think that is an important statement; I think it is something that the people of this country should take into consideration; I think it is something that the members of this House should consider very carefully. I believe that ours is a grievance that ought to be redressed. This matter is not a matter of party politics in any shape or form. It is a matter of growing interest to all the people of the maritime provinces, irrespective of party. The appeal we make to this House is for equity and justice, we do not make it to one party more than the other, but to the assembled parliament of Canada.

Now, at the time of this London conference this matter occupied a great deal of attention, and statements were made by leading members of that conference which show that under the saving clause I have just read in this opinion there was no current possibility of the maritime provinces losing their representation. In order to make that plain, I will trouble the House with one or two short extracts from speeches of members of that conference. They have been read before, I have read them myself in this House, but I think under the circumstances it will do no harm to read them again. I would refer to the opinion which Mr. Galt expressed at that London conference :

Having respect to the rapid increase of Upper Canada we think the lower provinces should not be reduced if they do not increase in the same ratio.

That was the desire of the conference. They had the idea that the maritime provinces would not increase in the same ratio as the upper provinces, and as a matter of fact they could not do so naturally.

Therefore the lower provinces would have the same they have now unless in the very improbable case of one falling off by five per cent or more. That is a decrease relatively to the whole federation.

Meaning then the four provinces which were attempting to form a union. Mr. Geo. Brown expressed the same views :

The practical result will be that while Lower Canada certainly will not be less, and the lower provinces may increase in population, they cannot decrease in the number of their representatives.

With regard to these two expressions of opinion it is to be noted that they may possibly have been uttered as arguments to the delegates from the lower provinces to induce them to embrace the scheme which was then offered to them. But we have also the statement made afterwards in 1870 by one of the fathers of confederation, a statement not made as an argument to induce delegates from the lower provinces to join the union, but a statement showing what was the true inwardness and meaning of the British North America Act, 1867 ; I refer to a statement of Sir John A. Macdonald, who said :

Th general purview of the British North America Act, 1867, seems to be confined to the four provinces, Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, originally forming the Dominion.

Now, that statement of one of the fathers of confederation contains the full force of the argument which we who come from the maritime provinces have to make in support of our request for relief in this matter. Considering the great interest that was taken by the people of the lower provinces in this matter when it was up for discussion, if they had any idea that it was possible for the basis of union to be changed without their being consulted, can we conceive for a moment that they would ever have consented to unite with the other proinces of Canada to form a union ? I think the question only needs to be asked to be answered in the negative. And yet changes have been made, the British North America Act has been altered, and without consulting these people down by the sea. Now, the Minister of Justice last session did not refer to this aspect of the case at all. He was like the judges of the Supreme Court who gave their verdict on the law as it stood, that is, on all the different parts of the British North America Act from 1867 to 1886 ; they could do no less than give their award on the basis of the whole Act, the different parts being treated as one. But we complain of that very thing, we complain that the Act under which we entered this union was not the Act of 1867 as modified to 1886, but it was the Act of 1867 alone, and that is really the most incontrovertible fact on which we base our claim.

In addition, there took place in 1898, a very important change in the constitution of this country. The province of Quebec had been made, under our scheme of union, the pivotal province of this confederation, because the unit of representation in Canada is the 65th part of the population of the province of Quebec. Now, it must be plain that after such a solemn agreement whereby the representation of the various portions of Canada had been made to conform to one 65th part of the population of Quebec, anything which would enlarge the area, anything which might increase the population of this pivotal province is a matter of very serious importance, and such enlargement ought not to be made without the consent of every other part of the Dominion of Canada which would be affected thereby, and of course there is no part which would not be affected. That Bill was introduced in 1898 by the then Minister of the Interior, the present member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) ; it was introduced in blank, and there was not a word said with this exception. Mr. Sifton said :

The Bill for the purpose of ratifying a conventional boundary on the north and northeast of the province of Quebec, which was agreed upon between the government of the province of Quebec and the government of the Dominion, and ratified by order in council of this government, under date of July 8, 1896. The Bill is not yet drafted, and I ask the indulgence of the House to introduce it in blank.

So this very important Bill was introduced in blank and passed this House without the slightest debate of any kind. It would almost seem, Mr. Speaker, as if on that occasion the spirit Ariel had silently flitted through this House and touched with his wand the eyelids of the members, because they allowed this great and important change to take place in their presence without any protest, even from those who ought to have been the very first to protest, namely, the representatives from the maritime provinces. But that is the way that that Bill was introduced and passed. I know that certain claims are made in regard to the boundaries of the province of Quebec, but the Minister of Justice himself, in his speech last year, stated that, as far as his opinion went, he believed that the northern boundary of Quebec, which the delegates at the London conference of the framers of the British North America Act had in their minds, was the height of land dividing the waters that flow into the St. Lawrence from those that flow into Hudson bay. He had no doubt about that last year and more than that the publications of our own parliament gave that as the delimitation of the

province of Quebec in the year 1871. Our own publications showed that the area of the province of Quebec, as understood and printed on the maps, authorized and acknowledged as being correct, was bounded on the north by the height of land to which I have alluded. The result of this added territory must certainly, without the shadow of a doubt, have a very serious effect upon the representation of this country. It must necessarily enlarge the unit of representation. What is the country that has been added to the province of Quebec? It is this large country about which we heard a great deal at the time the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill was before this House. We were told that we had mountains of information with regard to that country. I do not know how much information there really was, but I do understand that the information that is gradually coming to the front, as explorers and surveyors are making their way through there, leads us to believe that a large part of it will be capable of supporting a large population and that there is a large quantity of good agricultural land in it. We also know that from the Abitibi region we have had reports of large mineral wealth, and it is also right that we should take into consideration the fact that in the near future the addition of this enormous area, will have a very decided effect upon the unit of representation. I think that the area of Quebec, by the census of 1871, was 193,555 square miles, and that by the addition to the area which was made by the Act passed in 1898 it became a region of over 351,000 square miles. If, as some state, this country is sterile, what justification have this government and this parliament to go through that enormous area and spend millions and millions of money to build a railway? I take it that was not the idea of those who devised and carried out the building of this railway, that it was not thought that it was a sterile country but that it was a country worth opening up, developing and making the home of a large population. What will be the result if that expectation is realized? All we can look forward to is that the unit of representation which is now about 25,000 will in the comparatively near future increase to as much as 50,000 or 60,000 or even more. What will be the result of that? The result will be that Prince Edward Island would have one representative and perhaps none at all, and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick might have one, two or three; practically we would be reduced to the condition of taxation without representation, and I think I need hardly remind you that the people of this country will not submit to such a position; that is to be free to subscribe to all the expenditure that is necessary to build the public works of the Dominion and support the government of the country, but not to be free to have a word to say as to how these public works are to be built or as to how this expenditure is to be met. The Minister of Justice, in his speech last year, argued that because New Brunswick and Nova Scotia did not formally protest when their representation was reduced, therefore, they considered that they were being treated according to the bond. At page 2168 of 'Hansard' he stated:

> During these years, if there had been foundation for it in the understanding of those who entered the union, there is little doubt that protest and objection would then have been taken, but there was none.

I submit that the inference that the Minister of Justice drew in that statement is not fair or correct, and that the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had no reason whatever to suppose that if they had made such a protest it would have been heeded. As a proof of that statement I might remind the House that in 1905, New Brunswick did protest against the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan being put into the British North America Act so that the Act would apply to them in the same way as if they had been part of the original confederation. Was that protest heeded? No, Sir, no result followed from that protest at all, no heed was given to it and the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were placed under the British North America Act as though they had been part of the original confederation.

Now, Sir, the matter of this New Brunswick protest is a somewhat important matter and I am going to bring it to the notice of the House. The matter was considered so important that it was referred to in the speech from the Throne and I am going to read the resolution which was brought in by the then premier, Mr. Tweedie, who is now the governor of the province, and I am going to read a few of the remarks which were made by those who spoke on that occasion. I will first give the resolution as it appears in the New Brunswick assembly debates of 1905. The resolution is as follows:

> Whereas the Judicial Committee of the Provincial Council in its recent decision on the appeal in the representation case, left undecided the question whether in computing the population of Canada, under subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act the population of the territories should be included, and
>
> Whereas, in the Imperial order in council providing for the admission of British Columbia as a province of Canada, and by the statute which created the province of Manitoba it was provided that the British North America Act, 1867, should apply to them, as if they had formed part of the confederacy as originally constituted, whereby the contention of the government of this province that in construing subsection 4 of section 51 of said Act the words 'population of Canada' mean the population of the four original provinces was greatly and justly prejudiced, and

Whereas, the northern boundary of the province of Quebec at confederation was shown on the authorized maps, and was understood, and recognized to be the height of land between the waters flowing into the River St. Lawrence, and those flowing into Hudson bay, and

Whereas, the parliament of Canada did by the Act 61 Vic., chapter 3, enlarge the limits of the said province of Quebec by the addition to it of a large area to the northward (the area at that time being 193,355 square miles), thereby increasing the territory of said province to 351,873 square miles, an increase of 158,518 square miles, and

Whereas such Act was passed under the authority of the imperial statute, being the British North America Act, 1871, which declares that the parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby, therefore it is resolved,

1st. That in the opinion of this House, the earnest attention of the government of Canada should be drawn to the effect of said order in council, and statute respectively, relating to the admission to the union of British Columbia and Manitoba, and it should be requested to take such action as may be necessary in order to restore the four original provinces to the position in which they would have been, but for order in council and legislation passed subsequently to the British North America Act, 1867, in respect to which such provinces were not consulted, and to which they were not parties.

2nd. That in the Act for the creation of the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan it should not be provided that the British North America Act shall supply to them as if they were in the union originally and the rights of the original provinces as to representation should not be affected by the creation of such new provinces.

3rd. That in justice to the other provinces, particularly New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, which have no opportunity for enlargement of their areas, it should have been provided, and should now be provided that for the purposes of representation the boundaries of the province of Quebec, the population of which is the basis of representation, should be deemed to be as they were at the time of confederation, or that some just and equitable provision should be made to save the other original provinces, and also Prince Edward Island, from loss of representation; and further.

Resolved, that a copy of the foregoing resolution signed by the Clerk of this House, be forwarded to the Secretary of State, with the request that the same be laid before His Excellency the Governor General, and that a copy be also forwarded to the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

There was a protest entered by a province of this Dominion against the continuance of this injustice to the maritime provinces and yet notwithstanding the opinion of the Minister of Justice that protest was unheeded and the grievance unredressed. I may say that the Hon. Mr. Tweedie on that occasion made a very strong speech in support of the motion and he referred among other things to the lack of interest in provincial matters which is sometimes taken by former members of the local legislatures who happen to be transferred to the higher sphere of the Dominion parliament. He said :

I feel that this is a question which should be discussed by the members on both sides of the House, in the fullest manner and with the single eye to the interests of the province. It is worthy of note that sometimes gentlemen who are very heartily in favour of provincial rights when members of the provincial legislature, become strangely indifferent to them, when they go to Ottawa. I remember that Messrs. Fielding and Blair were very prominent in urging the rights of the maritime provinces at Quebec conference, in 1887, but when they got to the larger field they apparently forgot that they were pledged to support these interests.

Further he said :

At the time of confederation Quebec had certain well defined boundaries. According to the census of 1871 it had an area of 193,555 square miles. Quebec is the province by which the representation of the other provinces is regulated. In 1898 an Act was passed which extended the boundaries of Quebec so that it contained 351,000 square miles in addition of 158,000 square miles to its territory. This territory thus added to Quebec is that through which the Grand Trunk Pacific will pass and which we may expect to become populous in the future. The result will be to diminish our representation in a way never contemplated by the British North America Act.

During the debate the then Attorney General of New Brunswick, now the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), who represented the province before the Supreme Court and also before the Privy Council in the matter, supported the resolution strongly and used this language :

I have never entertained the slightest doubt that the fathers of confederation in framing their scheme of representation intended that it should be confined to the four original provinces of Canada, and that if other provinces were admitted it should be on terms. In that view I was fortified by the statement of one of the greatest statesmen of Canada, who was himself one of the fathers of confederation, and who took a leading part in bringing it about. I refer to the late Sir John A. Macdonald who in his report of the 29th December, 1870, on the admission of the Northwest Territory, said :

'The general purview of the British North America Act of 1867 seems to be sufficient to the four provinces, Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, originally forming the Dominion.

Again he said :

When British Columbia was admitted into the union it was stipulated that her representation should be increased under the terms of the British North America Act, and that this Act should apply as if she had been one of the original provinces of confederation, the same thing was done with respect to Manitoba. Now what has been the effect of this? It is that you must construe the British North America Act as if these provinces had been in the union in 1867.

I call the attention of the House to these words of the Minister of Public Works :

If that is so. the compact of confederation has been violated by legislation and by order in council without our being consulted. Surely the authorities at Ottawa should see that this wrong is remedied.

If the population of the territories and of British Columbia had been excluded, New Brunswick would not have lost a representative.

Later during the debate Mr. Pugsley said:

Some may say it will be difficult to have the wrong done us righted, but I think that it can be. I have faith in sense of justice of those administering the affairs of the Dominion.

Later on, in concluding his speech, he said :

I can only repeat what I said yesterday that the province of New Brunswick entered into confederation with a Quebec with certain defined boundaries, and that it was never contemplated that a Quebec should be created double the size of the original province. Yet Quebec is the pivotal province upon which the representation of this province depends. I feel that they have done us a great wrong, yet I do not despair but that when the matter is brought to the notice of government and the parliament, some steps will be taken to see that this injustice is not continued.

These are the words of the Attorney General of the province of New Brunswick at that time, and now the hon. gentleman sits in this House as Minister of Public Works, and has an opportunity, which I hope he will put into effect, of urging these views for adoption by the government of which he is a member. He has the whole matter thoroughly well grounded in his mind, and he is now in a position, I think, to force these views on this government with some hope of ultimate success. He knows as well as I do that this matter is growing in intensity of interest in the maritime provinces, and that unless it is satisfactorily adjudicated upon at an early day there will come a time when it will probably be more difficult of satisfactory adjustment. In the assembly of New Brunswick there were no two opinions on either side of the House in regard to this matter. The leader of the opposition at that time, Mr. Hazen, supported the stand taken by the government. Among other things he said :

I do not expect to be able to add anything to the arguments that have been advanced, but I think that it is extremely desirable in a matter of this importance that we should not give more perfunctory assent to the resolution, but should show our sympathy with it. I say this on behalf of myself and the other gentlemen on this side of the House of whom I am the leader.

Further on he said :

I sympathize entirely with the position taken by the members of the government with respect to this resolution, and I desire to say this emphatically so that it will not be possible for any one to say that there was a dissenting voice in this legislature.

So that it was not a party question at all. Mr. Hazen said further :

It cannot be successfully contended that we have not been affected by the increase of Quebec. If the attention of parliament is now called to the matter and to their right to legislate, it seems to me that any government should be willing to apply a remedy as it can be done under the provisions of the Imperial Act of 1871.

In conclusion he said :

In conclusion I may say that I sincerely trust that some practical good will come out of this discussion, and it will give myself and my colleagues on this side of the House great pleasure to strengthen the hands of the government in this matter.

Several other members spoke on the subject, but I will refer to only one more. The Hon. Mr. Hill, after going into the history of the confederation campaign, said :

What will be our condition if the reduction in our representation continues as we fear it may? It will mean taxation without representation. We, as Anglo-Saxons, and as the descendants of those who fought for responsible government, will never submit to that. If it should ever come to pass that we have to contribute to the vast expenditure to build up the west, and we with little or no influence in the councils of the country, if we find our importance buried under a swarm of Doukhobors, Galicians and Russian Jews, all of whom count in the census we may have to turn to the big brother to the south of us.

Later on he said :

It is not safe to conclude because the sky is cloudless to-day, that we will have no more storms. The United States were lost to Great Britain because the people of these colonies were denied representation in the parliaments of the country. So may it be if our people find our representation gone, and our influence nil in this confederation and our people may find it necessary to look to the great nation to the south.

The short extracts which I have made from the speeches delivered in that debate make it abundantly clear that the whole legislature of New Brunswick, and we might naturally consider that that would mean the whole people of the province,

were extremely interested in this question and considered it a really vital question, and such it is, as is becoming more evident as the days go on. It is said that there is a remedy for every wrong. If that is true in this case, how can that remedy be obtained? There is no use of our going to the courts. The courts have already decided against us, not on what we consider our claim, but on an amended Act to which we never gave our consent and on which we were never consulted. So that it is not to the courts of law that we must go, but to the parliament of Canada, where not only Acts of parliament, but the equity and justice of the case as well may be considered, and it is on the equity of the case, on the fact that the people of the maritime provinces have not had fair play, in so far as the legislation of the imperial parliament is concerned, but that these British North America Acts have been altered and changed to our disadvantage and without our being consulted that we base our claim. Therefore, it is that we come to this parliament asking for relief, and I feel satisfied in my own mind that that relief must come at some time in the near future from this or some other parliament. On the 13th of February last, I placed on the Order Paper the following resolution :

That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to amend the terms of the British North America Act, 1867, relating to the representation of the several provinces of Canada in the House of Commons, so as to provide that the number of representatives of any province shall not at any time be reduced below that which was assigned to it when it entered the union.

It is not my intention to move this resolution to-day, as the House is small, a great many of the members, especially from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec being absent. But I would offer the idea contained in this resolution as an equitable means of settling this trouble—a means which would take away the grievance which the lower provinces have at present, due to the fact that the bond of union has been broken without their consent. The carrying out of such an idea could not, I think, meet with any objection, from the provinces of British Columbia or the prairie provinces, or Ontario, and I cannot see any reason why any objection should come from them. In any event, I offer the suggestion as one way by which the wrong from which we claim we are suffering will be righted. The idea is not a new one. When British Columbia entered confederation, she entered it on the condition that although her representation might be increased, it could not be decreased. That provision of the law which was made in favour of British Columbia we ask should be applied also to the other provinces. I understand that it applies also to the Commonwealth of Australia, so that in applying it to the other provinces of confederation, we would be doing no violence whatever to historic precedent.

There is one more point I wish to make. The Act of 1871 authorizes the parliament of Canada to increase the boundaries of the various provinces under mutually agreeable circumstances, on condition that when that is done any of the provinces which might be affected thereby—and that is a very important provision—should be given redress. That is a provision which this parliament did not act up to when it enlarged the boundaries of Quebec; and there can be no doubt that it would be utterly impossible to make any objection to the statement that when the boundaries of Quebec were enlarged, every other province was affected thereby. That section read as follows :

The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

So that the parliament of Canada is given authority, under the Act of 1871, to make such arrangements in connection with the other provinces as would do away with any injustice will be more vividly brought to the minds and knowledge of the people in the near future than it is at the present.

I shall say no more on this subject at present. I think it is one which this parliament should take into its most serious consideration. The people of the maritime provinces are becoming awake more and more every year to the seriousness of the condition in which they are as regards their representation. These provinces have no possible means of expanding or extending their boundaries. The province of Prince Edward Island is entirely surrounded by water. The provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are surrounded by water on three sides, namely, by the Atlantic and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and on the other side by the province of Quebec and the State of Maine. There is therefore no possible chance for us to enlarge our boundaries, so that we are in the position of having to fight for what we believe to be our own; and I have not the slightest doubt that that aspect of the case will appeal to the people of the lower provinces, and that they will become more and more united on this subject, with the result that some day, unless this great grievance be rectified, it will be the rallying point around which the people of these provinces will act together and so present a united and strong front to this parliament, which appears to be at present necessary in order

to cause this parliament to make that change for which we are appealing and which it is only just and right we should obtain.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester). Although the remarks made by my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) bear on a question which is undoubtedly of great interest to the people of the province from which I come, I regret that he has chosen a time to bring that question forward when public opinion is concentrated on matters of more practical and immediate usefulness. The question is an academic one to-day and may not appeal to the people as urgently perhaps as the hon. gentleman desires. In the meantime, although my hon. friend has cited elaborate documents in support of his contention, I deem it my duty to declare that, although I come from the same province, I am not in accord with the request made by him. It is possible that I may have to meet the censure of many of my colleagues from the province of New Brunswick as well as the other maritime provinces for the stand I take; but as I am well known, in my own province at least, for having always had the courage of my convictions, I consider that on this occasion I am bound to give publicity to the convictions I have entertained for a lifetime and which I have lost no occasion to make known to the people of the constituency I have the honour to represent and its immediate surroundings.

In opposing any change in our constitution to-day, if I am wrong it is due to an excessive administration of the constitution of the British North America Act. I do not see why any one Canadian to-day should entertain other than an unmeasured admiration for the constitution we have enjoyed for the past forty years. The stand I take is due to the great confidence I have in the resources, wealth, capabilities and possibilities of the maritime provinces which, I am confident, will one day experience an industrial revival and take a leading place in the Dominion. When that day comes, and it is not far distant, I am convinced that the maritime provinces will acquire all the representaton we have lost during the first years of confederation. That we have lost any measure of representation is not due to any defect in the constitution but rather, let us frankly admit, to the lack of energy which the maritime provinces have shown in their own development. The time has come when we should stand together, not so much to look to the precise interpretation to be given to the statute, but to work together as one man for the development of our resources and the improvement of our means of transportation, which will give us the wealth and population that we lack to-day. I may, however, claim also that I am not altogether alone in the maritime provinces, and especially in New Brunswick, in entertaining the idea that we should stand by the Act of Confederation. I know a good many old statesmen and old journalists in New Brunswick, men who have given to their country the best years of their lives, who to-day share my views; and I am sure I have their sympathy when I voice their patriotic warning to the people of the smaller provinces, of the smaller bodies in the confederation to be careful how they depart from the terms of the British North America Act.

Confederation was reached only through great mutual concessions. The hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Daniel) has stated, with due appreciation of their importance, the aspirations that were entertained by the leaders of the people at that time. But every province made its share of concessions, moderating its own claims and merging its local aspirations in those of the whole of British America ; and each province received in return privileges which should fairly and equitably balance her rights and interests when weighed in the great national scale of the Dominion. The happiness and permanency of the new-born nation was the common desire which led to the concessions of local interests and made the union possible, and towards which every constructive element was set in motion. Our representation is not only the representation in this House, though it was upon this subject that such strong contentions were put forward at the Quebec conference and at the Charlottetown conference, as well as at the London conference, their proposal of representation by population as a condition sine qua non of union. The people of the maritime provinces, on the other hand, brought under consideration the Intercolonial Railway as a condition sine qua non of union. While it was arrived at that there should be representation by population in this House, and that the construction of the Intercolonial Railway should be carried through, the fathers of confederation looked to further protection for the people of the smaller provinces and provided for that protection by permanent and equal representation in the upper chamber of this parliament of Canada. I claim that to-day the representation of the Canadian people is not merely the representation in the House of Commons, or the representation in the Senate, but the aggregate representation in these two chambers, which together form the parliament of Canada. Our representation in these two Houses are so closely allied that you cannot change one without changing the other ; you cannot destroy one without destroying the other. The texture of our parliamentary representation is so closely interwoven, so intimately united, that if you break even one of its filaments the whole fabric falls in shreds. The representation in this House was a question well understood and well discussed in the maritime provinces, not less in New Brunswick than in

either of the others. It was because of the expected future development of the west and increase of its population that the people of the province of New Brunswick, as well as those of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, hesitated to enter into confederation. The only means by which that hesitation was overcome was the provision of permanent equal representation in the Senate. I do not mean to say that the Senate was established for the purpose of giving the smaller portion of the Dominion that representation; but it was found that the only means of counterbalancing, as we may say, the position of the weaker provinces in this parliament would be by giving them further security in the upper chamber, which security was granted at that time. My hon. friend from the city of St. John has claimed that the people were taken by surprise, that they were not aware of what was to take place, that they did not know the position in which the maritime provinces would find themselves after confederation. He has cited as authorities men like the late Sir Albert Smith, who had been an opponent of confederation, to show that the people of New Brunswick were not in accord with the system of representation by population in this House, I might claim that this same Sir Albert Smith became one of the most ardent champions of the constitution from the moment that constitution was adopted by the people of Canada, and that he is on record as having held as sacred the very principle of representation by population in this House, even though the representation of his own province was put on a small minority. I might also show that no greater advocate of the present constitution ever arose in New Brunswick than another who had also opposed that constitution before it was proclaimed, Hon. Timothy Warren Anglin, who was first representative in this House of the constituency which I have the honour to represent to-day. It is true that British Columbia was admitted to confederation under a statute by which it was provided that she should not suffer from change in the proportion of population. It may also be placed in contradiction to the position of Prince Edward Island, which came in the next year, but under a statute by which her representation was to be subject to the spirit of the clause of the British North America Act in every point. The introduction of British Columbia into the confederation under a statute by which her representation was not to be decreased, was precisely the fact which awakened Canadian opinion, I might say, to the necessity of holding firm to the principle of representation by population.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. TURGEON. Mr. Speaker, before recess I was endeavouring to show the consensus of opinion which existed at the time of confederation in the maritime provinces as well as in the older provinces when it was proposed that the principle of representation by population should be accepted by the people of New Brunswick and the other maritime provinces provided that equal representation should be given to the maritime provinces in the upper chamber of the parliament of Canada. I have only to refer to the discussion which took place at the time, and which is concisely reported in Pope's confederation documents to find that it was always the aim of the 'fathers of confederation' to give all due protection to the people of New Brunswick and the maritime provinces. While the people of New Brunswick, of the maritime provinces and the other provinces, as well as the fathers of confederation, were anxious to reach a completion of the negotiations leading up to confederation, while they were even anxious to consummate the idea of securing the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, which would bind the maritime provinces to the provinces of the west, Sir Leonard Tilley himself would have gone back to his province without the Intercolonial Railway if he had not had the assurance that the people would get fair representation under the system of representation by population, if not by equal representation in the House of Commons, at least by the permanency of the representation which would be given them in the upper chamber of this parliament. You will find that Sir John Macdonald, in addressing the delegates from the provinces who were met together at Quebec, said:

> In order to have no local jealousies and all things conciliatory, there should be a different system in the two chambers. With the Queen as our sovereign, we should have an upper and a lower House. In the former the principle of equality should obtain. In the lower House the basis of representation should be population, not by universal suffrage, but according to the principles of the British constitution. In the upper House there should be equality in number. The population of Upper Canada is 1,400,000, Lower Canada, 1,200,000, Lower provinces, 750,000. The rate of increase of population in Canada must be greater in future than in the maritime provinces. We considered at Charlottetown that Upper Canada should have twenty members, Lower Canada twenty and the maritime provinces twenty. If not politically united they should still have the same aggregate representation.

You see by that statement that in order to counterbalance the representation of other provinces in the confederation it was proposed that equal privileges should be granted to the people of the maritime provinces in the Upper House. We find that Sir Charles Tupper, the most influential representative of the people of his province

at the time, said in the discussion which took place in London :

In the maritime provinces we felt that the great preponderance of Canada could only be guarded against by equal representation in the legislative council.

There was no doubt that the people of the maritime provinces at that time were aware, as we are to-day, that there would be a great preponderance of influence in the west in the future by reason of the immense increase in the population which was bound to take place. It is owing to such an apprehension that the people of the maritime provinces were reluctant for a while to accept the terms offered them by the people of the western provinces. But from the moment that confederation was un fait accompli the very same men who had taken objection to the system of representation by population, who had objected to the terms of confederation, immediately lent their patriotic assistance to the movement in order that every thing might proceed smoothly towards a recognition of the status in which the people have been placed. Our people who are moving for a change in the constitution have always been pleased to quote what has taken place in British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. British Columbia, it is true, was admitted into confederation later on with a fixed representation of six members but that representation was increased under the provisions of the British North America Act. At the same time while we might say that the introduction of British Columbia was against the terms and spirit of the constitution at the time, we see a good deal of difference between the terms upon which British Columbia, with its large territory and immense resources, was admitted and the terms upon which the small province of Prince Edward Island, with a confined area and with less possibilities for the further, was admitted. The fathers of the confederation had determined that the maritime provinces together would have the same permanent representation in the Senate as the provinces of Quebec and Ontario.

The provinces of Quebec and Ontario were given a representation of twenty-four members in the Senate while the maritime provinces with a much smaller population were also allotted twenty-four senators and it was agreed that out of these twenty-four senators when Prince Edward Island entered confederation she should have four of the number. In 1872 British Columbia came into confederation and that province with her great territory and immense resources was only given three senators, which shows conclusively that the fathers of confederation always maintained proportionate representation in the Senate as protection for the smaller provinces. British Columbia with a large territory and great resources was bound to increase in population, and the terms of her union provided that her representation in the Commons was not to be diminished. When the British Columbia Act of union was submitted to the House the representatives from New Brunswick and others who had been urging before the people their apprehension as to the representation of the smaller provinces when other members entered the confederation, pointed out this danger in parliament. The Hon. T. W. Anglin, the first representative in this House of the constituency which I now have the honour to represent, and who through his position in the legislature as representing St. John, and who through his great newspaper the St. John 'Freeman' wielded immense influence throughout the maritime provinces and in New Brunswick especially : he was the first to protest against the admission of British Columbia on the basis of a representation of members already existing. He said as reported in the debates of 1871 :

He would not object to the admission of British Columbia to confederation were not the fundamental principle of the constitution trampled upon in the matter of representation.

In the opinion of Mr. Anglin the representation of British Columbia should have been made subject to the constitution as found in the British North America Act. Sir Albert Smith who then represented Westmoreland in this House took exception on the same point and he said :

There were two very important considerations and one of them was that there was a great departure from the principle of the constitution in the matter of representation.

Sir A. T. Galt, who had been one of the leading fathers of confederation said :

He depreciated interference with one of the principles of our constitution, namely, representation by population, by this resolution. He indicated the evils of admitting colonies or territories on the footing of present members of the confederation.

While the statute admitted British Columbia with a representation which was not to be decreased, that conclusion was arrived at by the members of the government no doubt owing to the great possibilities of that province and the certainty that its population would continue to increase. However, the representatives of the maritime provinces and of New Brunswick declared themselves against the introduction of British Columbia under such conditions. When in the following year the smaller province of Prince Edward Island was admitted to confederation we find that she was submitted to the conditions of the British North America Act even in her representation in this House of Commons. A few years before Prince Edward Island had

refused to come into confederation under that system of representation, but time had wrought a change in public opinion and at the time of the union they were willing to enter under such terms, a condition which was no doubt rendered necessary by the opposition of the leading representatives of New Brunswick and the maritime provinces when the year before British Columbia had been admitted on the basis of representation of present members. If we are now to endeavour to change the representation of the smaller provinces in the House of Commons, would we not put ourselves in a position to lose that permanency and that equality and that protection which we enjoy to-day in our representation in the Senate. If to-day we are to endeavour to change our representation in this House may it not be that the members from western Canada would endeavour to change the representation which we enjoy in the Senate.

If we insist that in this House our representation shall be based on an electoral unit of 17,000 or 18,000 instead of 25,000, which is the present unit, and which in the future may be 35,000, then it may be that the people of the west would come to the conclusion that we have lost our right to protection in the Senate, and the maritime provinces would, therefore, be in no better position so far as protection in the parliament of Canada is concerned than they are to-day. If to-day we ask the people of the west to extend their sympathy to us so as to give us what we have lost naturally under the terms of confederation, we may open an adverse current of opinion in the larger provinces which may place us in a worse position than we are in by the loss of representation which we have suffered. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that we should stand by the constitution. The constitution should be the guide of our patriotism; we should cling to it as to our only plank of salvation. We have stood by the constitution in the past. We in New Brunswick, the minority in New Brunswick especially, have stood by the constitution; we have suffered in years gone by for the constitution and in our very sufferings we have learned to admire, to love and to cherish it. We have appealed to the constitution in other moments of danger when provincial rights were assailed; we appealed to the constitution not very long ago when we formed new provinces in the west; we have stood upon the rock of the constitution, and to-day we should place our feet firmly upon that rock; we should maintain and preserve intact the British North America Act and allow time to so harden the mortar and the cement that the materials may cohere and combine to resist all attempts at changes out of a mere spirit of novelty.

Stability is better than uncertainty. We are building a great nation. We have since confederation made Canada a great nation under the present constitution. We have gone ahead in progress and prosperity at a greater rate than any other nation of the world. Our constitution as it exists has created a national sentiment all over the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We want stability to-day more than ever. We are inviting people to come and settle on our fertile plains, to develop our resources. We are inviting them from the British Isles, from the continent of Europe, from the United States, whence they come as fast as steam power can bring them. We want to create a nation which will remain a Canadian nation. We cannot tell after all, what the aspirations of those people may be. They may be varied; their desires may be excessive; they may possibly not recognize limitations. We should let people know, as they come and before they come, that Canada is ruled by a stable and inviolate constitution which will for all time resist attacks not warranted by wisdom or by circumstances. We should certainly put ourselves in a position to withstand in the future every attempt to change the constitution. As I said, in the few words with which I opened my remarks, if I am in error in opposing any change in the constitution which might for the moment appear to be of benefit to my province, I say that a temporary good in the destinies of a nation, especially a nation yet in its formative state, with tendencies to disunion or disturbance, is implicitly a wrong. Therefore I say that we should stand by the terms of our constitution which is an object of admiration to other nations.

On every occasion that this subject has been brought before the House, I have heard members from different provinces, more particularly the province from which I come, quote from the constitutions of other countries which would seem to commend themselves to their judgment. I do not see why we should not recognize as much of wisdom, as much of intelligence, as much of patriotism in the constitution of Canada, which was framed by a number of men assembled together at a moment when they were moved by the loftiest possible patriotism—a constitution which has been the admiration of other people, and which should be our admiration every day of the year. I regret as deeply as my hon. friend from St. John the loss by the province of New Brunswick of two or three representatives in this House. But would he and his friends think that the provinces by the sea would be more secure in the future, with two or three more representatives in this House, which is bound before the end of the century to have 300 or 350 members, if the people of the west should at that time claim some larger representation for their provinces in the House or in the

Senate? I have always been opposed to these changes in the constitution.

My hon. friend this morning made allusion to the position taken by the New Brunswick legislature some three or four years ago, in asking that some steps should be taken to have this wrong, as they called it, righted. The contention of the legislature at the time was, not that we should have a new constitution, but that the Dominion of Canada meant, so far as representation in the House of Commons was concerned, only the four original provinces which came into confederation. For my part, believing as I do that Canada should be compared in its origin to a growing tree. Canada meant the provinces that came in at the time of confederation together with all the territory that was to come in afterwards. It was not the Act of the smaller provinces of the east alone; it was the Act of British North America in toto. The courts have decided that the word Canada did not mean only the four original provinces, but all the provinces that have come in or that may come in in the future. Therefore that agitation has ceased, as the Privy Council has declared that the contention of the provinces could not be sustained.

I have full confidence that the maritime provinces are able to hold their own in this great confederation, in the development that we must expect in our resources, not merely the resources of the sea, which are inexhaustible, not merely the resources of the forest, which are great and powerful, not merely the resources of the soil, which are immense, but the resources of the undersoil, the resources of coal and iron, which have proved, in recent discoveries, to be the very richest in North America. The development of these resources is bound to bring population and capital to this country. I repeat that if the maritime provinces have lost representation in this House since confederation, it is not so much due to the constitution as it is due to our own lack of energy in the development of our resources. I place no restriction upon the possibilities of development in the maritime provinces. We have not perhaps made the same efforts for the development of our resources and the keeping of our children at home as have been made in the west. But a new era has begun, our young children have been taught to see their opportunities at home, and I have no doubt that our population will soon reach the point it ought to have reached before now, and we will then be entitled to a larger representation in this House. It is a fact which I am sorry to mention, but which is unquestionable, that since confederation until the last census two-thirds of our young men left our territory. Of late, however, we have been developing our own resources, our young men are finding more attractions at home, our population is beginning to increase, and in a few years we shall be in a position to recover our loss of representation. It is better for the representatives of New Brunswick to encourage a movement in that direction, to excite the patriotism of our young people, and induce them to remain at home and give the benefit of their labours to their own country instead of to a foreign land. If we have not made greater advance, the blame rests with ourselves, and I take my share of the responsibility. But if any efforts of mine in the district where I live have had the result of inducing our people to remain at home, if they have been the means of preventing some families from emigrating to the republic to the south, I think I have accomplished some good for my country. The present rate of emigration into the western provinces cannot continue, and I have no doubt that the maritime provinces, as their population increases, will be able not only to keep their present representation, but regain what they have lost. Let me, in this connection, draw attention to the fourth subsection of section 51 of the British North America Act, which provides:

> On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained, at the then last census, to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

So that the representation of any province is to be determined by a comparison of the last census with the one previous. But I claim that with the increase of industry and population in the maritime provinces, we shall soon be in a position to recover lost ground and regain the representation we have lost.

I therefore submit to my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) that he should join me in the patriotic endeavour to have our resources developed as rapidly as possible and thus keep our people at home. I would ask him to join me in calling the attention of the provincial governments, as well as the federal government, to the necessity of giving the maritime provinces all the transportation facilities to which they are entitled and which cannot fail to bring about a revival of industry and make our provinces the richest in the Dominion. I submit that we should direct our energies, not to obtaining a change in the constitution, but to the development of our own resources. Our resources are more lasting than those of the west because we have not only the resources of the soil but of the under-soil. We have the coal and the iron, which are every day becoming greater of greater ne-

cessity. Year after year larger quantities will be required for the purposes of the west. Only lately an iron mine at Bathurst, in my constituency. which has been proved by the Department of Mines to be one of the most valuable in the country, was sold for $80,000, and will be developed, and we have other mines existing in other parts of the province, some of them close perhaps to the constituency of my hon. friend. We have also other sources of wealth and what we require is greater transportation facilities. Let us urge on the government the improvement of the Intercolonial Railway in every way possible. Let us urge the improvement of its road bed from Moncton to Halifax. Let us insist on the acquisition by the government of many small branches which should belong to the Intercolonial Railway in order that they may be better equipped and give better revenue and furnish greater facilities to the districts through which they run. Let us unitedly ask for the further improvement of our harbours along the sea coast, from which transportation can be made across the ocean. For my part I believe that whether we be twelve or thirteen or fifteen members from the province of New Brunswick, we have no need to fear anything from the western representatives. I believe that every member of this House, whether from the east or the west, as soon as he enters this sanctuary of the Canadian people, feels himself animated with a sense of justice and British fair-play. I for one see greater danger in changing our consitution. If we change the representation in this House, we shall be called upon, in a few years, to change the representation of the upper House. In the upper House, we have our protection. A great movement has grown up lately for a change in the upper House. For my part I am as adverse to a change in the upper House as to a change in this House, for, as I have already said, our parliamentary representation is our representation in both houses of parliament; if we gain in one we shall lose in the other.

I do not wish to enter upoa n discussion of the question of maintenance of the Senate or changes in the Senate ; I say we should, first of all, maintain the protection which is given to the maritime provinces by our representation in the Senate—not that the Senate was created for the sole purpose of giving that protection, for it was created as the repository of mature wisdom, sober judgment and freedom from the turmoil of popular sentiment, but it was also so arranged that the smaller provinces should have in that body such representation as would afford them protection which they may lack in this House. Therefore, I say to my hon. friend from St. John that I, for one, as a representative of the province of New Brunswick, representing as I do a constituency which stands equally rich in resources of the sea and resources of the land, that I care not whether the province of New Brunswick has twelve members or fourteen members provided that of the Canadian tree I get the shelter and the shade.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) that the representation of the maritime provinces in this House is a question of the utmost importance. The maritime provinces are suffering under a wrong which is no fault of their own. But our constitution is not unchangeable like the laws of the Medes and Persians. We already have four amendments to the constitution made by the imperial parliament, and there is no reason why, if circumstances have changed since confederation, further changes should not be made. I think that no harm would be done by giving to the maritime provinces the same representation they had at confederation and securing it to them for all time in the same manner as such representation was secured to British Columbia when it entered confederation. I do not think it will be necessary to make a change in the representation in the upper House. It is true that the last speaker has said that the gentlemen who composed that House are supposed to be men of mature wisdom and sober judgment. The probability is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turgeon) fills the Bill to a T and that he looks forward, when tired of the turmoil of elections, he will take his rest in the upper Chamber.

Mr. TURGEON. No hope.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The hon. gentleman may not look for it now, but, perhaps, in the course of ten or fifteen years he may be glad to be clear of running around the country at election time. The constitution of this country, like the constitution of the United States, is quite different from what it was originally. Take the amendments to our constitution made since 1867—the amendments of 1871 and those following—and you will find that the changes made have been very important indeed. The constitution of the United States to-day you would not know to be the same as that which was passed by the first federal congress. The conditions changed and it became necessary to change the constitution to meet the new state of affairs. In the same way, it is necessary in the interest of the maritime provinces that, if the constitution allows their part of their representation to be taken away, the constitution should be changed so as to put them in the same position as that in which they were before. Prince Edward Island entered the confe-

deration in 1873. That province would not enter in 1867, because the terms proposed for the admission to the union did not meet with the approval of its people, and so they kept out of confederation for nine years after the first proposals were made. And on what ground? The ground was this very principle of representation by population, which they were not prepared to accept. They told the other provinces that they would not accept that proposition. The resolution which was adopted at Quebec by the conference based the representation in the House of Commons on the population as determined by the official census every ten years. It says:

The basis of representation in the House of Commons should be population as determined by the official census every ten years; and the number of members at first should be 194, distributed as follows:

Upper Canada	82
Lower Canada	65
Nova Scotia	19
New Brunswick	15
Newfoundland	8
Prince Edward Island	5

Now, the imperial government was very anxious that Prince Edward Island should come into the union, and despatches passed between the provincial government and imperial government with reference to the matter. The government of the Prince Edward Island informed the imperial government that they would not accept these clauses of the resolutions passed at the Quebec conference. The imperial government, being anxious, sent despatches to the government of Prince Edward Island, and, at the session of 1865 of the legislature of that province, the matter was threshed out carefully. The legislature, in the first place, passed a resolution which reads as follows:

18. Until the official census of 1871 should be made up, there shall be no change in the number of representatives from the several sections.

19. Immediately after the completion of the census of 1871, and immediately after every decennial census thereafter, the representation from each section n the House of Commons shall be readjusted on the basis of population.

20. For the purpose of such re-adjustments, Lower Canada shall always be assigned sixty-five members, and each of the other sections shall at each re-adjustment receive, for the ten years then next succeeding, the number of members to which it will be entitled on the same ratio of representation to population as Lower Canada will enjoy according to the census last taken by having sixty-five members.

21. No reduction shall be made in the number of members returned by any section unless its population shall have decreased relatively to the population of the whole union to the extent of five per centum.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN.

That is the relative circumstances of Canada and this island rendered a union practicable, the evident injustice of the terms agreed to by the Quebec convention would prevent their being rectified by the legislature of this island. Without alluding to all, it is proper to notice some of the objectionable features of the report. Without admitting the principle of representation according to population under all circumstances to be sound, it is, in the opinion of this House, particularly objectionable as applied to this island in connection with Canada, taking into consideration that the number of our inhabitants is, and must continue comparatively small, owing to the fact that we have no Crown lands, mines, minerals, or other resources sufficient to induce immigrants to settle here, and that we never can expect to become to any extent a manufacturing people in consequence of our navigation being closed nearly half the year, and all trade and communication with other countries stopped. Under this principle the city of Montreal alone would, at the present time have representation greater than the whole province of Prince Edward Island, and under the provisions of the convention which regulates the mode of readjusting the relative representation of the various provinces at each decennial census, looking at the rapid increase of the population of Upper and Lower Canada heretofore,—particularly the former,—and the certainty of a still greater increase therein in the future, over that of the population of this island, it follows as a certain and inevitable consequence, if a federation of the provinces were consummated upon the basis of the said convention, that the number of our representatives would, in the course of a comparatively short number of years, be diminished to a still smaller number than that allotted at the outset to us.

This resolution was passed by the legislature, and the province did not enter the confederation. At the same session an address was presented to Her Majesty embodying the terms of that resolution, and particularly setting out their objection to the representation clause, which I think is the most important clause in the address. After this address was presented to Her Majesty, the matter dropped. But the Dominion of Canada wished to round out the national territory, and it persisted year after year in making representations to the people of Prince Edward Island for their admission into the union. In 1873, at the request of the Dominion government, delegates were sent from Prince Edward Island to Ottawa, sent without any instructions from the people of the island, they went with an open mind. But there was one thing which the people insisted upon, and that was that they should have six representatives in the House of Commons of Canada, and they thought that this representation would be maintained for all time to come. In a communication which passed between the local government and the delegates when they were in Ottawa, it was stated that it was highly improbable they would get six representatives. That tele-

gram was sent by one of the delegates to the lieutenant governor, on the 26th of February, 1873. Negotiations proceeded for a month or so, and in the month of March the Dominion government conceded to the province six representatives in this House, and the people thought that the concession was made on the same terms as representation was conceded to British Columbia. But by some oversight when the resolution passed the legislature of Prince Edward Island, it read as follows :

But the population of Prince Edward Island having been increased by 1,500 or upwards since the year 1861, the island should be represented in the House of Commons of Canada by six members, the representation to be readjusted from time to time under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when these resolutions were passed what was the condition of Canada ? There was no Northwest, and the territory of the province of Quebec was one-third or perhaps less what it is to-day. There were other circumstances which led the people to believe that the population of the maritime provinces would increase relatively with the population of the rest of the country. But as time went on we found that the great Northwest was being settled, a boom took place there, and the young men who should have remained in the maritime provinces, being of an adventurous spirit, commenced to swarm into the Northwest, and to-day one-third of the population of those provinces is settled in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. Therefore I say that, conditions having changed so radically in respect to population, this parliament should take steps to give us back the representation which we had when we entered confederation. What is going to be the result to the maritime provinces when the great Northwest is fully settled ? We have not room in Prince Edward Island for a very large population, and I suppose that within the lives of the members of this House the representation of those provinces will be so reduced that from Prince Edward Island, at least, within the next forty years, we will have only one representative in this House. My hon. friend (Mr. Turgeon) wished us to abide by the constitution ; he thinks that no change should be made. I do not agree with him. I think that when the conditions change we should change the constitution. If we are to become a nation at all, we must lay the foundations of that nation in mutual confidence. We must not have one part of the country better represented than another part, and if a province is comparatively small it should have a larger proportional representation than a larger province. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) has argued here that this House should deal with this matter, and I agree with him that under the third section of the amendment to the British North America Act passed on June 29, 1871, this House can deal with this matter. The section reads as follows :

The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase, or diminution, or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

Look at the province of Quebec and see the vast amount of territory that has been added to it. Yet that affects the other provinces, it affects the maritime provinces more perhaps than the province of Ontario. Now it is suggested that a large territory should be added to the province of Manitoba. These conditions have changed the whole outlook with reference to representation in this parliament. That is a matter which comes peculiarly within the third section of the Act of 1871. I direct the attention of the right hon. leader of the House to the fact that this matter is one which could be dealt with in this parliament and that it is not necessary at all to go to the Imperial parliament to readjust it. An Act can be passed by this parliament reciting that the conditions with respect to the territory of the other provinces are such that they do not correspond at all with the condition when the maritime provinces entered into confederation and this parliament should deal with the matter because the population, by reason of the addition to the territory of the other provinces has greatly increased, while the population in the maritime provinces has practically remained stationary. These are matters which should receive the attention of this parliament. Last session and the session before this question was brought up, but the government did not think proper to interfere. The Attorney General of Canada, when this matter of representation was before the Privy Council, acted for the province of Prince Edward Island and his opinion, when he argued the case before the Privy Council for Prince Edward Island, was that we were entitled to additional representation not only on the ground that the statute expressly provided that we should have such representation but also because it was the intention of the framers of the Act that we should receive six representatives. There was an abundance of evidence, outside of the words of the Act, that it was the intention of the legislature of Prince Edward Island and of this parliament that when Prince Edward Island entered into confederation she should have six representatives for all time to come. The Attorney General pressed

that matter upon their lordships in the Privy Council, but they saw fit to take the letter of the law as they found it and as I have read it from the resolution passed by the parliament of Canada and the legislature of Prince Edward Island. But, notwithstanding that fact we have the assurance of the Attorney General in his argument that it was the intention of the legislature and of this parliament that we should have that representation for all time to come. I think the evidence that he produced before the Privy Council was abundant to show to the government and the parliament of Canada that we lost that representation by the blunder of the man who drew the resolution, by a mistake, in the conditions and a wrong of that kind should be righted by this parliament. I do not think that the maritime provinces should lie any longer under this wrong which was committed when we entered confederation. Take this great province of Ontario with its vast resources; every day we hear of new discoveries of minerals. It is the same in the province of Quebec. Their resources are illimitable. Prince Edward Island is a province dependent altogether upon agriculture, and we will probably never be a great manufacturing country because we are shut out, as was stated by the gentlemen who were present at the conference in 1864, for six months in the year, by reason of the isolation which results from our being an island. There may be a time when we will be able perhaps to increase our population by a small amount when we get our tunnel, but until that time comes I do not see any hope that our population will increase in proportion to the population of the other provinces of Canada, and I think. for the reasons which were given by the gentlemen who were present at the confrence of 1864 at Quebec, by reason of the facts which were adduced before the Privy Council by the Attorney General of Canada when he argued the case for Prince Edward Island, and by reason of the other facts which have been stated to this House by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) and by other hon. gentlemen who have spoken during the last two sessions upon this subject, immediaate relief should be given to the maritime province by the government of Canada.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, this has been a profitable subject of discussion in this House since the days of confederation. I do not know that any subject has created greater differences of opinion than the subject of confederation which we have before us to-day. I have with some little care, looked over the discussions of that day and I find that there were very great divergencies of opinion on the subject. George Brown, representing the large province of Ontario, was the great apostle of the principle of representation by population. One of the greatest men of that day who hoped to round off confederation, Sir A. T. Galt, when the province of Prince Edward Island was taken into confederation, tried to consolidate the province. The province had held out strongly from entering into the confederation with a small representation. I have here some of the resolutions that were offered at that time. Sir A. T. Galt moved this resolution,

That the unit of representation be reduced and that the number of members for Upper Canada be ninety-nine, for Lower Canada, seventy-four, for Nova Scotia, twenty-one, for New Brunswick, seven, for Newfoundland, eight, and for Prince Edward Island, six.

That resolution was discussed at some length and, I will quote a few of the remarks that Sir A. T. Galt made in support of it. He said :

We have supposed that the population of Lower Canada, being tolerably equable in its character, would afford the best basis. But having respect to the rapid increase of Upper Canada, we think the lower provinces should not be reduced if they do not increase in the same ratio.

I think that bears on the question to-day. That was the statement of Sir A. T. Galt, one of the fathers of confederation, a man who had done more, I think, to round off and complete confederation than any other with the exception, perhaps, of Sir George Cartier, Sir John Macdonald and a few others whose names I need not mention. Mark his words :

Do you think the lower provinces should not be reduced if they do not increase in the same ratio. Therefore the lower provinces would have the same as they have now unless in the very improbable case of any one falling off five per cent.

But the Hon. George Brown was not of the same opinion. Although Quebec and Ontario were united before confederation these two provinces had divergent views on many public questions and they never got along well together, and while Sir A. T. Galt held these views the Hon. George Brown, representing the great province of Ontario differed from him, and he moved a resolution in amendment to the motion of Sir A. T. Galt, to the effect that Upper Canada should have eighty-two members, Lower Canada sixty-five members, Nova Scotia nineteen members. New Brunswiick fifteen members, Newfoundland seven members, and Prince Edward Island six members. The disagreement between these two gentlemen shows that there was no great unanimity among the fathers of confederation as to fixing the representation. George Brown speaking in favour of his resolution said :

The practical result would be that while lower Canada certainly will not be less and the lower provinces may increase in population—

The central idea then was that the maritime provinces would increase in population. They at that time held a very prominent position ; they had resources in fisheries, mines, minerals, and agriculture and the central idea was that they would rapidly increase in population. Why they did not increase is a question for great speculation. And, Sir, the reason the maritime provinces have not increased in that rapid ratio that was anticipated by George Brown and others is because the maritime provinces since confederation have not held the position it was supposed they would hold. Newfoundland refused to join confederation and compare her position to-day with the position of the maritime provinces. Newfoundland has made more progress out of the union than Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have made in the union ; Newfoundland has done more to make her fisheries a success than has been the case in any of the maritime provinces. I tell this House that you may ask Newfoundland to joint the union as much as you like, but the record of progress in Newfoundland as compared with the record in the maritime provinces will keep her out of confederation, and you have not terms enough to offer to induce her to join. If you expect Newfoundland to come into the union, for one thing you will have to act more generously with respect to the representation of the maritime provinces. George Brown continued to say :

—the lower provinces may increase in population; they cannot decrease in the number of representatives.

That was what the people of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia then believed but that belief has not been justified by the events. One can hardly realize the time that has been spent in this House discussing this prolific question, and it is a question which will never be settled satisfactorily until a remedy is applied. Now, Sir, I purpose quoting the opinions of some other representatives from my province at the time the union was consummated, all of which go to show the importance attached to this matter by the people of the maritime provinces generally. The first confederation conference was held in Charlottetown, but Prince Edward Island did not enter the union at confederation, and I wish for a few moments to refer to the views of the representatives of my province at that time. Here are some of the views expressed at that conference by gentlemen representing Prince Edward Island. I will not read the whole of them, but I will quote enough to show the great stress they placed on that province having a fair representation in this House. Some of those gentlemen were very prominent in their own province—such men as Colonel Grey, Mr. Haviland, Mr. Palmer, Edward Whalen and James Pope. Everybody who knows anything about the history of Prince Edward Island knows that these men were men of no small calibre. Mr. Haviland said :

Prince Edward Island would rather be out of confederation than consent to this motion.

The motion was to give Prince Edward Island a representation of five members. Mr. Palmer, who was afterwards Chief Justice of the province, said :

Our trade and revenue are rapidly increasing. Why give up so great certainties for an uncertain benefit where we have only a feeble voice. Looking first at the larger provinces, Canada has secured to herself a greater number of representatives than she had before. It may be said that we may join with the other maritime provinces in any matter affecting our common interests but even then our united strength would still be far below Canada's number of representatives.

On the same day that Mr. Palmer spoke, Sir Alexander Galt said :

It would be a matter of the greatest regret that any difficulty should arise over this matter We request the Prince Edward Island delegates to reconsider their decision. It would be a matter of reproach to us that the smallest colony should leave us.

Another who spoke on the same occasion was Mr. Whelan. Every one acquainted with the history of the maritime provinces knows something of the life of Edward Whalen. He began his studies in Halifax under the tuition of Mr. Howe, one of the most eminent men Nova Scotia ever produced, the man who did the most to introduce responsible government into that province; and Edward Whalen came over to Prince Edward Island and introduced responsible government there, and his name is revered in that province from one end of it to the other. He broke up what was known as the family compact and established one of the most popular governments that ever existed in Prince Edward Island. Here is what he said :

We are in an isolated position. Our resources are large and our people would not be content to give up their present benefits for the representation of five members. It may be said that the confederation will go on without Prince Edward Island, and that we shall eventually be forced in. Better, however, that than that we should willingly go into the confederation with that representation.

I am going to quote next the views of a man perhaps equally eminent, Colonel Grey, a man who as a statesman occupied a position perhaps second to none in Prince Edward Island, and who was honoured with great distinction. He said :

I am instructed by my co-delegates to say that the provision of five members is unsatisfactory. Prince Edward Island is divided longitudinally in three counties, each return-

ing ten members (that is, to the local legislature.) But they have always been opposed to change in representation. You cannot divide the three counties into the five members.

I do not wish to tire the House, but this matter having come up, I think it my duty to place before the House these views. I am next going to quote Mr. Pope. I suppose every one at all conversant with the history of Canada knows something about the late James Pope. He was Minister of Marine and Fisheries in this country for a number of years, and was a man of great power and influence in his province. I do not know that there was one man, or even two or three men combined, who had as much influence in that province at one time as he. He was a practical man, a man of large vision, a man imbued with a desire to promote the best interests of his country and his province. This is what he said :

I agree with all that has been said by Colonel Grey and Mr. Coles.

I am going to refer to Mr. Coles. The most popular government we ever had in Prince Edward Island was a government known as the Coles and Whalen administration. They were Liberals of the old time and the old type. It was one of the most popular administrations and introduced some of the most advanced legislation ever known in the province of Prince Edward Island. The administration of Coles and Whalen did more for Prince Edward Island than any we ever had there. The names of Coles and Whelan will live in the hearts and memory of the people of that province for many years to come. They took hold of the educational question at that time. Coles and Whalen introduced a system of free education many years before it was ever thought of in any other part of Canada. We had a system of free education in the island, introduced by the government of Coles and Whelan, when such a system was not to be found in any other part of Canada. As far back as 1858, knowing that the youth of the province could never make any progress without an education, that government said : We will lay a tax on the land and provide a fund which will give a free education to every boy and girl in the province. And I do not know that at that time there was any other province in Canada so far advanced in education as the province of Prince Edward Island. The youth of that province rapidly took advantage of that system, and you will find in every part of the world, in every part of Canada and the United States, men from Prince Edward Island at the head of affairs, always associated with progress. Need I mention the names of Sir William Macdonald, of Montreal, Dr. Andrew McPhail, of McGill College, Professor Schurman, of Cornell University. Time would fail me to give a list of the men from Prince Edward Island prominent in banking and commerce and in every thing that makes for progress. And these men will, I believe, admit that their great incentive was the educational system introduced by Coles and Whalen. At that time the government led by Coles and Whalen introduced an Act to release the tenantry of that province from the oppression of landlordism. Landlordism had hold of that province. But the government of Coles and Whalen introduced what is known as the Fifteen Year Purchase Act. They practically made the tenants of the island free. These tenants are practically freeholders to-day. I merely refer to this to give emphasis to the opinions expressed by Mr. Pope. Mr. Pope said :

I agree in all that has been said by Col. Grey and Mr. Coles.

That was the late Hon. George Coles who led one of the most popular governments of Prince Edward Island.

But the circumstances of Prince Edward Island are such that I hope the conference will agree to give it such a number as we can divide amongst our three constituencies. Nature as well as the original settlement of the island has made three counties and it would give rise to much difficulty if we have to adjust five members of the three counties. I cannot ask it as a matter of right, but one of expediency, as one without which it is impossible for us to carry the measure in Prince Edward Island. I therefore ask for six members.

Mr. Haviland. I fully agree with Mr. Pope.

I may quote one other gentleman. You know, Mr. Speaker, that there are only to-day two living out of the great galaxy of bright and able men who gather at the board to form confederation. One of them is Sir Charles Tupper and the other is the Hon. Senator A. A. Macdonald. Both men are very vigorous and healthy for their age. I have here the views which were expressed by these men at that time and as they are the views of men living to-day, I am sure they will have some force with the First Minister. I trust that something will be done to restore to Prince Edward Island what was taken from her very unjustly. The Hon. A. A. Macdonald, then a member of this House and now a Senator, spoke as follows :

We are not bound by the principle of representation by population laid down in Charlottetown. Our constituents will say and will speak of the increased representation of Canada and the decreased representation of the lower provinces.

There was the point at which the discussion rose. Later on Canada was very anxious that the province of Prince Edward Island should join confederation. The im-

perial parliament was also very anxious that it should. Our neighbours to the south then did not display that agreeableness which we thought necessary for good relations, and the imperial government wisely considered that the Canadian provinces should be united. But what followed? When those representatives reached Ottawa, there was an administration known in Prince Edward Island as the Haythorne administration. Mr. Haythorne was one of the delegates sent to Ottawa to try and negotiate terms. One of the principal elements in dispute was this one regarding representation. I have here copies of some telegrams which passed between Lieutenant Governor Robinson and Mr. Haythorne at that time. Mr. Haythorne telegraphed to the lieutenant governor on the 26th of February, 1875 :

Probably yield six representatives.

That had reference to the negotiations with Mr. Mackenzie. That was on the 26th of February, and the 6th of March, there was the following telegram :

Highly probably get six representatives.

Further on, in a document from the lieutenant governor to Mr. Haythorne on the same day, the governor says :

We hope six representatives will be conceded.

Later on he said :

Six representatives conceded.

And finally there came this one :

Six representatives conceded.

And Prince Edward Island was in the union. Prince Edward Island would not have entered the union without this. There had been negotiations for years, and the province never would have come into the union with less than six members. And the idea in the province was that Prince Edward Island was to have six members continually—there was to be no change. Why should I say that ? This world is a world of changes; there are changes every day, changes in everything.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Tempora mutantur.

Mr. A. MARTIN. There are changes in things temporal and things spiritual—and in things military too, I suppose the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) would say. Well, there came a change. And why ? Is there a doubt about the law ? Was the Act of union indefinite ? Was there any doubt about it ? I believe there was grave doubt. I believe that there was such doubt about it that the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) accepted a retainer from Prince Edward Island to maintain before the Privy Council the right of the province to retain its six members. I think I had the honour—or, I do not know that it was a very great honour; in fact, it was a great pain, I may say—to hear the Minister of Justice, a session or two ago (it was last session, I think) telling this parliament that Prince Edward Island had no claim to retain its six members. Why should he accept this retainer from Prince Edward Island? Does not the Minister of Justice know the law ? Does not he understand the constitution ? I suppose the constitution is written so that he who runs may read. The Minister of Justice may have run, but he could not have read very well. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), a gentleman whom I respect, a gentleman who, I believe, is sincere and who is a credit to this House, made some remarks which I find it rather difficult to understand. He spoke of the constitution—he spoke of standing by the rock of the constitution. I know my hon. friend knows the constitution. I know also that he is student enough to be aware that this country has not stood by the constitution. The hon. member is ready to sacrifice New Brunswick in order to stand by the constitution, because he says that, while that province might benefit a little to-day, it would lose more some other day, and, for that reason, he would sooner stand by the constitution. It is not long since the constitution of this country was tampered with, and tampered with without any great benefit to the province of New Brunswick, and I do not know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turgeon) stood up in the House to maintain the constitution. It is not long since we had before this House the question of increasing the subsidies of the provinces—last year it was, I believe. The question came up in regard to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, the two wealthiest provinces of Canada. The constitution said that they were to receive 80 cents per head of the population of 1861, and no more. Did they stand by the constitution in that ? No. And there was no such thing as appealing to the Privy Council, no such thing as giving the Minister of Justice a retainer to assist in interpreting the constitution. Not at all; for these provinces were to receive a great advantage. And I want to ask the hon. member for Gloucester, in all seriousness and generosity—for he is a gentleman whom I respect—a question which I think he will admit is a fair one. The constitution was changed so that, instead of receiving 80 cents per head of the population of 1861, these provinces were to receive 80 cents per head of the population of last year and on the increased population from time to time, and these provinces profited by this to the extend of over $1,000,000 a year. How much did my hon friend's own province get out of it? I question very much if it got a dollar.

Mr. TURGEON Same proportion.

Mr. A. MARTIN. No proportion about it —they did not receive a dollar, and do not stand to receive many dollars for a great many years. And I will tell you the reason why. These two great provinces were equal to the occasion, as has been said, and as I myself said some time ago. They were very anxious to have these changes. There was no such thing as sending this to the Privy Council or retaining the Minister of Justice. Not at all; they simply said : We will snap the constitution, we will tear it to ribbons, we will treat it as so much waste paper. And why ? Because the province of Nova Scotia was getting the support of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the province of Quebec was getting the support of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and the province of Ontario—well I suppose they gave it to that province in expectation of favours to come, in which I think they will be disappointed. Well, my province got nothing. My hon. friend's province got nothing, and still the hon. gentleman says that he is standing by the rock of the constitution. Mr. Speaker, if you will take up the little book containing the rules of this House, containing also the British North America Act and amendments thereto, you will find a statute known as 34-5 Vic., chap. 28, 'An Act respecting the establishment of provinces in the Dominion of Canada.' Here is a clause to which I would like the Minister of Justice, if he were in his place, to give some attention:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase, or diminution, or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

I am not a lawyer, and I would like to have some of my legal friends interpret that clause. But it is so clear that I think it is sufficient to call attention to it. Here is another amendment, 38 and 39 Vic. chapter 38: An Act to remove certain doubts with respect to the powers of the parliament of Canada under section 18 of the British North America Act.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to this fact, that here they amended the constitution because there were some doubts about it. Well, were there no doubts in regard to the interpretation of the British North America Act respecting the representation of Nova Scotia? And there were not very grave doubts, graver than in any other case, in regard to my own province? Did they proceed in the same way, by amending the constitution ? Oh, no. They said : We will send that over to England, and we will send the Minister of Justice, or the gentleman who has become Minister of Justice, with it, so that we may be sure that you will lose your case. Well, here is another amendment, 49 and 50 Vic, chapter 35 :

An Act respecting the representation in the parliament of Canada of territories which for the time being form part of the Dominion of Canada, but are not included in any province.

I do not see that there is even a doubt in this case, but they are going to amend the constitution and put something in it that is not in. In the other case they are going to amend it because there are some doubts about it. When it becomes convenient to them to trample on the liberties of the people of a small province, oh, then they send it to the Privy Council in England, and they get an eminent lawyer to plead the case, and of course we know that you will lose it. But in the other instance, they amend the British North America Act. Well, I do not think it necessary for me to dwell on this question, because it must be apparent to almost every man that we are not getting the same kind of treatment as the other provinces. I was looking over the constitution to see if there was any amendment in regard to that. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, section 92 of the British North America Act, and if you will turn it up you will see that some questions are left under the control of the legislatures of the different provinces. Now, here is one to which I call attention because it bears directly on the question under discussion. Under section (10) we find among the exclusive powers of the legislatures:

Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs and other works and undertakings connecting the province with any other or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you look over the estimates you will find that the government is violating every item in that clause, violating it every day, violating it even without going to the trouble of passing an Act to amend the British North America Act. Why, there are telegraph lines in Nova Scotia galore, you will find one in every little corner of the province. There are telegraph lines all over the country which this constitution says belong exclusively to the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures. Take the next item, railways. We know that previous to 1883 no subsidies were granted to railways which did not extend beyond the limits of one province. But what do we see to-day? The smallest railway, wholly within one province, perhaps connecting two small villages together, is constructed by this parliament; and they come here and add to the Bill the words 'for the general advantage of Canada.' So they jump over the constitution and trample it under foot; but when it comes to a question of treating a small province with justice, oh, then we find that the

constitution is a very sacred thing, and we cannot tamper with the constitution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope I have said enough to convince the House that this question is not going to subside, this question will be kept to the fore as long as there is a government in Canada until a remedy is provided. I tell you that this is a burning question in every one of those provinces ; it is a burning question in my province. When this question was up not very long ago I remember the Prime Minister suggested a remedy, and I have given it a little consideration. We know that in the United States Senate the smallest state has an equal representation with the largest state. If I remember right, and if I do not, I hope the Prime Minister will correct me, he said that that idea was worthy of consideration, and that perhaps it would be well to give the smaller provinces increased representation in the Senate and thereby increase the influence which they would have in this parliament. Perhaps it may be; I do you know. I do not know that it would satisfy the people because we believe in the principle of responsible government. But, I am of the opinion that the Senate is a most useful body, a body that I would not wish to be done away with, a body that, in some respects, is far more independent than the House of Commons, raised up, as it is, above the turmoil of questions which may arise suddenly and which may cause a wavering in the public mind. I believe that the Senate is a more independent body. I am a member of the House of Commons and members of the House of Commons are very often governed by those who send them here. Sometimes the public will may not be the correct one. I think that generally it is pretty nearly correct although it may not be sometimes. It has erred and it may err again. It has erred in every part of the world. A body which will revise hasty legislation is a useful body, and if the premier would consent to equalize the representation in the Senate it would to some extent remedy the grievance, although I do not say that it would be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince Edward Island). Mr. Speaker, after the very exhaustive discussion of the subject to which we have listened, by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, I do not propose to occupy very much of the time of the House. I was here in 1903 when this question of representation was before the House and I at that time made as strenuous objection as I was capable of against the treatment which was being accorded Prince Edward Island in again reducing her representation to four members. It was objected by the government and by the right hon. first minister (Sir Wilfrd Laurier) that, as on several other occasions, we had allowed our representation to be reduced without any apparent objection from the then members of Prince Edward Island, there could be no valid reason why it should not again be reduced upon that occasion. In so far as that argument is concerned it has very little weight. In 1882, when Prince Edward Island was entitled to only five representatives in the House, according to the unit of population, we were accorded our six representatives. Why was it that at that time the interpretation as to representation by population, within the strict letter of the terms of union, was not insisted upon ? Was not that a sufficient precedent that the terms upon which Prince Edward Island came into confederation were not to be interpreted in the manner in which they have been, but were to be interpreted in the manner that I have contended for ever since I have been a member of this House ? Because representatives from Prince Edward Island and members of the legislature of Prince Edward Island saw fit not to protest against a reduction of representation is no reason why the wrong which was done should not be rectified at the present time. The legislature of Prince Edward Island had presented to it a statement in the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor dated March 19, 1903, in reference to this matter of representation in the following terms :

At the opening of the provincial legislature on March 19, 1903, the lieutenant governor referred to this matter of representation as follows :

> The claims of this province that its representation under British North America Act, in the Dominion House of Commons should not be reduced below the number of members conceded to it at the time of our entry into confederation, have been pressed upon the federal government by my premier and representatives of my administration, and I feel confident that the province will be given an opportunity to establish its rights in this respect.

And the mover of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne spoke strongly on this matter. His opening remarks were :

> We now come to the question of representation, this is to-day a most important question. In the very near future the Dominion parliament will be called upon to discuss a Redistribution Bill, and the House would be derelict in its duty if it should allow the central government to perpetrate another such error as inflicted on this province in 1891 without the strongest protests.
>
> A false interpretation was put on our terms of union by the Dominion government, the words: ' the representation to be re-adjusted from time to time under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867 ' were torn from their context and made to do duty as law. Mr Speaker, these words do not apply and never have applied to this province by right—it was an iniquity and we should deny it and defy it.
>
> What, Sir, are the principles laid down in the various Acts of confederation; is there one

essential principle or are there two distinct standards of representation, let us see. In 1864 a basis of confederation was adopted by the Quebec conference, in which the principle of representation was laid down, that principle was accepted after a time by the province of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but it was not accepted by us. We stood out for another standard and after a long fight we succeeded in securing a representation of six members for 95,000 of a population, this Sir, is quite another rule, and it is a rule of principle that has been acknowledged, accepted and applied to other provinces before and since that time, notably to Manitoba and British Columbia. One of the greatest obstacles to the scheme of confederation with this island was the insistence of the Canadian statesmen that representation by population should be part of the terms, while our people were quite as insistent of having not less than six members regardless of population.

Here was a protest from the provincial legislature at that time, and because other provincial legislatures had not seen fit to protest against the wrongs done to our province under the previous redistributions is no argument to be used by the right hon. first minister that they had acquiesced in it. In fact, we could not acquiesce in a situation of that kind without passing an Act in this House, in the provincial legislature and in the imperial parliament as we did in the case of the subsidies. In the case of the subsidies it was put up to us in the opposite way because the representatives of Prince Edward Island had accepted the resolutions regarding the subsidies, therefore it was not in the mouths of the representatives of Prince Edward Island in this House to protest. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) speaking with regard to the increase in the subsidy, said that because the representatives from Prince Edward Island at the conference had accepted the terms, we, therefore, as representatives of that province in the Dominion House of Commons, have no word to say about it. Of course it was, to my mind, a most ludicrous position in which to place the members of this House. What was the attitude of the right hon. first minister when a question of this kind was up in 1892 with regard to the province of British Columbia? At that time there was some grave doubt expressed as to the interpretation of the clause under which British Columbia came into confederation, as to whether or not she retained the representation that was given to her when she entered confederation. What do we find the right hon. first minister saying in 1892 upon that occasion when he was plain Mr. Laurier and when he was standing up for fair play to the smaller provinces of the Dominion? We find that it was then a different story altogether. Speaking with reference to the reduction of representation with regard to British Columbia he said.:

> But at the same time I am taken by surprise by the objection raised, for it has always been understood that British Columbia was entitled to six members.

Further on he says:

> I have always understood that British Columbia was entitled to six members until such time as she was entitled to a larger number, but that she should never have a smaller number than six. For my part I would be very sorry to come to any conclusion which would deprive British Columbia of that which the people supposed themselves to be their right.

Now, the case of British Columbia is on all fours with the case of Prince Edward Island, and if the right hon. gentleman wanted to treat this as a matter of fair play and justice he had only to refer back to the words he uttered in 1892 and if, to use his own words, he had given to the people of Prince Edward Island 'that which the people supposed themselves to be their right' the case would have been easily settled. The whole history of the case, the speeches made at the conference, the speeches which have been made in the House of Commons by the representatives of Prince Edward Island, the speeches which have been made in the local legislature of Prince Edward Island and all the evidence we can get as bearing upon the terms of confederation go to show that the representatives at the conference at that time were absolutely convinced that they had six members in perpetuity. We have had several expressions from the right hon. first minister and also from the Minister of Justice that would lead us to believe that in their opinion, while the representatives of Prince Edward Island expected that they were getting six members at that time, they did not have it in their minds that they were going to get them for all time to come. The Minister of Justice, speaking on this question in 1906-7, at page 2100 of 'Hansard' sad:

> The contrast between the language I have read in regard to Prince Edward Island and that which had been used in the case of British Columbia only two years before, coupled with the circumstance that at that time Prince Edward Island was not, upon the strict basis of population, entitled to six members, but barely to five, makes it to my mind irresistible that the thing about which they were stipulating, and about which alone the parties then negotiating were thinking, was the population at that time, and the representation at that time and the number of representatives in this House with which the island should enter the union.
>
> I do not for a moment mean to suggest that there was at that time present in the mind of the representatives of Prince Edward Island the expectation that the island would 20 or 30 years later find itself in the position it is in to-day.

Well, I will endeavour to show that it was in the minds of the representatives of Prince Edward Island and very distinctly

in their minds, that in time to come the increased unit of representation in Quebec would be such that Prince Edward Island would be practically without representation in this House. The strong appeal made against the island going into confederation was based on the question of its not receiving six members in perpetuity. Sir Wilfrid Laurier apparently had the same idea as the Minister of Justice for on page 2196 of 'Hansard' 1906-1907, he said:

One thing is plain and that is that when the fathers of confederation framed the British North America Act they never contemplated there should be any discrepancy in the future career of the several provinces. They were of opinion that the provinces would march forward with equal pace and that as decade after decade passed the rate of progress would be found to be about the same in all.

That was not the case in connection with the entrance of Prince Edward Island into the union, and if the right hon. gentleman would familiarize himself with the language used by the Prince Edward Island representatives at the conference he will find they never contemplated that the island would go forward decade after decade in the same ratio of population as the pivotal province of Quebec. Speaking on a resolution introduced by the leader of the government, the Hon. J. C. Pope, against confederation and the terms of the statute, Mr. Duncan said:

Nothing could be more unjust to Prince Edward Island than representation on the basis of population as laid down by that scheme according to which Canada would have 100 representatives in the House of Commons more than the aggregate of all the colonies; the number assigned to us being only five. Representation on that basis might do well enough for Canada but as respects Prince Edward Island it would be nothing other than mere mockery.

The right hon. gentleman will find that Mr. Duncan did not contemplate that in the thirty years after confederation Prince Edward Island would go forward in the same ratio as Quebec and the other larger provinces. Does any one suppose that these representatives of Prince Edward Island were contending for representation only until the next decennial census ? Were they not contending for the broad principle, that for all time to come Prince Edward Island would have a representation of six members in the House of Commons. Every thing in connection with the history of the entrance of Prince Edward Island into confederation points to the fact that her representatives were contending for the broad principle of six members in perpetuity. It is not comprehensible that the island would have stayed out of confederation from 1867 to 1873 upon this one point, if the people of the island expected that the population of their province would increase in the same ratio as that of the other provinces. They felt that in the following thirty years their representation would be decreased to five members, and eventually to four, and that is why they contended for a fixed representation of six members. It is only reasonable to suppose that these gentlemen foresaw what would happen and that they were endeavouring to safeguard the position of their province for all time to come. Mr. Pope used these words :

Among these objections I may mention the principle of representation by population. The statistics of Quebec warrant the belief that in a few years the population will be so increased by the introduction of the tide of immigration that the island would lose in the halls of confederation even the small voice it raised at its entrance to the union.

Do you think that a man of Mr. Pope's ability would view the horizon in the limited scope that the right hon. gentlemen, the Prime Minister seems to think. These men knew that the population of the island would not increase in the same ratio as the population of the other provinces and they supposed they were protecting the isisland in her representation for all time to come. Mr. Howlan said :

The fact is best shown by illustration. Prince Edward Island with a population of say 85,000 it is said to have five representatives at the start. Suppose she increases at the rate of 20 per cent each 10 years, at the end of 20 years the population would be 126,000, but at the same rate of progress the population of Lower Canada would be 1,596,000 which divided by 65 would give one representative to every 24,550 people, so that the island would not be able to claim an increased membership.

Here Mr. Howlan prophesied what actually has taken place. The unit of representation at the last decennial census was a little over 25,000 and Mr. Howlan in the speech he made before confederation pointed out exactly what has occurred. There is no doubt in the world that up to the very last moment the contention of the representatives of Prince Edward Island was that their province should have a fixed representation of six members in perpetuity. The whole history of the entrance of Prince Edward Island into the union goes to show that the construction placed upon the terms of the union by the House and by the Supreme Court and by the Privy Council, was not the construction the people of Prince Edward Island intended should be placed on these terms. I tell the right hon. gentleman that the case of Prince Edward Island should never have gone beyond the walls of this parliament, and that the right hon. gentleman was not fair to the province of Prince Edward Island when he sent the case to

the Supreme Court and the Privy Council. He was no more justified in doing that than he would in referring the question of provincial subsidies or any other alteration of the terms of the British North America Act to the courts, and declined to leave the responsibility with this parliament. This clause in the Act of union with Prince Edward Island should have been interpreted by this parliament. But the Prime Minister, because Prince Edward Island is a small province and has not the same strength in this House as the larger provinces, referred the case to the law courts, whereas if a more powerful province were interested he would have left this parliament to decide. Had a case arisen where there was any ambiguity or doubt as to the interpretation of a similar clause with regard to the larger provinces of the Dominion, the case would never have gone outside this parliament, and the right hon. gentleman and his supporters would have interpreted it, as he has declared such cases should be interpreted according to the intention of the province at the time of entrance into confederation. A few years ago the Minister of Justice speaking in this House compared the case of British Columbia as being on all fours with the case of Prince Edward Island, except that in the British Columbia Act the word 'increased' was used while in the Prince Edward Island Act the word used was 'readjusted'. I submit to the good sense of the House, the Prime Minister should have applied to Prince Edward Island the principle he enunciated when he said in referring to British Columbia in 1892: For my part I would be sorry to come to any conclusion to deprive British Columbia of that which the people supposed to be right. In the light of all the evidence, the case of Prince Edward Island should have been settled in this House when the right hon. gentleman was leader of the government in 1903, on the same principle as he declared should be the case when defending British Columbia in 1892. When negotiations for a number of years had failed to bring about the entrance of Prince Edward Island into confederation, there was a conference, and a number of messages were exchanged between the representative of the province at Ottawa and the lieutenant governor and the local government in Prince Edward Island, and I probably cannot do better than read those telegrams. On the 26th of February Mr. Haythorne, who was the representative of Prince Edward Island sent this message to the Lientenant Governor of Prince Edward Island:

Probably yield six representatives.

The matter was then under consideration. On the 6th of March this telegram was sent by Mr. Haythorne:

Highly probably get six representaties.

We have a telegram from the Lieutenant-Governor of the same date:

We hope six representatives will be conceded.

Later on the same day Mr. Haythorne wires his colleague in the government, Mr. Edward Palmer:

Six representatives conceded.

Thus you find, nine years after the question had been first mooted, and six years after confederation had taken place, the point for which Prince Edward Island had contended was yielded, and she came in on the understanding that she was getting six representatives in perpetuity. I could go on and quote further from the people who were representing Prince Edward Island at those different conferences, and perhaps clear up the mists that seem to have settled on the government side of the House as to what the real intentions of the parties were at the different conferences. A debate arising upon a resolution in the Prince Edward Island legislature as to the representation of Prince Edward Island in this House, Mr. Palmer said:

Why give up so great certainties where we have only a feeble voice?

Mr. WHALEN. Our people would not be content to give up their present benefits for the representation of five members. It may be said that confederation will go on without Prince Edward Island, and that we should eventually be forced in. Better, however, that, than that we should willingly go into confederation with that representation.

COLONEL GREY. The provision of five members is unsatisfactory. Prince Edward Island is divided longitudinally into three counties. We cannot divide three counties into five members. Besides, to divide it into ridings would cut the capitals in two.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Galt has proposed six members for Prince Edward Island. I approve that rather than Mr. Brown's motion, because it allows us to give our counties two members each.

Mr. POPE. The circumstances of Prince Edward Island are such that I hope the conference will agree to give us such a number as we can divide amongst our three constituencies. Nature as well as the original settlement of the island has made three counties, and it would give rise to much difficulty if we had to adjust five members to three counties. I cannot ask it as a matter of right but as one of expediency, as one without which it is impossible for us to carry the measure in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HAVILAND. Prince Edward Island would rather be out of confederation than consent to the motion. We would have no status, only five members out of 194 would give the island no position.

Now, why were all the men talking of giving two representatives to each of the three counties of Prince Edward Island if

they were expecting that every ten years those counties would be carved up again, and that they were not getting six members for the province in perpetuity ? The right hon. leader of the government knows this ; and if he has not abandoned the position of fair play he assumed in 1907, I can appeal to him on this occasion. He hoped that the different provinces of the maritime provinces would go on and increase their population and regain their representation. This is what he said, as will be found at page 2196 of 'Hansard' of 1906-7 :

If unfortunately my anticipation should not be correct; if unfortunately these provinces should not regain their lost ground, and if as has been said by some the representation of Prince Edward Island should come to the vanishing point. I have no doubt whatever that all the other provinces would only be too glad to come to the rescue and make the necessary provision to give that province the standing it occupied when it entered confederation. I say this to show that the remedy which is sought by my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) to-day is an extreme one, and one which ought to be reserved as a last resort, if it shall be found that nothing else can be done.

If the right hon. gentleman anticipates that when Prince Edward Island gets to the vanishing point, we shall get back the representation we had at confederation, why delay till that time the doing of justice to Prince Edward Island ? It is simply a case of delayed justice. If the right hon. gentleman believes that the government at that time will step in and do justice to the province by putting us back to the place we occupied at confederation, why does he not move the will of his government to give us that justice at the present time ? I do not see how the right hon. gentleman can escape from that position. And during all that time we would have a disunited Dominion and a dissatisfied province in regard to her representation. When this subject was up a few years ago, the right hon. gentleman suggested that the proper method of bringing it forward was by some sort of address to the Throne. I cannot see why such an address as was submitted by the hon. member for Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes) upon that occasion, if it were properly worded, should not have, as I believe it would have, the support of this House. Now, this question is one of very great importance to our province, and the Prime Minister himself regards it as such. He wanted to see the case argued out in 1906. He then said :

I understand that several members desire to speak on the question who are not present. It is one of great importance, and the government has no objection to an adjournment.

My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) also said :

The subject is one of great importance and it is desired it should be discussed and brought to a conclusion. Therefore I trust the adjournment does not mean that we shall not hear any more of it.

We did not hear any more of it that year but it was brought up last session, and I hope the First Minister is still of the opinion he entertained then. The matter is one of paramount importance to Prince Edward Island and also, though in a lesser degree, to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The case of Prince Edward Island stands on much stronger grounds than theirs, and I trust the right hon. gentleman will not see this debate pass without expressing himself on the question and giving us some idea as to what action he intends taking to do justice to our province. If I can judge from the expressions he has used on several occasions in this House, I do not very well see how he can get up and throw cold water on the case which has been made out this afternoon.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.) I hardly know whether to say I am or am not surprised at the silence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) on this question, because I am bound to say that those of us who are familiar with the political career and the methods of that hon. gentleman would require a great deal on his part to surprise us. I say this in view of the position which that minister took on this question before his transference to the federal cabinet. There is no doubt that he professed a very profound interest in it for two or three years before he became a member of this government, an interest, I may say, which he valued as worth to the people of New Brunswick, $5,000, for that is the amount he took from the provincial treasury for his services in connection with the endeavour to obtain for the province of New Brunswick its rights in respect of its representation in this House—the same amount, which he obtained from the treasury of New Brunswick for his services in connection with the eastern extension claim while he was Attorney General of that province. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) not only argued these cases before the Supreme Court of Canada and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but after the judgment of the Privy Council disallowing the contention which he set up, he brought the matter up in the provincial legislature by a resolution which I believe my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) has already read. Speaking to that resolution in the legislature of New Brunswick, the Minister of Public Works said :

I hope, as a result of this discussion, that members of parliament who are friendly to us, will stand up for our rights and try to do away with the injustice we have suffered in the past.

That is the statement made by the Minister of Public Works in the legislature of

New Brunswick with reference to the duty of the New Brunswick members of this parliament.

Mr. LANCASTER. How many years ago?

Mr. CROCKET. In the session of 1905. Yet when my hon. friend from St. John brings this matter before the House, we find the Minister of Public Works absolutely dumb. I was occupied in the Public Accounts Committee this morning and had not the pleasure of hearing my hon. friend from St. John when he introduced this subject and am consequently not able to say whether the Minister of Public Works was then in his seat. But I do know that he was in his seat fifteen or twenty minutes this afternoon while the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) was opposing the resolution of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel). He then left the House and has not since been seen in the chamber. This is the hon. gentleman who expressed, in so earnest and sincere a manner, in the legislature of New Brunswick, his hope that the members of parliament from that province would stand by its rights in the matter of our representation in this House and not let up until justice was obtained. In the course of the debate in the legislature of New Brunswick, I find these expressions used by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) :

I have faith in the sense of justice of those administering the affairs of the Dominion.

And again :

I feel that in passing this resolution we shall have done our duty, and after that the responsibility will rest with those who have the power to remedy this injustice.

The Minister of Public Works has since then become a member of the federal cabinet. He has become a colleague of those in whose faith he expressed such confidence in 1905. He is a member of that cabinet on whom, he then said, the responsibility would rest if justice were withheld from the province of New Brunswck. In view of those declarations, what can be said of the Minister of Public Works not so much as making himself heard in the course of this debate. He has been a minister of this cabinet for ten or eleven months and has sat as a member of this House for the past six or seven months without having once raised his voice on behalf of what he declared so solemnly he regarded as a matter of most vital concern to the province of New Brunswick. I must say—and I have no hesitation in expressing my surprise in this instance—that I was surprised to find my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) addressing the House this afternoon in opposition to the proposal of my hon. friend from the city of St. John. As that hon. gentleman himself said, this is a matter of the most vital concern to the people of New Brunswick and has been recognized for some years past as one of the most important political questions that has been discussed in this parliment affecting the interest of the maritime provinces. I will venture to say his views are at variance with the sentiment of the entire province upon the question.

If I remember correctly, the board of trade of the maritime provinces, and the board of trade of the province of New Brunswick have both passed unanimous resolutions upon the question in favour of amendment of the British North America Act so as to provide that the representation of the maritime provinces should not be further decreased. I was not at a loss to understand upon what ground my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) opposed this proposition. As I understand him, it was because of the great admiration he had for the constitution and its framers, and his profound confidence in the resources of Canada. As my hon. friend the senior member for Queens (Mr. A. Martin) said, the hon. member (Mr. Turgeon) took the position that he should stand by the rock of the constitution. But as my hon. friend from Queens has already pointed out, this constitution in which the hon. member for Gloucester expresses such great confidence has been amended on more than one occasion, and within the past year that constitution, on representations of this parliament was amended in its provisions respecting the subsidies to the several provinces. I did not observe my hon. friend from Gloucester at that time standing by the constitution as it was originally adopted; on the contrary he approved of the resolution which passed in this House changing the basis upon which the subsidies were appropriated to the different provinces, and changing them, as has already been shown, very much to the disadvantage of his native province of New Brunswick. At that time, I pointed out that New Brunswick came out at the small end of the horn, that it got the smallest percentage of increase of any province of the Dominion. And yet my hon. friend from Gloucester who tells us to-day that he has such a regard for the constitution as originally passed that he is willing, as a member of this House, that New Brunswick should continue to suffer what is undoubtedly an injustice with respect to our representation here, rather than change the Act, did not raise his voice against that amendment of the constitution.

Now, as to the merits of this question, it seems to me there can be no two opinions. There can be no doubt that, although, at the confederation conference population was agreed upon as the basis of representation, as the guiding principle, yet this was expressly made subject to a limitation which is set out in subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act, as follows :

On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

It has already been shown by the quotations made from the proceedings of the confederation conference that the delegates representing the maritime provinces contended that there should be a provision that the representation assigned to the maritime provinces at the time they entered the union should not be subject to diminution. The clause which I have quoted was regarded as an absolute safeguard against that possibility. I believe that my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel)—although I did not have the pleasure of hearing his speech—made quotations from the confederation documents proving that it was stated that if this clause were embodied in the Act there would be no possibility of the diminution of the representation of the maritime provinces in this House. That clause was accepted on that assurance and it is clear that had the conditions as they then existed and were in the minds of the confederation delegates not been altered by the admission of five new provinces and subsequent legislation with reference to which the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were not consulted, the clause would have operated to prevent any decrease in our representation down to this day. Now, that being the case, I ask could the delegates representing the maritime provinces reasonably have been expected to foresee these subsequent developments? I think it goes without saying that no man could fairly have been expected to foresee, in the year 1866 or 1867, the admission of the five provinces that have been since added to confederation and whose population has been counted in their entirety against the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in the scheme of representation. There is no question that the bargain that was made between the four original provinces of confederation has been altered without the consent of these provinces. If that be so, is it unreasonable that the representatives of New Brunswick and the other maritime provinces should insist in this House upon that bargain being kept and their provinces restored to their original rights? My hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) who preceded me, quoted a section from the British North America Act providing that the boundaries of none of the provinces should be extended without the consent of the other provinces. But we know that the boundaries of the province of Quebec have since been greatly extended, so that the area of that province is now nearly double its size at the date of the consummation of the union. It has been stated in this debate that 150,000 square miles of territory has been added to the province of Quebec by virtue of the legislation of this parliament, thereby materially altering the unit of representation as laid down by the terms of the original Act

Now, it was stated by my hon. friend from Gloucester as another reason for his position in this matter that the judgment of the courts had determined the case and that therefore there should be no further agitation of the question. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that is a statement which should not have come from a gentleman so intelligent and well informed as my hon. friend from Gloucester. Surely that hon. gentleman sees at once that had the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upon this reference, been otherwise than it was, there would have been no necessity for the intervention of this parliament. If the judgment had been favourable to the contention of the provinces, then we would have had within the four corners of the Act as it now stands all we are contending for. It is for the very reason the judgment of the Privy Council is to the contrary effect that we are now asking the intervention of this parliament, and the passage of a resolution memorializing the Imperial parliament to make the amendment. Now I want to point out in this connection that the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was based, not upon the Act as it was originally passed and accepted by the four original provinces of the confederation, but upon the subsequent amendments to the Act to which these provinces were not parties, and with reference to which they were not consulted. Last session I took occasion to examine the judgments of the several judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, and I find in them these extracts bearing upon that point. In the first place, I find this passage in the judgment of Mr. Justice Davies:

> After careful consideration of the whole Act and its amendments I have concluded that the expression 'four provinces' means and must be constructed as 'several provinces.'

That conclusion was based not upon consideration of the original Act, which embodied the agreement of the four original provinces, but upon subsequent amendments to which the original contracting parties were not privy. Further:

> If any reasonable doubts did exist as to the true meaning of the sections under review, this subsequent Imperial legislation would seem to remove them.

Subsequent imperial legislation to which New Brunswick and the other maritime provinces were not parties.

Upon the whole, after careful consideration, I am of the opinion that after the admission

of new provinces and territories into the union, the expression 'Canada' and 'provinces' throughout the Act of 1867 must, unless specially restricted by the context, be necessarily given on interpretation different from that which they respectively bore before these provinces and territories were admitted.

Showing that the judgment of the court in this matter reposed entirely, not upon the orignial Act to which they were parties, but upon subsequent legislation and subsequent events. Then, in the judgment of Sir Elzear Taschereau, there is this passage :

It may well be that the framers of the British North America Act have not foreseen or provided for every possible eventuality in the respective positions of the different provinces of the Dominion as to population or other matters; it may be that some provinces would have refused to join the union had they foreseen all the results that their adhesion to it is now ascertained to carry, but with such consideration we are not here concerned.

Of course Sir Elzear Taschereau sitting as a judge was interpreting in strictness of law the language of a statute that was before him. But I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House, if that which Sir Elzear Taschereau said was not a consideration for him is not fairly a consideration for this parliament—whether the confederation delegates could resonably have foreseen these conditions. If they could not, and the conditions have since been altered by legislation with which they had nothing to do, then I say it is but simple justice and equity that this parliament should intervene to restore the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, to the position which they undoubtedly occupied, to the position which was undoubtedly guaranteed to them by the Act as it was originally passed. In conclusion I feel that, although this matter has been before the House on several occasions, it is one of such great importance to the province of New Brunswick that I must renew my urgent request that the government take action and remedy the injustice, the admitted injustice, from which we have suffered.

MILITIA TRAINING CAMPS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion carries I would like to ask the Minister of Militia whether he is prepared to give a statement with respect to the camps?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The statement which I made this morning was practically correct. It having been decided to hold camps of instruction in eastern Canada and the maritime provinces, a militia order was at once issued, dated the 11th May, giving the places and dates of same, also the provisional staffs and brigades to be trained thereat. The dates fixed were approximately, the same as in previous years, which have been found to be more convenient for the officers and men of the several corps ordered to train in those camps. Changes have been ordered in the dates of certain of the camps for the following reasons :

Goderich, Ont.—From the 16th to the 15th instant, by special request of the Grand Trunk railway, owing to the necessary rolling stock not being available to handle the troops on the 27th of June, that is the date of the closing of the camp.

Niagara, Ont.—From the 9th to the 15th of June. The officer commanding Western Ontario having reported that, owing to the weather being backward, more time was needed for the installation of the water supply system; it having been decided to remedy, this year, a complaint which has existed for some time past relative to the insufficient water supply at that camp. The postponement was also necessary owing to seeding being delayed.

Barriefield, Ont.—From the 15th June to the 31st August. The officer commanding Eastern Ontario has stated that the medical officer has strongly reported against using water for this year's camp obtained from the same source as last year. To complete the necessary arrangements to obtain water from a fresh supply will occupy some little time, hence the recommendation that camp be postponed this year until after harvesting operations are completed.

Rockliffe, Ont.—From June 22nd to date not yet fixed. Last year the troops in No. 4 military district trained at the permanent camp grounds at Petawawa, but, owing to typhoid fever developing subsequently among the permanent force in camp there, it was decided to install a complete drainage system at Petawawa this year, thus rendering the camp ground there unavailable at the present time, hence the decision to hold the camp at Rockliffe. The Ottawa city authorities have undertaken to lay a three inch water pipe to the range.

The contract for the pipe was given on May 12, but the department has since been informed that the pipe required has not yet been shipped from Scotland. Therefore the mains cannot be put in in time to permit of the camp being held on the 22nd instant.

The date has not yet been fixed, but it is hoped that it may be within a few days after that date.

Laprairie, P.Q.—The officer commanding, Quebec command, has recommended that the proposed camp at Laprairie be either postponed, or another place selected, as, owing to the recent floods, the camp ground is in a swampy and unsanitary state.

Mr. DANIEL. When will the Sussex camp be held ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have no dates here, but there is no change in the date, whatever it is. The date has been published and the dates also, of the Nova Scotia camps. There has been no change. They are generally held later in the season. The Nova Scotia camp at Aldershot is always held in September.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Except in so far as the minister has mentioned, the dates will be the same as already announced ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. In addition there was a militia order passed on the 29th ult., which I presume has caused the inquiry to be made and may have caused some of the remarks to which the hon. leader of the opposition referred, I think, last evening in the House as having been made in the newspapers. At any rate, I have seen some references in the newspapers to this order, No. 8, of the 27th of May, which is as follows :

It is notified, for the information of all concerned, that, in the event of provision not being made by parliament for the several camps of instruction referred to in militia orders Nos. 66 (1) and 108 (1), 1908, prior to the dates fixed for their commencement, it will be necessary to postpone the same until the requisite funds are available.

That is the order. Of course, it would be impossible to go into camp until the funds were voted, but there are some days yet before the camps would begin. Therefore, there is ample time. This was thought to be a proper precautionary notice to give. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that in so far as the camps of western Canada are concerned, that is Manitoba, the Northwest and British Columbia, they are proceeding as the department has funds. The one-eighth vote which was granted some time ago under the Supply Bill approved by His Excellency, is in hand for these camps and they are being carried on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Although there is a vote in the estimates, I am not aware of parliament, up to the present time, having been requested to vote the necessary funds for the camps, and I can only say that if the request had been made it would have been favourably entertained.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is plenty of time yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is plenty of time yet, as the minister says. Therefore, while the notice was sent out, properly, no doubt, by way of precaution, it has given rise to certain rumours which have come to me and for that reason, I desired to have the matter cleared up, and at the same time to make it perfectly apparent that we did not obstruct the granting of supplies for the camps simply for the reason that we have not been asked to vote the money.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Of course, the militia vote is a part only of the Supply Bill and although the vote might be granted, although the full amount might be passed by this House of the money necessary for the annual camps, it would not follow that the money would be available until it had passed through the Upper House and received the assent of His Excellency the Governor General. As a matter of fact, the whole Supply Bill has been before parliament for some months. I may say that the militia votes were called earlier in the session, but the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—and I am not complaining of this—took exception to going on with the votes, because at that time either some of the reports connected with the department or the portion of the Auditor General's Report referring to the militia estimates of last year had not been laid on the table of the House. I take no exception to that. I think it was a perfectly fair objection to make.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as the Supply Bill is concerned, of course, it is quite practicable to do as has been done on many occasions—pass an emergency Supply Bill with respect to any service if the government think that course proper or advisable.

Mr. FIELDING. I am obliged to dissent from the statement of my hon. friend when he says that no obstacle has been placed in the way of the passing of the militia estimates. I wish to say that an approach was made to hon. gentlemen opposite to take a vote on account for the public service, and that we received intimation that it would not meet their concurrence. However, it is six o'clock and perhaps you, Mr. Speaker, do not wish to remain any longer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The only militia estimates that were placed before the House went through on the 26th of May, after five minutes discussion.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not specifying which estimates were passed or were not passed ; I am simply saying that an application was made to hon. gentlemen opposite to take a vote on account of the whole of the services of the country, including the militia estimates, and we were informed that we would not have their co-operation to do that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As a matter of fact, the application was made by the government to pass militia estimates received instant attention. Subsequent to that difficulties arose with respect to a certain Bill and when hon. gentlemen opposite requested that the rules of the House should be superseded there was not that concurrence which had been manifested on a previous occasion.

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever may have been the cause of the hon. gentleman's objection, it is not for me to say. I do not want to discuss it, but I wish to state that it is within my personal knowledge that application was made to hon. gentle-

men opposite to co-operate with us in making a further vote on account to permit the public services to be carried on and that hon. gentlemen could not co-operate with us. I am not finding any fault, but I am putting on record a fact which is beyond controversy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The proposition which was made to us was that the rules of the House should be suspended and that we should depart from the ordinary course.

Mr. FIELDING. The proposition was the same as was made before to vote a sum on account, including the militia estimates, to assist us in carrying on the public service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was to suspend the rules of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. All right.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Lest it should seem discourteous if nothing were said on our part, I desire to say a few words with reference to the observations of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) on the very important subject to which he invited the attention of the House to-day. I think it was worthy—if it had to be dealt with at all—of receiving fairer treatment than the hon. gentleman himself gave it, or than he permitted the House to give it. At an early stage of the session the hon. gentleman placed a notice on the paper intimating his intention to bring this matter before the House and he had abundant opportunity to do so, but for his own reasons he did not avail himself of it, and months passed, and now in the seventh month of the session he has brought up the question at a time and in a manner which certainly is not calculated to advance the cause he claimed to have at heart. He brought it up in an empty House with little more than a quorum present, with half a dozen of his own friends in the House, with the two front benches of the opposition vacant nearly all day, and with indeed a similar condition on both sides of the House. It was quite evident that the object of my hon. friend was not so much to invite the attention of the House to the matter as to join his friends in that policy of delaying the business of the House which in their judgment they have seen fit to pursue. Now, I desire to say that while the representation of the maritime provinces is an important question, there are at this moment more important questions which concern the maritime provinces as they concern all other provinces of the Dominion. In our judgment the most important business this parliament can do now is to devote its attention (after fair inquiry and criticism) to the appropriation of the sums of money needed for the carrying on of the public service, for the payment of our officials, for providing the money for Public Works, and for all these services which the Dominion has to carry out. Believing that any extended discussion would simply play the part that my hon. friend desired to play, and assist in the policy of delay in the voting of supplies, I do not think it necessary to enter into any extended discussion of the question, important though it is. I would therefore say to my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) were he in his place, that if we do not allow his observations to pass without notice—because that would seem discourteous—we are obliged to consider that important as the question is that he brought before the House it is less important than voting supplies for the public service.

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

Immigration—Salaries, agents, employees, Canada, Great Britain, and foreign countries, &c., $200,000.

Mr. MONK. Are the moneys paid on account of the immigration service in England paid through the London office and at what intervals are statements rendered here?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The salaries are paid monthly and the other accounts are paid as presented on cheques signed by the High Commissioner conjointly with the assistant commissioner of immigration. The accounts are sent here every month to be entered in the books of the department.

Mr. MONK. What proportion of this $200,000 is expended in the British Isles, what proportion in France, and what proportion in continental European countries?

Mr. OLIVER. Great Britain and Ireland, $32,484; United States, $43,320; Canada, $119,140; continental Europe, $4,700.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Wiallard and Mr. Geoffrion are I think the only two immigration agents we have in France and there is considerable complaint about the service in that country. I do not think Mr. Wiallard has made any special study of immigration. He is a Frenchman by birth was occupied in other things while in France and when in Canada I do not think he devoted any of his attention to that subject. Mr. Geoffrion is a young lawyer who I think has in no way studied the subject of immigration except perhaps since the government recently sent him to France. Does the government intend appointing other agents in France? What reports have been received from Mr. Wiallard and Mr. Geoffrion? There is very good immigration to be had from France but proper means must be taken

to get it. I have never seen any of Mr. Wiallard's reports in any of our official publications. Mr. Geoffrion is a very nice young man no doubt, and apart from letters he has written to the papers and which indicate that he is having a very pleasant time in Paris, nothing has been brought to our notice to show that he has taken up seriously the question of immigration. I would like to know if the minister has received any report from either of these gentlemen, and what is the general direction of their efforts ? Is it in Paris that they are looking for immigrants, or have they made any efforts in the provinces of France ?

Mr. OLIVER. When I visited France in 1906, I saw Mr. Wiallard and discussed the subject of immigration with him. He informed me that his plan of operation was, by means of newspaper advertising or otherwise, to get into communication with people in the country parts who would be likely to emigrate to Canada and to become desirable settlers. Then he made it his business to go to that part of the country and take counsel with these people. When he was successful in inducing them to look favourably on the project of emigrating to Canada, he saw what was to be done with regard to their embarkation. His work was personal and direct. He explained to me that under the restrictive laws of France a campaign such as we were able to carry on in England was not possible in France, and that we had to depend either on a very cautiously carried on publicity campaign or on personal effort such as he was putting forth. He is assisted by Mr. Geoffrion and by Mr. Montpetit, who is employed temporarily. Besides these, Mr. Foursin is employed in the office. We sent to France several farm delegates such as we sent to Great Britain and Belgium. We have also selected certain responsible booking agents in France to whom we pay commissions on immigrants who pass our inspection and are otherwise satisfactory to us.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend, before he occupied the responsible position which he occupies to-day, and when I think he entertained somewhat different opinions on immigration from those which he seems to hold to-day, expressed an idea which I have found confirmed by all those of long experience in immigration; that was, that the immigrant must be followed from the time he has been selected in a foreign country until he gets absolutely settled and acclimatized in Canada. In the province of Quebec, the provincial immigration agents succeed very well, because they correspond with the immigrant before he comes out here, or with societies that take an interest in sending immigrants here, and when the immigrant arrives, he is met by these men and is guided by them to the place where it is intended he shall settle. The testimony of those agents is to the effect that for two years at least they have to follow the immigrant. They go at stated periods to see where he is settled, in order to make sure that he is settled there, that he has all the assistance necessary, and that he becomes a good and valuable addition to the nation. I mention that because I have noticed for the last year or two that from most of our numerous agents we get no reports or they are not published in that part of my hon. friends yearly report which relates to immigration. We have several immigration agents in the United States, but what they do is not apparent, so far as I know, from the reports laid before this House; and we have no reports from these agents in France. I think my hon. friend would render very much more effective the work of these men if he required them to make a monthly report, as to the work they are doing, what immigrants they have sent out, what parts of the country they come from, and what is their destination. You would then be able to trace some of those people after their arrival, and a very useful purpose would be served. In regard to Mr. Geoffrion, we have read some very interesting letters of his, from a literary standpoint, as to his impression of France, but they have nothing to do with immigration. I think that young man would be much better employed if he gave us a report every month of what progress he is making in the work he has been sent there to prosecute. The same remark applies to Mr. Wiallard. I think our agents, not only in France, but in all foreign countries, should send us frequent reports, so that we would know how the tide of immigration is flowing in all those countries. I would like also to ask the minister if he has contemplated the possibility of imposing a head tax on immigrants—not such a one as is exigible in the United States, but one that would enable the country to lighten somewhat the burden of its immense immigration budget. I think that this year we shall be spending considerably over a million in the way of payments to agents and others and their expenses of advertising. My own belief is, of course, that we should abolish bonuses, and that we should content ourselves with doing a certain amount of advertising to make our country known. If last year we had imposed a head tax of $2, or half the American head tax, we would have derived from it $500,000 on the immigrants that arrived here. I do not think we would have one immigrant less and we would have had a considerable amount for the purposes of this vote. That is a subject which might well engage the attention of my hon. friend, especially now that our immigration is increasing so much.

Mr. OLIVER. To take the last criticism first, let me point out that our immigration is not increasing.

Mr. MONK. Well, it has increased every year until this.

Mr. OLIVER. It is in the process of very rapid decrease as far as numbers are concerned. That is the tally this year, so far as it has gone, as compared with last year. There is about thirty-seven per cent decrease in ocean port immigration as compared with the first four months of last year. As regards the suggestion concerning the bringing of reports by our agents, I would beg to inform my hon. friend that these gentlemen do report from week to week. It would not be practicable to publish all these reports in the blue-book, but they are available, and my hon. friend or any other hon. member can have access to them whenever he pleases. He is mistaken when he says we have no printed reports from these gentlemen, because I find in the report of the Department of the Interior for the nine months ending March 31, 1907, a report from Mr. Paul Wiallard of Paris, dated April 1, in which he gives a statement of the class of work he is doing and generally such a report as we receive from our different agents in the same service in different parts of the world. My hon. friend would do well to read the report of the Department of the Interior pages 80 and 81.

Mr. MONK. It is a very summary report and there is none from the United States.

Mr. OLIVER. When we have to deal with so many reports, we cannot give much space to each one, but he will find that the report in question is a very complete statement of the case for the space it occupies. Mr. Wiallard mentions that:

> This year we have a delegate, Mr. Vauriot, a Frenchman, settled in Manitoba for many years, and who has succeeded there. He has taken part in some of our gatherings and been able to judge of the work that we do. In company with Mr. Pierre Fourcin, my colleague, whom I sometimes send into the provinces when I am detained in Paris or called in other directions, Mr. Vauriot has himself spoken and given verbal information in regard to the Northwest at five private assemblies held in four days and at each of which there were present from forty to fifty persons, making ready to leave, and in every case enthusiastic for our country.

So that I think we are giving a reasonable measure of publicity to the work we are carrying on in France. It is to be regretted that it is not more extensive, but my hon. friend will understand that there are difficulties in the way which need not be enlarged upon, but which render it neither possible nor advisable in other circumstances and conditions such as prevail in the United States. There are several good colonies of old country French people in different parts of the Northwest, who are very satisfactory as citizens and farmers. Their numbers are being increased in a moderate degree from year to year. As regards my own views on the subject of immigration, while I do not know that they are of interest to the House and the country, my hon. friend and those beside him seem to have some trouble in their minds over them. Well, my views are exactly now what they have always been. I did object some years ago to the system of indiscriminating bonusing, and I say so still. I am not asking the House to sanction such a system but on the contrary a system of most careful and discriminating bonusing. At present instead of bonuses being used simply as a means to secure numbers of immigrants, they are used as a means to secure specially well selected settlers, such as are best suited to our conditions and circumstances. I have, therefore not a word to retract of anything I said regarding immigration in past years, because the policy I am urging at present is distinctly the one I then enunciated.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is very modest when he says that because we echo the opinions he expressed in this House several years ago in opposition to the then declared policy of the government, we are giving indication that we have trouble on our minds. The policy of the government has not changed since then.

Mr. OLIVER. As far as my poor understanding goes, it has radically changed.

Mr. MONK. I do not want to prolong the discussion, but my recollection is that my hon. friend was then thundering against the importation of Galicians and others from eastern Europe and stated very vigorously that we were grouping in the Northwest elements which would one day cause great trouble. Yet to-day we are paying bonuses in the same part of Europe.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. MONK. The order in council granting bonuses covers that part of Europe from which the Galicians come although we have not named booking agents there. My own impression is that people coming from that part of Europe book at Antwerp and other western European points and that we actually pay for them. My hon. friend to-day is, however, entirely in accord with the rest of his colleagues upon that point. I shall not deal further with the bonus matter, because I referred to that some time ago. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) points out the report from Mr. Wiallard. I had forgotten his report. But it is a very short report indeed. It seems to me that a man who is entrusted with the direction of a great immigration movement should be able to give us an annual

report containing some more detailed information than is to be found in what we can read in the report of Mr. Wiallard, printed in the report of the Department of the Interior. We ought to have a review of several pages informing us fully as to the chances we have of getting immigration from France, what the law is absolutely, to what extent our efforts may go without violation of that law, and what has been done during the previous year, with a quantity of detail. We need not fear the trifling expense of printing a few more pages of this material. We are extravagant enough in other respects, that we need not mind, on such a vital question as immigration, the expense of procuring a sufficient report and printing it. Did I understand the minister to say that we had a weekly report from all our agents ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have a weekly report from all our salaried agents.

Mr. MONK. Then we have such reports from Mr. Wiallard and Mr. Geoffrion ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have from Mr. Wiallard and I think from Mr. Geoffrion also, but, as Mr. Geoffrion is the subordinate, it is possible we may not have a report from him. Mr. Geoffrion is not the agent, Mr. Wiallard is the agent.

Mr. MONK. Would my hon. friend have any objection to laying on the table the reports received from Mr. Wiallard and Mr. Geoffrion during the last few months ?

Mr. OLIVER. No objection.

Mr. MONK. When the discussion on these estimates continues, I should like very much to see them. As regards the immigration agents in the United States, their bills foot up to a very large amount —somewhere between $50,000 and $75,000. Each agency in the United States—and we have a number—costs us between $4,000 and $7,000 a year. I think that we should have, at the end of the year, and should print in the minister's report, something more exhaustive from these officers that we may see exactly what they are doing and judge if their efforts are worth the money we are spending on the posts. My hon. friend knows very well, that most of these agents of ours in the United States are men who never specially qualified for a work which, to my mind, requires study and preparation. They are political friends of the minister, relatives of members of this House on the government side, and so on. That does not mean, nor do I pretend, that they are not qualified for the work ; but it lays upon them, and upon the government the obligation to fully justify the large amount we expend for their wages and expenses. I would suggest to my hon. friend that, for next year, he should get fuller reports from these men. and that we should incur the trifling expense to embody these reports in the annual report of the minister, in order that the people may judge of the value of the efforts being made by these salaried agents. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that the government at one time considered the question of putting on a head tax ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member (Mr. Monk) but I may say, as a matter of information, that when the Immigration Act was introduced in the session of 1906, it contained a provision which would enable the government to impose a head-tax should it see fit to do so. However, that provision was so strenuously opposed by some of my hon. friend's (Mr. Monk) friends that it was thought advisable to drop it. I may say, however, that it was not the intention of the government to impose a head-tax under the conditions then prevailing ; the object was merely to give power to impose such a tax under some such conditions as now prevail which call for direct effort on our part, to exclude, as far as possible, certain classes of immigration. The government, I say, did consider the question of imposing a head-tax, but the House, and especially some hon. gentlemen opposite, seemed to think it inadvisable to confer this power upon the government, and therefore we are not in a position to impose such a tax.

Mr. MONK. This would indicate that the government at that time desired to take the necessary power to impose the tax, and, as he states, the government contemplated that in view of conditions that existed then and now——

Mr. OLIVER. Not then, but such conditions as exist now ;—I do not say the actual conditions existing now, but such conditions.

Mr. MONK. I do not look upon the immigration question as a party question. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that it was opposed by hon. gentlemen on his own side.

Mr. OLIVER. It was not a partisan proposition. I merely mentioned the fact that it was opposed by some hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MONK. I take the hon. gentleman's assurance as to that, having no recollection of it. I assure him that if I had been in the House I would have supported the proposition very strongly, because I believe that a small head-tax would recoup us a good deal of the expense to which

the country is put on account of immigration. The hon. gentleman will find that in the United States not only do they impose a head-tax, but that they have increased year by year, and yet every year have had a larger immigration than the year before. The reports of the superintendent general of immigration of the United States are all in the same direction—that the imposition of a head-tax has not prevented the coming in of immigrants, but, in the United States, this tax enables the authorities to meet every single dollar of the immense expense occasioned by immigration inspection and management and have a handsome surplus at the end of the year. I think that if our government had that power it would be necessary for the government to consider whether it ought not to use that power, at least to some extent. The position in the province of Quebec is this—and I think it must apply to every province that has ocean ports: the serious, earnest immigrant who intends to settle on the land, as a rule, goes through our province to the west, and this is the tendency with the large crowds of immigrants who arrive during the summer months. But the worthless immigrants and the malefactors—for there are many of these who come—stay in the large cities. It is an absolute affliction in the city of Montreal, the number of immigrants who, when they land, stick in the city and become criminals there. My hon. friend will find, if he seeks information from our magistrates, and even from the judge of our higher criminal courts, that most of those who have, in the last few years, before these tribunals for serious offences, such as assault and murder, are immigrants. These cases are far less frequent in the Northwest. Those who observe the movement tell me that the farmer and the farm labourer who settle on the land, come in through the ocean ports and go thence into the interior. Under those circumstances I think the imposition of a head-tax would deter, not the immigrants who are useful, but those who come out here either because they are sent away or helped out of those countries, or those who come here to pursue a career of crime.

I would like to say a word in regard to French immigration. As I have already mentioned in this House, there are parts of France where we can get an excellent class of immigrants, men of good reputation, who would settle on the land. I mentioned at that time that from the southern ports of France there had gone out to the Argentine Republic last year over 17,000 immigrants, from Bordeaux and some other southern ports. They make excellent farmers and law abiding citizens. Under the laws of the Argentine Republic they are not admitted unless they can show by documentary evidence that they have an absolutely clean record in their own country, and every one of those 17,000 immigrants carried to the Argentine Republic a livret such as almost every citizen of France has to carry in his pocket, showing exactly what his record has been. The fact that they were admitted into the Argentine Republic shows that they were men who would make very excellent settlers upon the land. I think it would be well if my hon. friend would call the attention of Mr. Geoffrion, for instance, to the fact of these settlers leaving France last year. Although it would perhaps be a sacrifice to Mr. Geoffrion to leave Paris for a few weeks, I think he could do more useful work in those provinces of France from which this class of immigrants remove.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has again brought up the question of French immigration, and has discussed it in so friendly a spirit. The hon. gentleman referred to the relatively large number of immigrants who annually leave the southern ports of France for the Argentine Republic. It is quite true, a large number of immigrants leave, not only the ports of Bordeaux and Marseilles, but all the Mediterranean French ports, for South America. For many years France has had a commercial treaty, with that republic, and there are in Paraguay, for instance, in Uruguay and on the La Plata river, as well as in the Argentine, large French settlements. But we must bear in mind that the reason of this large tide of immigration from the southern ports of France to South America is that there has been for years a number of lines of steamers established and subsidized by the French government and by the southern republics, and where you have a subsidized line of steamers you can trace out the emigrant. Last year I read to the House, and this year again I have seen in the library, exhaustive statistics in regard to French immigraton. We are told that thousands and thousands of French immigrants leave the soil of France every year for South America and for the United States. Last year the figures were given in this House, and I think they showed that there had been 50,000 or 60,000 immigrants leaving France for South America and the United States. Well, Mr. Chairman, these are not by any means all French people that leave the southern ports of France, a great many of them are Italians, Spaniards, Swiss, Syrians and Greeks, who come from their respective countries to Marseilles and Bordeaux where they take ship to cross the ocean. My hon. friend knows that the two largest ports whence Italians emigrate are Naples and Marseilles. Mar-

seilles, in fact, is one of the largest French ports in Europe, coming second after Liverpool. As a matter of fact, however, the French do not emigrate in large numbers. The other day I was reading a book on immigration to the United States of American, and I was surprised to learn that during the last ten years the French immigration to the United States hardly amounted to two per cent of the total immigration. There are some Frenchmen who go to New York, and especially to New Orleans, and a few go to San Francisco and Chicago. According to a statement made by a noted French writer, Le Comte d'Avenel, whose book, no doubt my hon. friend has read, most of the French immigrants coming to the United States are professors, artists, waiters, and so forth. I am pleased to say that it is from France that the artists and professors chiefly come who go to the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend suggests that our agents in Paris should visit some of the most desirable districts in France, and he has mentioned a country which is inhabited by that famous race, the Basques. I am pleased to inform my hon. friend that Dr. Brisson, who has taken a great deal of interest lately in French emigration to Canada, returned a few weeks ago from that region specially inhabited by the Basques, accompanied by two or three hundred of them, and I am sure they will make good settlers on our farm lands.

My hon. friend knows also that in France it is quite difficult to publish anything which might induce immigrants to come to Canada. There has been a standing law since 1861 or 1862, issued under the French empire of Napoleon III, prohibiting any display of advertisements or any inducement to people to emigrate from the country. The reason is quite obvious. In France the birth rate has decreased instead of increased. It is an appalling fact in France to-day that with the exception of the large centres, such as Paris, Marseilles, Bordeaux and in most of the departments, with the exception of the northern departments, the birth rate has decreased very materially. The French government from the economic and national point of view cannot help our agents in carrying out the policy of sending emigrants to Canada or to any other country. That law of 1862 is an edict of the Emperor Napoleon III prohibiting any agents from carrying on any propaganda and inviting the prefects to report immediately or to arrest, if need be, any agents trying to send emigrants to foreign countries. That law has not been applied very severely but it is still on the statute-book of France. My hon. friend was speaking a moment ago of Mr. Wiallard, one of our agents in France. I have read some of the letters that Mr. Wiallard has sent to the Department of the Interior. I had many conversations with him when I was in France two years ago and since that time I have been in correspondence with him, as has my hon. friend, the Speaker of the Senate, who is a personal friend of Mr. Wiallard. Again and again Mr. Wiallard has remonstrated and stated that if the number of emigrants from France to this country was not larger—it has increased very materially the last ten years from practically nothing to 1,600 per year—one reason was that they could not publish in the papers any advertisements in order to give Canada as good a show as possible. He said that he was obliged to be constantly on his guard because he might be remonstrated with by the authorities. My hon. friend knows that Mr. Wiallard is a Frenchman by birth but that he became a Canadian thirty-five years ago. He married a Canadian, his family was born and brought up in Canada and he is interested in seeing that as many as possible should come to Canada of a desirable class. He is personally an able gentleman, a hard worker and a very good agent. In order to dispel from the minds of hon. gentlemen, especially those coming from the province of Quebec, any erroneous idea which they may have, let me state that by the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and also his predecessor we have been treated with very great fairness indeed on this question of French emigration. Through the Hon. Mr. Sifton we have been able to secure the appointment of Mr. Foursin-Escande of the Canadian Bureau of Paris. Mr. Foursin-Escande was brought to this country twenty-five years ago by the late Sir Adolphe Chapleau. He established in the far west several French settlements and I am informed by some of the clergymen whom I know and by some of my hon. friends who represent in this House western constituencies that the French and Belgian settlements in the wast are most prosperous We have obtained from the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) the appointment of Messrs. Geoffrion and Montpetit. I am free to speak of the ability and special fitness of these two gentlemen because my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) knows them personally and knows them well. Both have been his students and have been following his lectures as a professor in Laval Uuiversity. He knows that Messrs. Geoffrion and Montpetit are specially fitted for the positions which they occupy in France. Messrs. Geoffrion and Montpetit are travelling from one department to another in France giving lectures. My hon. friend knows that these lectures have certainly produced good results. Just a word to explain to the House that the department, the head of the department and his subordinates have been very fair towards French immigrants. At my request and at the request of my hon. friend the

Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), they have not only doubled but trebled the number of pamphlets and books on Canada and Canadian resources and the Northwest published by the department and issued every year. Very interesting pamphlets on the country have been issued in French and distributed broad-cast in France through the instrumentality of Messrs. Geoffrion and Montpetit, Wiallard, Foursin-Escande and Fabre.

My hon. friend is probably aware of the campaign which is being waged at present in France against all immigration. There seems to be an increase of bitterness on the part of certain Frenchmen against the emigration of their own kindred to any other country. My hon. friend must have read some very bitter articles published recently by prominent Frenchmen, among others a sensational article written by Senator Delpech and another written by Mr. LaBroue, a member of the French assembly.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. France may some day send her agents to Canada to repatriate these immigrants.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If we increase at the same rapid rate we have in past years, we may some day be able to replenish the population of old France. The Department of the Interior has willingly though cautionsly done its best to encourage desirable immigration from France and the returns show that proportionately we receive a larger number of French immigrants than do the United States. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) also said that Quebec should have the same opportunity as other provinces to retain desirable immigrants for farm work. I may say that at the close of last session we appealed to the Minister of the Interior and he has made the same arrangement for Quebec and for the eastern townships as was in effect with regard to Ontario. Each county can appoint an agent whose name is sent to the immigration authorities at Ottawa and that agent is authorized to meet the incoming steamers and to select a number of immigrants according to the need for labour in his county. Many of the counties in Quebec, (among others the county of Jacques Cartier) have availed themselves of this arrangement made by the Minister of the Interior. I agree with my hon. friend that we should encourage desirable immigration from France, and I believe that we can get excellent settlers from the country of the Basques, from Normandy, from Poitou, from Anjou, and from Brittany. But the work must be done in a manner which will not embarrass the French authorities.

Mr. MONK. The Postmaster General is mistaken when he says that the immigration from France to the American continent, to which I refer, is composed of Italians. As a rule the Italians ship from Naples and Genoa but there are some who sail from the French ports. When I spoke of the 17,000 immigrants who left from Bordeaux, from Arcachon, and from another French port I did not refer to the Italians. From these three ports 17,000 Basques went to the Argentine Republic in 1907. The Year-book for the present year states that in 1905 there were 94,098 Frenchmen in the Argentine and in 1906 there arrived there 127,000 Italians, 79,000 Russians, and 3,698 French from France.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. gentleman look at the trade returns between France and the Argentine.

Mr. MONK. I do not think France subsidizes any steamship line to the Argentine Republic but if she does then the Minister of Marine was doubly wrong when he gave $200,000 a year to subsidize a direct line between Canada and France without having asked the French government to pay a portion of that subsidy, in view of the fact that it is stated they subsidize a line to the Argentine republic. The statement of the Postmaster General in that regard was a condemnation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as a negotiator. I would not like the Postmaster General to infer that I have any special grievance against Mr. Wiallard or Mr. Geoffrion. I know these gentlemen very well and I would not like to reflect on them but still we must express our opinions in this House on such an important matter as immigration without respect to personal friendship. Mr. Geoffrion is a charming and very talented young man but I would never dream of entrusting him with the work of an immigration agent. The same may be said of Mr. Montpetit. The Postmaster General knows that Mr. Foursin-Escande is too old and infirm to engage in any active work of that kind. The Postmaster General has stated that we are not permitted to conduct an immigration propaganda in France. If that be so how is it that we have four immigration agents in that country and that we cover France with pamphlets and advertising matter just as we do countries where there is no prohibition ? The Postmaster General says we must do it with certain caution, but if the laws of France be against that work he knows Frenchmen well enough to know that it would not be tolerated for five minutes. If there is a country in the world where the eyes of the police and of the secret agents of the government are upon you, it is France, where the government watches the action of every individual in every minute detail. The information which I have from competent men is that there is no impediment whatever to an immigration propaganda being carried on in France. It is a long time since Napoleon III disappeared, and I think the law to which my hon. friend has referred has

been abrogated or has fallen into disuse. An agent of the local government has just gone to France from Montreal, at a cost of $5,000, to get servants of every description, and he has publicly advertised his mission. If there were a law in France against that kind of work, does my hon. friend think these operations would be possible ? I think not. How is it that the Minister of the Interior has never taken the trouble to ascertain definitely whether the laws of France allow that kind of work or not ? It is my belief that there is no law against it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, yes, there is one, When I was in France I got a copy of the law, and I will send it to my hon. friend.

Mr. MONK. I would like to see it, because I do not think there is such a law that is put into operation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Although the text of the law has not been sent by Mr. Wiallard, he refers to it in his last report, where he says :

In regard to the question of publicity, as we have already said elsewhere, we cannot make a very active propaganda by means of the press, as is done in England and in the countries where no prohibitive law exists; we enjoy, however, a certain liberty in this respect, of which we shall know how to take advantage, as we have done before. Newspaper articles, distribution of pamphlets having only an historic, geographic, or economic character, and consequently not giving rise to any objection on the part of the authorities, notices drawing the attention of the public to the existence of the office of the Commissioner General for Canada, always ready to give official information as to the advantages offered to certain classes of emigrants; such are the means we have employed up to now and which we count on using further and on a larger scale, to accentuate still further and to increase the favour which our country enjoys in France.

Mr. MONK. This of course does not give us any information as to the real state of the law. It is quite possible that there exists in France some prohibition against actually seducing a man out of his own country and taking him abroad. There are several countries in Europe where it is not allowed to induce a man by false representations to leave the country and go to another country. But this is a different matter, and Mr. Wiallard's opinion as to the extent to which the law goes in France is worth nothing. It is surprising that none of these agents that we have in France should have sent a report, giving us the exact state of the French law on this subject. If it is forbidden to carry on any propaganda in France, why are we spending thousands of dollars every year to maintain agents for the purpose of carrying on that propaganda? My hon. friend says we are doing it cautiously. Well, I must say that I do not like that way of doing things. It reminds me of the mysterious contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company, under which we paid thousands of dollars to agents for the purpose of carrying on a propaganda, and when we wanted to have the names of those agents, my hon. friend, the incarnation of Liberalism in the province of Quebec, voted that we should not have their names and applauded when his leader, the Prime Minister, expressed a fear that they might commit suicide if they were discovered. Does my hon. friend think there is any danger of our young and jovial friend Mr. Geoffrion committing suicide? Oh, no. I entirely approve of the system they have in the United States, and I venture to think, without being a prophet, that we shall have the same system here before long. They forbid all immigration propaganda. They do not spend a single cent to employ people in foreign countries to induce other people to come to the United States. They have never for a single moment entertained such a policy. They consider it undignified. They make their country and its progress known by judicious advertising at world exhibitions, and I venture to say that the United States as a country of settlement is much better known in France than Canada is. So that for my own part I do not at all approve of the system of having immigration agents anywhere. But if we have them in France, we ought to act openly with them. If there is a law there forbidding them, we ought to withdraw them. We pay a considerable sum for these agents, and we ought to know the work they are doing. The fact that they are residing in Paris does not satisfy me that they are employing their time continuously for the purpose of advancing the cause of immigration.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend knows that their work is not confined to Paris. The office of Mr. Fabre is in France, but these agents go into different provinces to do their work, returning on Saturday night to Paris.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows that Mr. Wiallard has his residence and his office in Paris. I do not know whether Mr. Geoffrion resides in Paris or not. I assume that he does, from those very interesting letters which he has been sending to the French papers in Montreal, which are dated from Paris, and from which it abundantly appears that his excursions into the provinces do not necessitate his being absent from Paris very long; and in Paris there is not very much immigration work to be done. What alarmed me most in my hon. friend's statement was the announcement that we were going to have immigration agents in each county in the province of Quebec. Is the system which has existed in the province of Ontario of having agents in each county going to be duplicated in the province of Quebec?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. MONK. I am not aware that those agents have been a success in Ontario, and I am afraid that the system will not work much better in Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The farmers of Ontario are very much pleased with it.

Mr. MONK. I do not think it has served the purpose for which it was established. It was established for the purpose of enabling certain political friends of the government in Ontario the opportunity of making a little money.

Mr. OLIVER. Will my hon. friend tell me the source of his information that the system of distribution agents in Ontario has been a failure?

Mr. MONK. I have seen in the papers a very severe criticism of the system, and one of those agents, I think, was arrested and is being prosecuted in Ontario. I am against all this kind of immigration expenditure. In Ontario it has been resorted to for the purpose of giving encouragement to political friends, and I have no doubt whatever that if the system is now introduced in Quebec, it is for the same object.

Mr. OLIVER. Does it encourage my hon. friend's political supporters to prosecute them?

Mr. MONK. When they are caught with their hands in the cash box, they have to be brought to justice. I think if we were to prosecute all those who waste part of that million and odd dollars spent on immigration, the minister would be kept very busy indeed. We have agents in the eastern townships, and my hon. friend has consented to add to the number by appointing agents in other parts in the province of Quebec, and he consented to do all this because of representations made to him by gentlemen on his side that he must do to the rest of the province of Quebec what he has been doing so abundantly for Ontario the past year or two. I do not think he will deny that.

Mr. OLIVER. What evidence has my hon. friend of this aggressive attitude on the part of the province of Quebec?

Mr. MONK. It is very difficult to give evidence on that point. It is, in that respect, like many other things everybody speaks of, which we hear about in the corridors of this House, which we see hinted at in the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite in the province of Quebec, but if we are asked to do, as we are asked every day in the Public Accounts Committee—if we are asked to produce the best written and absolute proof, such as is required in a court of justice, of course we cannot do it. But there is no one in the province of Quebec who has any doubt about what I have asserted.

Mr. OLIVER. My objection was to the assertion of my hon. friend that it required an aggressive attitude in order to bring to my mind a case of injustice, if one should exist.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend the Postmaster General said last year that there was no immigration from France. I am glad to see him back here so that I may remind him. He said last year that it was useless to seek immigration from France because Frenchmen do not emigrate.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend must not put words in my mouth which I did not utter. I have no hesitation in saying that of all the countries of Europe, France is probably the one which sends the fewest emigrants to foreign countries. I base my opinion on all authorities who have written of late on the subject, and my hon. friend knows perfectly well that such is the case. But I am in favour of desirable French immigration. It will come in a limited number, but if we can capture that limited number, so much the better. We are doing our best in that respect, and we have met on this side of the House from the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Department of the Interior, and we also did from his predecessor, much sympathy and the best encouragement possible.

Mr. MONK. I notice that my hon. friend is very generous in the praise he bestows on the Minister of the Interior. He even went so far as to praise the previous encumbent of the office.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am only stating the truth. And I am saying this because my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and his immediate predecessor have been greatly misrepresented in the province of Quebec as being deadly opposed to all French immigration. Why should they be? As a matter of fact they have not. We have received from both the best possible encouragement; but even with the best possible encouragement, as I said last year, we cannot expect a very large flow of immigrants from the country of our ancestors.

Mr. MONK. That eulogium of the previous minister is very significant? Are we to infer that he is coming back? My hon. friend will remember that when the previous minister (Mr. Sifton), towards whom he is so generous to-night, resigned, my hon. friend's organ in Montreal made a terrible attack on him; and among other accusations was this very one, which no doubt emanated from my hon. friend or his neighbour the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), and which went to say

that he had been bitterly opposed to all French immigration ever since he was made head of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I never realized how apt is the good English expression 'a figment of the imagination.' This is indeed a figment of my hon. friend's imagination.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows very well what appeared in his organ in Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no organ there unfortunately.

Mr. MONK. He has a very noisy and turbulent organ in Montreal, and at the time attacks appeared in it, emanating either from my hon. friend or his neighbour the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who both inspire that organ, and the gravamen of these accusations, which appeared every morning against the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) at that time, was that the government were obliged to get rid of him because he was so much opposed to French immigration. Now my hon. friend tells us that he noticed at all times how friendly that hon. gentleman was to that particular branch of the service. My hon. friend says that there are not many emigrants who leave France. That is not what Le Vicomte d'Avanel says. My hon. friend has just referred to that eminent writer.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He deplores the fact that so few Frenchmen avail themselves of the immense opportunities which are to be found in the western states.

Mr. MONK. What he deplores is that they have not taken their share in the immense prosperity of the west.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. And I would infer from his remarks that Frenchmen have not been conspicuous in the development of the west, but I would not infer that they had not emigrated in fair quantities. Another thing remarkable is that he does not point out that there is any law against French emigration. My hon. friend will remember that quite lately in an article in 'La Revue des deux Mondes,' one of the leading French periodicals, written by one of our French lecturers in Montreal, on French emigration—although there are many inaccuracies in his article—he does not refer in any way to the laws of France as being opposed to emigration from that country. My hon. friend was mistaken in saying that there were more immigrants came from France to Canada than came from France to the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In proportion.

Mr. MONK. The proportion of immigration is much larger from Italy, Russia and Germany. But my hon. friend would be astonished, if he took up the four last reports of the immigration commissioner of United States, to see by the valuable compilations of statistics there, how many Frenchmen have migrated to the United States. As a practical conclusion, I would like a statement from the Minister of the Interior that we are to have more extended reports from Mr. Wiallard and his associates in the future. The report given in my hon. friend's return covers scarcely two pages and is in such general terms that it merely conveys no information whatever of a valuable kind.

Mr. LAKE. I see that this same amount of $200,000 was appropriated for this service in 1907-8. But in the Auditor Generals' Report, I cannot find any distinction between the salaries under this head and other expenses. How much was actually spent in salaries last year ?

Mr. OLIVER. The whole vote was expended, $200,000.

Mr. LAKE. But did $200,000 cover all the salaries of the agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries ? Or was it necessary to get a further sum from some other source ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are some other things besides that are paid out of contingencies.

Mr. LAKE. Under what authority is the minister able to pay salaries out of contingencies ? I want to know exactly what was spent last year under this item of the estimates, and from what sources the money came and by what authority ?

Mr. OLIVER. I say that the sum spent under this item is $200,000.

Mr. LAKE. But I want to know the sum spent on this service : 'Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries.'

Mr. OLIVER. The information is not arranged just in that way, but I may be able to give the answer in a few minutes.

Mr. MONK. Has the minister with him the list of booking agents in France to whom we have given the privilege of earning this bonus ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Currie & Son, Hernu & Perron and Pitt & Scott. Each agency has ten subagencies in France, making thirty subagents who are working in our interest.

Mr. MONK. I can scarcely understand that. For, the evidence we had before the committee on immigration led me to believe that we had only three certified or authorized booking agents in France.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But they have subagents.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. MONK. But we find that in the British isles, every booking agent must take out a license, and every licensed booking agent in the British Isles has the authority of this government to earn the bonus. And there are hundreds of them.

I hear some hon. gentlemen crying 'carried.' Perhaps the subject of immigration does not interest them. But it interests us, and the subject ought to be examined somewhat carefully before we vote a million dollars for the service. We are entitled to get information, even if somebody is driven to commit suicide.

I say that, in England, every licensed booking agent is the authorized agent of this government. He receives circulars showing the advantages he may reap by selling tickets to Canada to get the bonus. In France, there are only three agents. If it is a country where it is worth our while to recruit, why do not we have a sufficient propaganda ? What is the use of having three booking agents in Paris, if, as the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) says, the really good immigration is to be found in the Basque provinces or in the Norman country ? Why not have your booking agents in Rouen, in the centre of Normandy ? And if the Basques are good immigrants, why have not you booking agents in the cities of that region ? Why have not Mr. Wiallard and these other gentlemen whose salaries we are paying, taken an interest in this matter ? If this system of $5 a head and $2 for babies is a good system, why not carry it out in a proper way, in every country in which we think it worth while to carry it on at all ?

Mr. OLIVER. The booking agent, both in England and in France, is licensed as my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has said : The booking agent may have a number of subagencies. For instance, my hon. friend has heard of the booking agency firm of Cook & Son, in England, Scotland, France, Belgium, Holland, and, I suppose, every other European country. These people have numerous agencies throughout the British islands, to say nothing of the continent, but it is the firm of Cook & Son that is responsible to the British government for all these agencies. In France, there is the firm of Pitt & Scott, which has subagencies in all parts of the country. But it is the firm itself which puts up the security with the French government and is responsible to the government for the conduct of those agencies. Because there is only one firm of Pitt & Scott, it does not follow that there is only one point at which that firm sells tickets to Canada. There are three firms in all with which we are doing business in France, and each of these has subagents. We do not deal with the subagencies, but with these firms, because we believe them to be reliable firms, firms who will not get us into trouble with the French government or deal improperly with the immigrants. They are responsible people, as we understand it. Whatever is being done is done in the open light of day, and will be. We believe that by dealing with responsible firms we are achieving a measure of publicity which we could not achieve in any other way at the same price. With regard to the inquiry by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), there is a contingency vote out of which we paid last year about $7,000 in salaries. I cannot give a detailed statement of the balance of the contingency vote, because it was out of this vote that we pay the detention hospital charges, which charges are recouped to us, in many cases, by the steamship companies.

Mr. LAKE. Am I correct in assuming that the $207,000 will cover all the salaries of last year?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Is a bonus still being paid on Galicians coming to this country?

Mr. OLIVER. No, we have no booking agencies operating in Austria-Hungary.

Mr. MONK. At one time the government gives one explanation and at another time a totally different one. When this question of paying bonuses was discussed, my hon. friend stated, and the superintendent General of Immigration stated at that time in an interview he gave to the 'Globe' newspaper, and we by no means paid this bonus to anybody who sold a ticket to an immigrant for Canada. There had to be a selection, and if a man was found qualified he got an authorization from this government, and that man alone could receive the bonus. Now what are the facts as revealed to us this evening? They are quite different. Every booking agent in the British Isles can earn a bonus, there is no special authorization of any kind given. The mere fact of the booking agent receiving the little package of circulars in which this bonus system is made known to him, constitutes his authorization. Therefore every booking agent in the British Isles who has a license to sell tickets is ipso facto authorized by this government. That admission was made by the Superintendent General of Immigration before our Committee on Agriculture. Now on the continent it is different. I saw by the evidence given before the Agricultural Committee, and by the documents of the committee, that we had three booking agents in Paris. It now turns out by a statement which seems to

have no foundation—I mean to say that it does not seem to result from anything that has been put before this House—that through these three agencies in Paris we extend our ramifications for bonus all over France. Is that the case? Are these men at the sub-agencies, whose names are not known to us, authorized to collect a bonus? We had a statement previously that only the man who is examined, found qualified and specially authorized by this government, would get the bonus. Now to-night we are told that there are over forty agencies throughout France.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think that any number of sub-agencies in France was mentioned.

Mr. MONK. The Postmaster General said that each of these three agencies had ten sub-agencies. Where did the hon. gentleman find that out?—because we had the testimony under oath of the head officer of the department in the Committee of Immigration that we had three agents, and their names were given.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When was that evidence taken before the committee?

Mr. MONK. A few days ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no discrepancy between the statements. There are three large firms in Paris, Pitt & Scott, Currie & Son, and Hernu & Perron. Hernu & Perron have their central office in Paris, just in front of the Canadian office, Rue de Rome. It is well known that they have sub-agents in every large city of France. I saw the names published this summer. Take the Cooks, for example. A firm like the Cooks has an agency in every city and every town of France.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that if Cooks in London are our authorized agents, all Cooks' sub-agents can earn the bonus?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I say that those three agents get the premium, and they are interested in getting as many as possible from the different suboffices all the same. They will get the premium on every immigrant they bring from any portion of France, not only from the place where they have their central office. They have agencies all over France. A firm like Hernu & Perron has agencies at Bordeaux, at Marseille, at Dunkerque and at Havre, in fact in every large port of France, and the whole staff of every sub-agency is working for the central agency in Paris.

Mr. MONK. I pretended that was the case when I discussed the motion for the abolition of the bonus, and my hon. friend the minister sternly denied it. He said that we only had agents specially authorized. The Postmaster General says that Cook & Company are the greatest booking agents in Europe; and he says that Hernu & Perron in Paris have sub-agents everywhere. Therefore the sub-agents are entitled to earn the bonus.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I hope the hon. gentleman is not playing upon words. I say that these immigrants which are being gathered by the sub-agencies of Hernu & Perron, entitle Hernu & Perron to the premium on those immigrants. Whether they are gathered by Hernu & Perron in Paris, or whether they are gathered beyond Paris by the sub-agents, it is the firm of Hernu & Perron which gets the premium.

Mr. MONK. That is what I argued at the time. Now what is the consequence of the minister's statements? Cook & Sons in London, Cook & Sons in Glasgow, and Cook & Sons in Aberdeen are authorized agents entitled to collect the bonus. Now surely their sub-agents are in the same position, and they earn the bonus also.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hernu & Perron's agents are paid by them, not by the government.

Mr. MONK. Therefore it follows that Cook & Sons agencies all over the continent of Europe, wherever the bonus is authorized to be paid, earn the bonus. Does the Minister of the Interior admit that the proposition of the Postmaster General is well founded?

Mr. OLIVER. I will try again to explain the situation. My hon. friend has said that Cook & Sons in the British islands are entitled to the bonus under certain conditions as other booking agents in the British islands are.

Mr. MONK. They are authorized to collect the bonus.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend says that they are allowed to collect the bonus.

Mr. MONK. Because all licensed agents are.

Mr. OLIVER. As a matter of fact all licensed agents are not because for cause we refuse to deal with certain booking agents.

Mr. MONK. If they rob you, of course, you do not deal with them.

Mr. OLIVER. Not only if they rob us but if they do not act properly we refuse to do business with them. But as a rule what my hon. friend says is correct, that licensed booking agents in Great Britain and Ireland are entitled to secure the bonus under certain conditions. That condition prevails in the British Isles because there is no restrictive law against immigration, but, on the continent of Europe, because of the restrictive laws, we do not make a general.

automatic arrangement with all booking agents. We only deal with those whom we consider reliable and satisfactory. We select in those countries the agents whom we will do business with. In the British Islands we select those whom we will not do business with. Cook & Sons are not those whom we have selected to do business with in France or on the continent.

Mr. MONK. It seems that it is very difficult for me to make my reasoning clear to the hon. gentleman. We have agents in Paris to the number of three ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. MONK. They have sub-agents all over France and when these sub-agents book emigrants to Canada the head office collects the bonus ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. MONK. We have Cook & Sons in London and when Cook & Sons book an immigrant to Caanda they collect the bonus ?

Mr. OLIVER. Cook & Sons in the British Islands but not Cook & Sons in France, Belgium, Holland or anywhere else on the continent.

Mr. MONK. Why not ?

Mr. OLIVER. Because we have no agreement with Cook & Sons.

Mr. MONK. You have no agreement with Hernu & Perron. Your arrangements are the same as you have with your English agents. You have no special arrangement differing from that which you have with your English agents.

Mr. OLIVER. They are appointed by us as our agents. They are selected by us to act as our agents just the same as we select certain agents in Great Britain to act in Great Britain for us.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman is simply playing on words. There is no appointment and my hon. friend knows it.

Mr. OLIVER. I will not continue the discussion with the hon. gentleman as a matter of argument but I want to state to him as a matter of fact that we do not pay Cook & Sons a bonus on each immigrant booked by them from France.

Mr. MONK. Well, there is no appointment of agents. When we were put under that impression some weeks ago it was entirely erroneous unless you call an appointment the fact of giving a booking agent three or four circulars in which it is shown that he can obtain the bonuses by booking to Canada railway navvies, farm labourers, farmers, and domestic servants. Does the mere fact of our immigration agent giving the booking agent these circulars constitute his appointment? Hernu & Perron and Currie & Sons in Paris have the same appointment as the booking agents in the British Islands in that they get these circulars in which it is shown that they can get $5 or $2 a head for immigrants of a certain class. We pay a bonus, under the terms of our order in council to immigrants from Galicia. The order in council covers German Galicia ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. MONK. And Russian Galicia ?

Mr. OLIVER. Sure.

Mr. MONK. But my hon. friend says that we do not pay any bonus because we have no booking agents there. What I want to know is this : Cook & Sons have agents all over Galicia and in all those countries ; supposing they get their immigrants booked through Cook & Sons in London what is to prevent Cook & Sons of Paris from claiming the bonus through Cook & Sons in London ?

Mr. OLIVER. Our arrangement is that the booking agent can only claim bonus on a citizen of the country in which he is a booking agent.

Mr. MONK. I say that there is no such indication in their appointment whatever. If I can be shown that there is I will retract that statement.

Mr. OLIVER. Our circular to booking agents makes that distinct statement for the very reason that my hon. friend has suggested to the House.

Mr. MONK. There is a suggestion in the circular that the bonus is paid to the booking agent himself and not to any sub-agent. I remember that suggestion but that is not what the Postmaster General has told us this evening.

Mr. OLIVER. The circular most distinctly points that out and it is in the circular for the definite purpose of preventing what my hon. friend suggested a little while ago—a booking agent say, in Antwerp, collecting commission on an immigrant from some other country than Belgium. A booking agent in Antwerp can only collect commission upon people of Belgian citizenship.

Mr. MONK. Has my hon. friend a circular with him ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I am not able to give the hon. gentleman evidence of that fact but that is the statement as I remember it in the circular. However, that is the administration for the very obvious reasons

that he has already placed before the committee.

Mr. MONK. Of course, if it is in the circular we can find it, but my recollection of the circular is that it forbade the right of a booking agent to get the bonus through any other person whatever.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. Minister of the Interior said a while ago, in answer to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that he was of the same opinion regarding paying bonuses that he held a few years ago. Well, that may be so, but if so the minister has changed his method of expressing his ideas because, as far as my recollection goes, and I think I have refreshed my memory by reading the hon. gentleman's speech, he denounced in toto the bonus system in the old country. He declared distinctly that the payment of bonuses to the steamship companies and the payment of bonuses to permanent agents in the old country was money worse than wasted, and the only feature of the immigration policy he did not condemn was the sending of farm delegates from Canada to the mother country. I understand the Minister of the Interior has continued sending delegates to the old country to whom he pays $100 per month and expenses. Probably some of these farm delegates have induced immigrants to come to Canada, but some of them not being practical farmers themselves proved of doubtful benefit to the country. Some were clergymen, some residents of towns who knew nothing about farming, but they had a nice jaunt at the expense of the government and a salary of $100 per month besides. Can the minister give me the names of the farm delegates who were sent to the old country in 1907 ?

Mr. OLIVER. About 20 were sent but I am sorry I have not the names at hand. I will give them later.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Were they selected from each province in the Dominion ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, except from the maritime provinces.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the minister any figures to show the number of immigrants which each delegate has induced to come out ?

Mr. OLIVER. It would be impossible to give the result of their work in the actual number of immigrants who came here. We get a report from the delegate showing in such detail as may be where he has been and the means taken by him to present the advantages of Canada to the British public. We expect that the presentation of the advantages of Canada by a credible representative will have an effect beyond the mere fact of his presence, and that at a later date people will come to Canada who have been influenced by him. My hon. friend will agree that it is not the man who is most easily moved to emigrate who makes the best settler ; possibly the man who is slowest to move is the better man after we secure him. True we may have made mistakes. We desire to give a reasonably fair and equal representation to the various provinces with a special preponderance to the prairie provinces. We have to get men as we can, and I am sorry to say the selections have not always been entirely the best. But taking it year by year and considering all the circumstances the system is thoroughly justified by its results. We have been able by this means to bring the agricultural advantages of Canada directly before the population of the British Isles in a way that we could not otherwise do. Our efforts are particularly directed to get people who will settle on the land and the difficulty in former years was that the advantages of Canada had been brought prominently before those who were not fitted to take advantage of our conditions. So far as we have been able to follow the work of the agricultural delegates it has been eminently satisfactory, and those who have come as a result of their mission have been in the majority of cases the very people Canada wants and is quite willing to spend money to get.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Have the labours of the delegates been confined to the British Isles ?

Mr. OLIVER. One has gone to France, one to Belgium, and one or two more will go.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Who went to Belgium ?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Morel.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What time of the year was he sent ?

Mr. OLIVER. November or early in December.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Was he a native of Belgium ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What qualifications must these men possess ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have to do the best we can, but the qualifications we ask are that the man shall be an actual farmer, that he shall be a successful farmer, and if possible a native of the country to which he goes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I suppose he must have farmed on the prairie for a time ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, he must be a man who has made a success of practical farming in this country.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the policy of paying the farmers ?

Mr. OLIVER. Last year we sent them immediately after the new year, to remain three months, and we paid them $100 a month and their expenses during their absence from home. We found, however, that the season was rather short, because these men, being engaged in practical farming, had to be at home on their places early in the spring. So that this year we tried to get them away in December. The period is three or possibly four months.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I feel a little sensitive on this point of immigration from Belgium, because I made efforts last fall to get a very successful farmer in my constituency, Mr. Hardy, of Hartney, sent there, and after trying for two months, I found that he could not be sent. I think that one of the important qualifications of these men is that they must be Grits.

Mr. GRAHAM. They are the people who talk well of the country.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They have always a pleasant smile. Who went to France ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry that I am unable to give the name of the man who went this year. The delegate who went last year was Mr. Vauriot. Both of them were from Manitoba.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). How long has the system of paying $100 a month been in vogue ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say at the moment when it was made a system. It has been the practice ever since I have been in the department, and I think some time before. At first I think there was a system of sending what were called returned men, that is to say, men who had come from the old country a few years before and who wished to make a visit home. They were given a free passage back or some slight assistance in that way. But it was found that that was not satisfactory, and it was decided that if we were to get good service we would have to send men whose time was worth something to them, that is, men in actual business, who could not afford to go simply for fun, and we had to pay them something as a salary, so that they could provide for filling their places at home while they were absent. They were placed at the disposal of our regular agents, to go and come and give their services as they were required. Although that appears to be more costly than the other way, we believe that we get more value for our money.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The reason I ask that question is that about a year ago I met one of these returned farm delegates on a political platform. The preceding speaker had twitted him with having received a considerable amount from the government as a delegate, but he rather repudiated the idea and posed as a philanthropist, saying that he had only got his expenses. However, I find in the Auditor General's Report that even this gentleman is down for $100 a month ; so that he must have had a slip of the memory. I wish to ask the minister if the government has been assisting any needy settlers in the province of Manitoba within the last year by buying provisions for them ? If so, in what portion of the province do they reside, who made the request, and what quantities of provisions were dispensed ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, it has been unfortunately necessary this year to provide some assistance in what are called the Toulon and Gimli districts in the eastern part of the province. That is the only part of the province where it has been necessary to give assistance.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What did the provisions consist of ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could give the hon. gentleman a complete return. The principal supply was flour, in addition to which there were some small articles which were absolute necessities.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What security has the government ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have taken a lien on the homestead as security for the advance.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Who was it made the request for assistance ?

Mr. OLIVER. A petition was received from the locality, and the case was investigated by our officers, and it was decided that it was a proper action to take.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The minister would not object to bring down that petition ?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, no.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The reason I ask about this is that I saw an article in a newspaper of the district in which these provisions were distributed, stating that it was felt by many that while there may have been a few deserving families requiring assistance, advantage had been taken of the distribution by some of the government agents there to get a hold on these people, and to use this distribution, like the distribution of seed grain, as a political lever. It was reported that the advances were held back until an election was on, and that they were then used for the purpose of influencing votes. In the method of distribution of this flour among the Galicians and other foreigners the object seems to purchase their votes in that

way. Let me read an article which appeared in a Selkirk paper:

Surely the elections are not very far distant. They are casting their shadows before them in the shape of three or five carloads of flour sent by the government for the foreigners at Gimli and Winnipeg beach. These people are getting too wise to be inveigled in this way, as they find out it is to be charged up against them when they receive the patents for their lands, or in other words they are expected to pay for their own election bribes, and many of them are refusing to take any of it. It looks like another election dodge such as was acted upon at the last provincial election when innumerable patents were granted to those who had complied with the requirements and the duties of a homesteader on condition that they cast their votes for the Liberal candidate. The game was to hold off granting these patents until election times and then to convince the foreigners that it was a gift if they put up the goods on election day, although they were entitled to these patents some time before.

According to that article inducements in the shape of distributions of flour were held out to those who were really not in need of it in order to get their votes. I am aware that there has been purchased from the Lake of the Woods Milling Company some $870 worth of flour, distributed amongst those foreigners, to say nothing of over $400 worth got for the same purpose from the Ogilvie Milling Company, and a good many of these foreigners repudiated the idea that they were in need at all. No one is going to condemn the distribution among needy settlers, but there were comparatively few that required this distribution. Whatever truth there may be in this article, those in charge of the distribution will be better able to tell. Who did distribute this flour?

Mr. OLIVER. Having seen probably the same article my hon. friend has read, we had a further report made, and will be able to present the whole of the facts to the House to-morrow, as well as the names of the officials who made the distribution.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. When was it made?

Mr. OLIVER. In January and February of this year.

Mr. BARR. Among the Canadian immigration agents appear the names of a large number of officials at Ottawa, such as Mr. Bryce, Mr. C. H. Beddoe, Mr. Dan McGillicuddy, and others. Are they paid as agents $100 per month and expenses besides their usual salary, and how long are they kept on the other side?

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. Bryce is the chief medical officer of the department. He has charge of the hospitals and of the examinations for medical fitness at the ocean ports. He is also medical officer for the Indian Department. Mr. Beddoe is chief accountant for the Interior Department. As such he went to Europe to investigate the accounts of the North Atlantic Trading Company and was paid his travelling expenses in that connection.

Mr. BARR. Two hundred and ten dollars are charged for his expenses in that connection. One would judge from the Auditor General's Report that all those mentioned went to Europe. Mr. W. W. Cory obtained an advance for travelling expenses. Dr. Bryce also appears in the list of Canadian agents of immigration and was paid $450 expenses. Then I think my hon. friend to the left must have been mistaken when he said they must all be Reformers, because I find in the list the Hon. Frank Oliver $2,900 for travelling expenses. We always looked upon him as an Independent. I suppose he went to the old country also.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentlemen whose names have been mentioned receive a good deal more than $100 a month, and these expenses are in addition to their salaries.

Mr. BARR. How long would they remain in the old country?

Mr. OLIVER. The farm delegates remain generally about three months. Dr. Bryce did not go to the old country. Mr. Beddoe went to Amsterdam in connection with the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract, and I think he remained there three or four days. I was absent some seven months from Canada.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Smith, formerly of Winnipeg, head of the immigration branch there, was transferred to the old country and Mr. Bruce Walker brought over in his place, but why was the transfer made, and what are their respective salaries?

Mr. OLIVER. The salaries are the same in both cases, $3,000. Mr. Smith was getting $3,000 in Winnipeg and Mr. Walker $3,000 in London, with $600 living allowance in addition. Mr. Walker desired to change his location on account of the health of his wife with whom the English climate did not agree, and Mr. Smith desired to change his on account of the health of a member of his family with whom the climate of Manitoba did not agree.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I desire to bring to the attention of the minister a matter which is mentioned almost every session, but which will stand repetition particularly upon the eve of an expected election. I refer to the part that immigration and other officials of the department are taking in politics. Notwithstanding that this parliament unanimously passed a resolution a few years ago—acquiesced in by the minister—declaring that no civil servant shall take part in elections, I received information from numerous sources that the

hon. minister's officials are taking an active part in elections at this moment. During the past few weeks, a Galician interpreter connected with the Interior Department, is making a house to house canvass in the Galician colony in my constituency. This took place last election and has taken place at intervals since, and the same is now going on. The expectation is that he would get a number of these people naturalized—and that is another thing, commissioners appointed under the Naturalization Act passed by this parliament, have been going there taking their naturalization papers and rounding the people up together to get them registered, and taking a very active partisan part in politics. When I was coming through Winnipeg, a month or so ago, I heard that two or three officials had been amongst the foreign population in the northern part of Alberta and Saskatchewan. I am sure that the minister, personally, would like to see the mandate of this parliament obeyed, therefore, I call this matter to his attention. But immigration agents and others do not of their own volition and without some instruction from their superior officers, carry on such work as this. The minister may not be cognizant of it, but some of his officers must be, and they must have taken it upon themselves to direct these immigration agents to take this active part in politics.

Mr. OLIVER. Can the hon. gentleman give me the name of the interpreter of whom he speaks ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Of course, the old stand-by is always there, Philip Harvey. But he is not the one I speak of as being in my own constituency at the present time. I have not under my hand the letter telling about this man, but my recollection is that his name is Genik or something like that. I can let the hon. minister know.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to have the name. I have already said in this House, and I say again, that I do not think the government stands to profit by political activity on the part of its employees; and, so far as I am concerned, I object entirely to that activity. I have addressed a letter to the employees of the department warning them against taking an active part in politics. I should be very glad to have information from any of our friends on the other side in regard to improper activity on the part of our officials, and I will find out whether my instructions can be carried out or not.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the penalty ? No doubt, the minister is sincere in this, and yet, though we bring the matter to the attention of the minister, these officials still go on as before. What does the minister do when he finds that his instructions have been disregarded ? I have already referred in this House to cases of which I know. I can give names to-night if necessary of public officials whose principal occupation is canvassing for elections. The minister says he would like information, but, if he is given the information, what penalty will he inflict? Will he dismiss the official ? There is no doubt of the facts—these men in Manitoba, in the Northwest and in British Columbia are continually canvassing for election.

Mr. OLIVER. The only penalty we can enforce is dismissal from the service. Of course, that would not be done without careful inquiry, and our friends opposite would not expect us to dismiss a man unless the eivdence is clear. Certainly they would not expect us to dismiss him on mere report. That is why I said I would like the name and occasion, so that I could bring the matter to an issue. And, of course, hon. gentlemen opposite may be to some extent mistaken and may believe that certain action is taken when it is not taken. I suppose they will admit that there is a possibility of even themselves being somewhat biased in their view as to the action of officials. It has been absolutely necessary that our officials in connection with immigration should visit many settlements during the past winter. As, for instance, we had to give relief to some people in the northern part of Manitoba, giving certain people seed grain——

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Did you have to give seed grain in Manitoba ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, in some of the unorganized parts of the province in the north, we distributed a little seed grain. The Manitoba government, of course, had full charge in all organized municipalities, acting through the municipal organization. But in the territory which is not municipally organized, in the northern country, there is no provision made, and we had to give a small amount of seed grain taking liens on the homesteads. Throughout the other provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, where there was a general distribution, of course it was necessary that the services of our officers should be very generally used that the occasion might be met as fully as possible. Hon. gentlemen opposite may perhaps admit that it may turn out that they have been charging to political activity that which was a necessary act in the ordinary transaction of the business of the department.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The minister did not quite understand the drift of my question. Under what authority does this government distribute seed grain in the unorganized parts of Manitoba ? The Bill applied to Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. OLIVER. Under the same authority as that under whihc we gave relief of the new settlers in the vicinity of Toulon.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Was there any appropriation ?

Mr. OLIVER. No. There is a vote for contingencies which has always been at the disposal of the Immigration Department to meet such cases, and where the amount is not large it is met under that vote. Last year, of course, we had to have a vote of $30,000 to meet the special conditions which existed southwest of Saskatoon. In ordinary years, we are able to meet any cases which may arise out of the vote for contingencies, but this year we were not able to do so. It is out of that vote that we are allowed to give the relief that we did give at Toulon, in the northern part of Manitoba, and in Saskatchewan.

Mr. LAKE. When the minister is bringing down the information he has promised in respect of the special relief, I would ask him to include all the places he has mentioned, and also to bring down information in regard to repayments of relief given in the past.

Mr. OLIVER. There will be no difficulty in bringing down the information in regard to relief given during the past winter, but it would take a considerable amount of research to make a return of repayments that have been made from time to time, because no separate account has been kept of them.

Mr. LAKE. All I wanted was a general idea as to how the money was collected, and to what extent it was being repaid.

Mr. OLIVER. There will be no difficulty about giving a general idea.

Mr. LAKE. In regard to officials of the government taking an active part in elections, I would suggest to the minister that he could at least furnish them a strong excuse for abstaining from taking part in elections by putting a clause in the Election Act inflicting a penalty upon any man who takes an active part either on one side or the other.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Genik, the interpreter that I mentioned, was engaged in the municipality of Rosthern where no seed grain was distributed, and consequently there was no excuse for his being there at that particular time. Even had he been engaged in that particular occupation, it was long past the time. The reason why I think it was this man that I refer to, is that one year ago when the provincial elections were going on he was engaged in the same work. I was in the constituency and he was pointed out to me. I know he has been actively engaged in the past, and I think it is the same one.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon. gentleman give me the name, whoever he was ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I see in the Auditor General's Report the name of L. B. Cochrane, Medicine Hat, who gets $75 a month as immigration agent. Is he engaged in any other occupation ?

Mr. OLIVER. He is also sub-land agent at Medicine Hat.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is he not a merchant ?

Mr. OLIVER. His son is a merchant.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think he is head of the firm.

Mr. OLIVER. That would not necessarily interfere with his employment as a subagent. Almost invariably the persons whom we employ as sub-land agents have some other calling or profession.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. A man who gets $75 a month should spend most of his time in the service of the government, without engaging in mercantile pursuits.

Mr. OLIVER. So far as my knowledge goes of Mr. Cochrane, whatever his other interests may be, he does spend his whole time in the capacity as immigration agent and sub-land agent.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is there more than one medical health officer in Winnipeg ?

Mr. OLIVER. Only one.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the duty of the inspectors ? I see one, Thomas Cory, of Gladstone, inspector, receiving a pretty large salary. What would be his duties?

Mr. OLIVER. He is an inspector of British immigrant children, and his salary is provided by the imperial government, under an old arrangement in regard to the immigrant children. We pay him and two or three other inspectors, and we are recouped by the British government. This gentleman resides at Gladstone, and wherever any of these children are located he has to inspect them and report on their treatment.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I see another item about a party of Scotch ploughmen. Give us a little explanation about that.

Mr. OLIVER. What does the Auditor General's Report say ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Expenses in connection with a party of Scotch ploughmen, $110. It does not say to whom the money was paid. It may have been paid to Robert Adamson, in Winnipeg.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Adamson some years ago busied himself in going over to Scotland and engaging ploughmen, and bringing them out to the prairie provinces. But

he has not been in that employment for the past three years. I presume the amount of the hon. gentleman finds there is payment of some balance due on former work.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What did these Scotch ploughmen do ?

Mr. OLIVER. They are immigrants, and they engage with farmers in the west. I understood that the men brought out by Mr. Adamson were of a particularly desirable class.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I don't say they were not. The way the item appears here, I do not know whether it means that they were brought out to teach the farmers how to plough.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Adamson went over to Scotland and went into the agricultural districts to get in touch with men who were practical farmers, and men who were ploughmen employed on farms. He brought out ten or twenty of them, and accompanied them to the west and placed them with farmers. They were ordinary Scotch immigrants.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to tell the minister that when I was on the train going from Montreal to Sherbrooke, at Christmas, I met a man whose name I forget, but I think he came from Moosejaw. He told us that he had been living in the west for twenty years, and was on his way to Scotland to see his friends. He said to us : 'I am not very rich, and a friend of mine came to me and said: 'What will it cost to go to Scotland ?' He told him what it would cost. Well, he says, I will help you.' He said that he went to a man at Moosejaw and this man got him appointed an agent to go to Scotland. He said : The government pays my fare from Moosejaw to Scotland and back again, it pays all my expenses, it gives me $2 a day for my time, from the time I leave home until I get back, and if I get some immigrants to come out with me, I will receive $2 per head. I heard him say this on the train. He was a Scotchman probably 50 or 55 years of age and he said he had been supporting the government all his life and it was time he should get some benefit.

Mr. OLIVER. I guess he was a Scotchman.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). In the Auditor General's Report, page L—29, I see the name of Martin Jerome, Winnipeg, and that he is down for $100 a month or in all $680.64. Martin Jerome comes within the category, I understand, of an active politician. He was a delegate to the Liberal convention in Provencher two months ago, and he was ballotted for in opposition to the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Cyr). He seems to be at all the Liberal conventions. He is a very active politician and still he is drawing $100 a month. Then, I see the name, on the same page, of Mr. Thomas McNutt, of Saltcoats, seven and a half months at $125 a month, $937. I have nothing against Mr. MacNutt personally. He is speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature and a most active politician. He could not occupy the position he does as a member of the legislature without being one, and still his name has been figuring in the Auditor General's Report for many years past. I think both these gentlemen come within the category of active politicians, and still they are employees of this government in contravention of the rule laid down by parliament.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Jerome is not now in the employ of the department.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Since when?

Mr. OLIVER. Some time last fall he ceased his connection with the department.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What about Thomas MacNutt?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. MacNutt is well known as an old-timer in that locality and he has been employed, not on salary, but from time to time at a per day payment.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). He is down here for $125 a month.

Mr. OLIVER. At any rate his engagement is not, as I recollect, an engagement at a yearly salary. I am not at all sure what objection there may be to the employment of Mr. MacNutt, but I have always understood that he was a man who stood very well in the community and, although a member of the local legislature, he was not considered an active or offensive politician.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I think he is an active partisan or he would not be where he is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is the superintendent of the Halifax detention hospital?

Mr. OLIVER. Malcolm Chisholm.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). At page L—25 of the Auditor General's Report there is an item for the North Atlantic Trading Company of $24,333. Is that the final payment? Does that cover all the arrears?

Mr. OLIVER. No, that is not the final payment. The final payment is $36,901.50, paid during the year 1907-8.

Mr. LAKE. Was the renewal of the bonus on European immigrants a consequence of the cancellation of the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company?

Mr. OLIVER. To some extent it may be said to have had a connection with that. The agreement with the North Atlantic Trading Company was brought to an end on November 30, 1906. From that time on there was no bonus paid on immigrants coming from Europe. It will be remembered that the North Atlantic Trading Company agreement did not provide for bonus on immigrants coming from Belgium or France, but only from certain other countries of Europe—Holland, Norway, Sweden, Germany, Austro-Hungary and Russia. After the 30th November, 1906, there was no special inducement for immigrants from any part of Europe. It was thought advisable in the early part of 1907 to adopt in a measure the regulation that prevailed in the British Islands with regard to dealing with European immigration, with the restriction that instead of dealing with all booking agents we only would deal with the booking agents selected by us in such countries as we might feel safe in selecting. That brought France, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Germany, Denmark, Finland, Austro-Hungary and Switzerland all under the same provisions as those which existed in England with two exceptions. One was that the bonus was only half what it was for a British immigrant and the other was that we only paid it to selected booking agents instead of to booking agents generally. That system ran on for nearly a year and it was found that it seemed to produce very little result. We found that we were not securing very many of the class of immigrants that we wanted to get and we thought it would be fair to increase the bonus to the same amount as that paid on British immigrants. That is the position as it stands now. Had the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract not been cancelled the present system of bonus would not have been instituted, but this has followed the cancellation of the agreement with the North Atlantic Trading Company. There are some very radical differences between the two arrangements. With the North Atlantic Trading Comany there was only nominal restriction as to the classes of immigration. Now the restriction is very definite and strict. Therefore the number upon whom the payment is made is very small. The North Atlantic Trading Company agreement covers all the countries mentioned except France and Belgium. In Russia, Germany, Austro-Hungary and Switzerland we have not yet been able to arrange for booking agents. We have booking agents in France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. In these countries we have an arrangement with select booking agents as to the payment of a bonus on the same conditions that we pay the British bonus. A booking agent can only collect bonuses in respect of citizens of the country of which he himself is a citizen and in which he is operating.

Mr. LAKE. Since the cancellation of the North Atlantic Trading Company contract no bonuses have been paid to immigrants from countries where there are no select booking agents. Has there been any considerable falling off in the immigration from these countries in consequence?

Mr. OLIVER. I am rather inclined to think there has, but I cannot say definitely at the moment.

Mr. LAKE. I suppose the government will keep careful watch to see whether the bonus system is productive of any increase in immigration. The order in council provides for the payment of the bonus upon navvies or miners who have signified their intention of following farming or railway construction in Canada. Is it sufficient that a navvy should make the mere statement that he intends to pursue farming when he gets to Canada ?

Mr. OLIVER. The navvy or miner gets no benefit himself from the bonus, and he has no object in making a mis-statement as to his intention. We accept the statement of the booking agent in the old country, and if the statement of the booking agent tallies with the statement of the immigrant to the agent at our port, the booking agent is entitled to the bonus. But, we are able by our system here to a very great extent to trace our immigrants and if we find that the immigrant does not follow farming we make a deduction of the amount of the bonus from the next payment due to that booking agent. If we find the booking agent has entered into collusion with the man in order to improperly secure the bonus we cease doing business with that agent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the object of advertising in the Christmas numbers of a great many papers.

Mr. OLIVER. We think it a very satisfactory way of bringing the advantages of Canada before the notice of desirable immigrants. These papers publish a special issue in which the advantages of a particular part of the country are written up, and we purchase a portion of that special issue for distribution through our agencies to the desirable classes. In other cases a newspaper will get out a special issue the circulation of which will be very large and we sometimes advertise in that paper.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I could not understand precisely was what advantage it was to advertise in a Canadian paper, which presumably is almost entirely circulated in Canada, and could have little or no influence in promoting immigration from foreign countries.

Mr. OLIVER. That is true, but the special number of the 'Globe' in which we had this advertisement was not a part of the regular issue of the 'Globe' or sent to its regular subscribers. It was a special issue offered for general sale, and we thought that it was a very creditable representation of Canada, and would be used to a great extent by people who, though living in Canada, have interests in the United States or in England, and who would send copies to their friends in those countries, thereby bringing before them the advantages of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not alluding more to the Toronto 'Globe' than to a great many other papers. It seemed to me to be a very indirect way of reaching people abroad. I can understand the purchasing of a large number of copies of a particular issue of some journal and sending them abroad. That is simply another form of immigration literature; but it does not seem worth while for the department to advertise in these Canadian papers unless it takes some means of assuring the sending of copies of the advertisement abroad. Coming back to special issues of newspapers, have they been pretty thoroughly distributed? Some time ago the statement was made that a large number of copies of the Halifax 'Chronicle' which had been purchased, not by this government, but by the Nova Scotia government, had been lying in London for some time and that storage was charged on them. Has anything of that kind occurred under this department?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say. I think it would be inexcusable if it did. We have plenty of means of distributing these papers. If there was such a case, I do not pretend to offer the House any excuse for it.

Mr. LAKE. I understand that some time ago the minister ordered the distribution of a million copies of the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' and that reports came from the United States to the effect that a large number of copies were lying in the post offices because there were apparently no such individuals as those to whom they were addressed. Is the minister continuing to order these very large editions of the Winnipeg 'Free Press' or other papers?

Mr. OLIVER. The edition my hon. friend speaks about was gotten out some years ago.

Mr. LAKE. I think two years in succession.

Mr. OLIVER. Since I have occupied the position I do not think we have had such an issue as my hon. friend speaks of. In the annual report there is a list of the special editions we have purchased during the preceding year. The largest is one of 36,000 copies of the 'Northwestern' a German paper published in Winnipeg.

Mr. LAKE. Where did they go?

Mr. OLIVER. They were distributed chiefly among our agencies in the United States. One of the most successful features of our immigration from the United States is the German immigration, and I think we have had good value for the money expended.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). An enormous amount of money is expended for printing and advertising, a great deal of which seems to be spent in the way of subsidies to party papers. Winnipeg seems to have fared very well in this respect. The Winnipeg 'Canada' got $591.99, the Winnipeg 'Canadian Hungarian,' $426, the Winnipeg 'Loberg,' $1,280, the Winnipeg 'Nordwestern,' $807, the Winnipeg 'Stovel' Company, $2,214; and some of these payments were not at all for special editions, but simply for copies of regular editions. The Toronto 'Globe' got $10,281, the Halifax 'Chronicle,' $1,132, the Ottawa 'Free Press,' $3,285, the Saskatoon 'Phoenix,' $300. Not only have large amounts been paid to newspapers, but any person who has had a fad for getting out any particular article can sell it to the government for immigration purposes. For instance, the Rev. Dr. Bryce, of Winnipeg, got out a book entitled 'Everyman's Geology,' and the government purchased 5,000 copies and paid him $887.50. I do not know what particular influence that book would have in inducing immigrants to come to this country. I have not seen the work, but I know that the Rev. Dr. Bryce has got out several books, and has a faculty of unloading them on the government and the public at very remunerative rates. Rand, McNally and Company, of Chicago, got from the government last year no less than $23,355. No doubt the atlas they got out could not be got out in Canada; but surely some of the printing done in Chicago could be done in Canada. These are only a few items. There is an enormous amount of money paid out for printing and advertising, and I do not know that we have a sufficient return for the outlay. The regular issues of a great many of these weekly papers are of no particular use in the way of inducing immigrants to come to Canada, and a great many of the payments to them are only subsidies.

Mr. STAPLES. In nearly every little local paper favourable to this government throughout the western country you will find advertised the homestead regulations. What does that insertion cost?

Mr. OLIVER. It varies according to the circulation and standing of the paper. Each paper has its own rate, and we pay either

the paper's ordinary rate or something approximating it. For the ordinary country paper it runs about $4 or $5 a month. That however is not paid out of immigration but out of Dominion lands. It is for the information of settlers distinct from information to intending immigrants.

Mr. STAPLES. I have learned for the first time that there is a distribution of seed grain throughout Manitoba. Where has that been distributed?

Mr. OLIVER. The distribution is only in that part of the northern section which is not organized into municipalities. The amount distributed was to the value of about $5,000.

Mr. STAPLES. In what township and range and who were those who received the grain?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not got the information but there will be no difficulty in giving it. I have already said that we would lay it on the table.

Mr. STAPLES. What was the nature of the grain distributed?

Mr. OLIVER. Principally oats.

Mr. STAPLES. Where purchased?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Mr. Castle informed me a short time ago that he purchased a large quantity of oats in Prince Edward Island and also in Scotland and was selling them at 85 cents a bushel.

Mr. STAPLES. Who got the seed grain?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I do not know, but no one got any in my district.

Mr. HERRON. Some years ago I was told that when foreign immigrants landed in the locality of a land office, the agents had instructions to hire teams and give assistance in that way to foreigners who wanted to examine the land, but that they were not allowed to do the same for immigrants from the British Isles.

Mr. OLIVER. The rule is that if a settler looking for land desires to engage one of the land guides, the settler has to pay the guide for the use of the team. We pay the guide ourselves $2 a day. and that is paid irrespective of the nationality of the applicant.

Mr. HERRON. I was told by a subagent that he had instructions to do that for foreign immigrants only.

Mr. OLIVER. The subagent had no warrant for any such statement.

Mr. STAPLES. I see in the Auditor General's Report that the government have purchased blankets at $6.50 and $7.50 a pair. That appears pretty expensive. What are those used for?

Mr. OLIVER. They have to be purchased for the immigration sheds and hospitals.

Mr. STAPLES. Were they bought by tender?

Mr. OLIVER. Whom were they bought from?

Mr. STAPLES. From Craig & Company, Winnipeg, according to the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. OLIVER. They were not bought by tender.

Expenses of deporting undesirable immigrants, $2,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How many did you deport last year?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that since the Medical Act went into force, in 1902, we have deported 1,400.

Mr. STAPLES. From what part of Canada have they been deported?

Mr. OLIVER. From all parts. Wherever a complaint has been made we have always acted upon it.

Mr. LAKE. Are they sent from the port of entry, or from any part of the country?

Mr. OLIVER. The Immigration Act provides that any person who, within two years of his arrival in Canada, becomes subject to certain disabilities, if complaint is made, can be deported on a certain course being taken.

Mr. STAPLES. Under what regulations are they deported, and from whom must the information come?

Mr. OLIVER. The Act provides that, where there is a municipality, the information shall be laid by the clerk of the municipality; elsewhere, the department may act through it own officers. Where there is a municipality we prefer to act on a recommendation or wish of the municipal authorities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the government bear the whole expense of deportation?

Mr. OLIVER. The law provides that municipalities may be required to share the expense, but, in practice, either the transportation company or the Dominion government bears the expense. I do not think we have had one case in which municipalities have borne a part of the expense.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may be mistaken, but I have some recollection of a speech made by the provincial secretary of Ontario in which it was shown that considerable expense was incurred by that pro-

vince for deportation. But probably I am mistaken.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it was probably on account of the presence of undesirables.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There was that but I thought there was the other also.

Mr. OLIVER. I think not.

Mr. LAKE. Can the minister give any idea of the proportion deported by nationalities, showing from what countries we get the desirable and from what country the undesirable immigration ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have not it worked out in that way, and I do not think the result would really give the information my hon. friend desires. It is somewhat dangerous to rest simply on the doctrine of percentage when it comes to a question of the desirability of a number of immigrants.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What disposition was made of the Doukhobors who were taken back to Saskatchewan ? I understood that the provincial government protested to the Dominion government against their return there. Are they being looked after by the provincial authorities, or has the government here any responsibility in the matter ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think I explained on a previous occasion that the position taken by the government is that these people are not immigrants and are outside the immediate control and responsibility of this government. My information is that these people are being dealt with by the provincial government, although I have no definite information on the subject.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Has the provincial government sent in any protest or request in the matter ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have had some communication with the provincial government on the subject ; but the position that we took was as I have stated. The law is perfectly clear that, up to a residence of two years in the country, immigrants are under the authority of this government, but, after that, we have no authority over them. It is not a matter of dispute or argument but a matter of fact.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). As I understand it, they are being looked after by the Mounted Police. Is not this government in control of the Mounted Police.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a dual authority there. The organization of the force is under the authority of this government, but the force is employed at the instance and under the legal authority of the provincial government. So, any duties the Mounted Police may be discharging in Saskatchewan in regard to these people are at the instance and under the authority and direction of the provincial government.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. For what reasons may people be deported ? Because they become a public charge ? Is that the only reason ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is one reason. Another is insanity, conviction of crime, or disease.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Was application made by the city of Toronto recently for a number of young men to be deported ?

Mr. OLIVER. Last month, something over a hundred men, Bulgarians and Macedonians, were deported from Toronto on complaint of the city that they had become a public charge.

Mr. STAPLES. Up to a certain period, immigrants would have to be looked after by the municipal authorities, and it costs them considerable to communicate to this government and have the undesirables deported. Does the government reimburse the municipalities what they have paid ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. HERRON. From the information we received before the Immigration Committee from the superintendent general, it would appear that there was not sufficient precaution taken at the port of entry to examine these immigrants for disease or anything else which would disqualify them for entry. I believe the information was to the effect that a medical officer would examine 400 immigrants in an hour. Now it must be an impossibility to make any proper examination of an immigrant in so short a time in order to discover whether he should be admitted under our laws. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why we have had to deport so many. We receive a good deal of information in that committee that would be of advantage to the government in dealing with immigrants, for instance, with regard to the relations between the booking agent and the immigrant. It would seem to me quite natural that when the booking agent and the immigrant meet together the agent should suggest to the immigrant how to answer certain questions, establishing a collusion between them. There also appeared to be a lack of medical supervision at the ports of entry.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It would be interesting if the minister would explain the system of inspection of immigrants who come to Halifax, for instance, in the large ships.

Mr. OLIVER. A choice has to be made between care and speed in the inspection

of immigrants at the port of entry. At the present time, in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway boats, the medical officer boards them at Rimouski, and he has the opportunity of looking over the passengers during the trip to Quebec, that is about twelve hours. In the case of the other boats that arrangement has not yet been made, but it appears to be a desirable arrangement and will be extended to all the boats, as all the boats that come to Quebec land at Rimouski. When a vessel lands at Quebec, if the examination has not already been made on the boat the medical officers make an examination of the first and second class passengers immediately. Then the third-class passengers are landed at the detention sheds and are passed under review as rapidly as possible. If the officer has reason to suspect any physical imperfection in an immigrant, instead of stopping the line of immigrants until this person has been fully examined, he is sent to the waiting room, and when the main body of passengers have been examined, then the suspected cases are taken up and examined more fully. This gives every reasonable opportunity to the medical man to make a thorough examination. Unless he is absolutely satisfied that the immigrant is all right, he can hold him back and give him a special examination without detaining the great body of passengers. If, after having made the second examination, he finds that his suspicions are confirmed, he may either send the passenger to the hospital or send him back to the country whence he came. When we consider the large number of immigrants who have come out during the past four or five years, we have very little reason to complain of inefficiency in regard to our medical inspection. Just to show that the inspection at the port is to a considerable extent effective, since the Medical Act has gone into force there have been detained in the way I have mentioned at ocean ports 16,000 people and of these over 3,000 have been actually excluded ?

Mr. CROCKET. In how many years ?

Mr. OLIVER. Six years. When you consider the large number of immigrants who have arrived during that time, and when you take the number of deportations and the number of instances where deportation has followed detention, I think it is fair to say that the medical inspection at the ports has been fairly efficient and is becoming more efficient and that there is a reduction in the number of undesirables since the Immigration Act of two years ago was passed which provided for deportation. Before that we did not have the authority to deport. Once the immigrant was landed and entered into Canada we had no authority to send him out, but since the Act providing for deportation came into force there is really very little purpose in an immigrant who is physically unfit attempting to pass the inspection, because even if he does pass the inspecting officer he can be picked up at any place throughout the country within two years and sent home. This deportation provision of the Act is a very drastic provision. It is really heart breaking to enforce it in many cases but it is the only effective way of preventing undesirable immigration. I have every confidence that the deportations which have taken place within the past year or two will have a very manifest effect in checking physically undesirable immigration.

Mr. CROCKET. How many have we deported in the past two years after passing the port of entry?

Mr. OLIVER. 1,400 have been deported.

Mr. CROCKET. After passing the port of entry?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, that includes people who had come in for two years before. That included four years immigration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the Act applied to people who had come into the country before it was passed ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Medical Act which purported to exclude these people went into force in 1902, but the Deportation Act of 1906 gave us authority to deport those who should have been excluded.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What about the bonus paid to immigrants who were deported ?

Mr. OLIVER. In all such cases we charge that amount against the booking agent and deduct it from any future payments that may be made to him. If we find he has not been acting in good faith we discontinue business with him.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Does the minister not think that if these immigrants had to produce a certificate of health prior to embarking from the country from which they came it would save a great many of these heart-rending scenes that he speaks about? If they had to undergo a strict examination prior to getting on the vessels by reliable medical men it would save a great deal of trouble and sorrow and avoid the hardships which these people have to endure in travelling thousands of miles to and from their own homes.

Mr. OLIVER. That is something that looks very good on the face of it, but it is not feasible when you come to deal with it. There is just as much difficulty in dealing with the medical examination of immigrants on taking the steamer as there is in

dealing with them on the immigrant leaving the steamer. These people do not live where the steamer sails from. They come from a distance to take that steamer, they come intending to take it immediately and delay at the point of embarkation is just as difficult, in fact it is more difficult to deal with, than delay, at the point of debarkation. Of course, it would be an advantage if that could be done, but there is just the same difficulty in doing it and by only making a medical examination at the port of debarkation the responsibility is thrown absolutely upon the steamboat company. We believe that in the end we will get better results by putting it up to the steamboat company that they shall only carry people who can pass our medical examination. The steamship company do not like to take people back at their own expense. We believe that we will have a more effective check by checking them at the port of debarkation than at the port of embarkation because if they were examined at the port of embarkation the steamship company would be relieved of responsibility.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do the steamship people make a medical examination themselves ?

Mr. OLIVER. They purport to make a medical examination themselves but it is simply for the purpose of assuring themselves that there is little or no danger of anything occurring during the passage. That is not good enough for our purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One would suppose that if there is a certain danger of their being put to the expense of taking a large proportion of the immigrants back they would make a medical examination of the same character as that to which the immigrant is subjected on his arrival here.

Mr. OLIVER. That is our object, and I believe we are in the way of attaining it.

Mr. LAKE. Could you not induce the shipping companies to a frame of mind which would lead them to require medical certificates at the port of embarkation ?

Mr. OLIVER. We are probably getting them to that frame of mind by compelling them to take the immigrants back.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the United States make a medical examination at the port of embarkation ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, at southern European ports, but not at British ports.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If immigrants have been in this country for a year and six months are the steamship companies responsible for their return ?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. We think it unfair to hold the steamship people responsible for more than a year after the arrival of the immigrant, but if an immigrant were here for over a year we have an arrangement with the steamship companies to take them back at a charity rate which we pay.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is that rate?

Mr. OLIVER. Fifteen dollars across the Atlantic.

Mr. STAPLES. Do the booking agents go through the rural districts soliciting immigrants?

Mr. OLIVER. Generally they advertise their business, and I understand that a few of them do make such a canvass.

Mr. STAPLES. If these agents go to the homes of intending immigrants the medical examination should be made at the originating point. A responsible medical officer in the district should give a certificate which would be presented to the booking agent and by him to the steamship company. This would save a great deal of trouble to the government and a great deal of distress to immigrants who may be sent back. For what disease is the majority of these immigrants deported? I understand that trachoma is very prevalent and that the disease is spreading and is incurable.

Mr. OLIVER. I have heard it said that the disease is incurable and I have also heard it is not difficult to cure. In the hospitals which have been established at the ocean ports we give treatment for it, and in a very large number of cases there is said to be complete recovery.

Mr. HERRON. Who can tell whether an immigrant is or is not a farmer so that the booking agent is entitled to the bonus? To my own knowledge men who professed to be farmers knew nothing at all about the business, but no doubt the bonus was paid on them.

Mr. OLIVER. I have already gone over that question twice to-night, but for the information of my hon. friend I will go over it again. The booking agent makes his claim, stating that the immigrant has represented himself thus and so to him. That claim is checked against the statement made by the immigrant to the inspecting officer at the point of landing. The ship's manifest shows the name of the immigrant, so that the chain of identification is complete. If it is found that the statement of the immigrant accords with the claim of the booking agent, there is a prima facie case for the payment of the bonus. However, the department has an opportunity of knowledge in regard to the subsequent movements of the immigrant, which is fairly

accurate; and if it is found on inquiry that a man in regard to whom a bonus has been paid has not followed the occupation he declared his intention of following, the amount of the bonus is deducted from the next payment to the booking agent. That is not an infallible check, but I think that the statement of homestead entry made upon the lands in the Northwest generally, in proportion to the total immigration, fairly well bears out the belief that we do not pay bonuses on more people than the booking agents are really entitled to receive payment upon.

Some resolutions reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 179) to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin.—Mr. McCraney.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are you to take Supply to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We shall continue with the estimates of the Minister of the Interior, and later, if opportunity offers, we will take up those of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 5, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 182) for the relief of Hattie Spratte.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I would like now to present the motion of which I gave notice a day or so ago regarding the fourth report of the committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the debates of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Would my hon. friend permit me—I have received a communication from Mr. Gervais, chairman of the committee, in which he asks that this report be not taken up in his absence. I would ask my hon. friend to let the matter stand until Tuesday next when Mr. Gervais will be present.

Mr. MONK. As that report was adopted on the 20th of May it might be acted upon and that may be invoked as a reason against my motion. If I have the assurance of my right hon. friend that the delay will not be invoked against the motion which I am about to make I have no objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am informed that action has been assumed upon that report.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. JOHNSTON moved that the third report of the committee on Public Accounts be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER. In all these cases there must be appended to the motion a clause asking that the rule be suspended. We had a discussion on that matter a little while ago and this course was recommended.

Motion amended and agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Last report of the International Waterways Commission—Soulanges Canal.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. MONK. Will the Minister of Railways and Canals be good enough to lay upon the table of the House the report made by Mr. Boyer upon matters concerning the Soulanges Canal. It is absolutely necessary we should have that report before the estimates for that department are gone into.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). That report has been received but I have not had an opportunity to act on it as yet. It would hardly be wise to place the report on the table before I have had a chance to digest it and take action on it. I expect in a very few days to be able to lay it on the table.

Mr. MONK. It is necessary that we should wait for that report until the department takes action upon it. The matter is a serious one, and have we not the right before going into the estimates to see what the commissioner has reported as to the state of affairs existing upon the canal ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Before we get through with the estimates there will be no trouble about it. I think my hon. friend will agree that it would be unwise to discuss these reports in public before the department decides what action it will take.

ORDER IN COUNCIL *re* IMMIGRATION.

Mr. LENNOX. When will the order in council regulating immigration into western

Canada passed in pursuance of the statute of this session, be laid on the table of the House ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I think I will be able to lay it on the table of the House as soon as the estimates are taken up.

Mr. LENNOX. This is a matter of urgency and importance and there has been already a great deal of delay. I ask that it be laid on the table of the House at once.

Mr. OLIVER. As soon as I have an opportunity to see the commissioner of immigration I will do so.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. DANIEL.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John). As a question of privilege I desire to refer to some of the remarks made by the Minister of Finance last night when I was not present in the House. Referring to me and to the subject I brought to the attention of the House yesterday he said :

> At an early stage of the session the hon. gentleman placed a notice on the paper intimating his intention to bring this matter before the House and he had abundant opportunity to do so but for his own reasons he did not avail himself of it, and months passed, and now in the seventh month of the session he has brought up the question at a time and in a manner which certainly is not calculated to advance the cause he claimed to have at heart. . . . It was quite evident that the object of my hon. friend was not so much to invite the attention of the House to the matter as to join his friends in that policy of delaying the business of the House which in their judgment they have seen fit to pursue.

With regard to the latter statement I have to state that it is untrue in fact.

Mr. FIELDING. Order.

Mr. DANIEL. Well, if there is any other parliamentary term that the hon. minister prefers that expresses the same idea, I will use that. The statement attributes a motive to me which did not exist. There is no basis for any such insinuation. I placed this proposed resolution on the Order Paper as early as the 13th of February. There were a very large number of resolutions on the Order Paper, and mine was not reached before the time came when the private members' day was taken away altogether. After that, on two occasions, at the most, I made arrangements to bring the matter up, but at the request of gentlemen who wished to speak upon it, I delayed it, and this was the first time——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hardly think the hon. member is out of order in explaining why he brought up this question yesterday, and not earlier.

Mr. DANIEL. I am not debating the question. I am simply giving the reasons why it was not brought up before. After the private members' day was taken, the only method left to me to bring this matter up at all was on the motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply, and I took the first clear opportunity that occurred to me to do so, and brought it up yesterday.

Mr. FIELDING. As the hon. gentleman has been allowed to give the reasons why he did certain things, I am at liberty to give the reasons why I made the observation I did. The hon. gentleman had ample time, long before the private members' day was taken by the government, to bring forward this matter, if he desired to treat it as a great and important matter. I do not undertake to discuss the wisdom or unwisdom of the course he has pursued. As to whether or not he delayed the business of the House, I have nothing further to say than that the record of yesterday's proceedings will speak for itself.

Mr. DANIEL. It was only in the first week or two after the resoultion was put on the Order Paper, at the most that I had the opportunity to bring it up on private members' day.

Mr. FIELDING. Private members' day stood for several months during the session.

Mr. DANIEL. There were previous motions on the paper and they took up the time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—HON. MR. PUGSLEY.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. I was out of the House last evening, when, as I observe by the report in 'Hansard,' the hon. member for the county of York (Mr. Crocket) referred to the fact that I had, previous to coming to this parliament, taken an interest in this question of representation and that I had argued the question on behalf of the province before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as well as before the Supreme Court, and he criticised quite severely my absence from the House and my not taking part in the discussion. Mr. Speaker, all that I desire to say is that I felt, and felt most strongly, that the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) had brought this question before the House at a most in-

appropriate time—at a time when, if hon. gentlemen on this side of the House engaged in any lengthy discussion, they would only be aiding my hon. friend in what I thought was an obstruction to the important business which this House was called upon to deal with. In my department there are public works of great importance, the carrying on of which is delayed by reason of our not getting the Supplies. There are thousands of labouring men throughout this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just allow me one word. Mr. Speaker,—and therefore I thought that I ought not to be a party to wasting one minute of the time of this House under such circumstances.

Mr. TAYLOR. What are you doing now?

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to a return which I asked for on January 29, with regard to the public expenditures in Prince county, P. E. I. It would not take very much trouble to make up that return, but it is not down yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am quite satisfied that that return was brought down some weeks ago.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I went to the return room yesterday morning, and was told that the return had not yet come down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find by the Votes and Proceedings, on page 1015, that that return was brought down on the 26th of May.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals when we may expect the return that was promised early in the session in regard to the investigation of the tunnel matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend will remember that it was not a report of an investigation, but a return of certain information that the chief engineer had been compiling on the subject. I might say that so far nothing very definite concerning the tunnel has been found. I will make inquiry about it.

ILLEGAL DISTRIBUTION OF WHISKY.

Mr. MONK. I would like to call the attention of the government to a very urgent and important matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is only for the purpose of asking a question ?

Mr. MONK. Only for the purpose of asking a question. Information has reached me from a reliable source to the effect that there is $8,000 worth of whisky in bond in charge of the customs at Thetford Mines belonging to F. X. Labranche of Megantic, and the whisky is being distributed in the counties of Beauce and Megantic without duty being paid. My information is to the effect that the whisky is out of the possession of Mr. Labranche and that he is not a consenting party to this operation. I would like to ask the government if they have any knowledge of these acts, and if they will take immediate steps to check this violation of the law if it exists.

Mr. FIELDING. Is my hon. friend in a position to give the source of his information ? Such charges are almost invariably denied, and if we had the source of the information, it would facilitate inquiry.

Mr. MONK. My information comes from a very reliable source, and I will have no objection, when my hon. friend is through, to communicate it to him.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will send me the name privately, I will make inquiry of the Customs Department at once. I think that there must be a mistake; or that the information is incorrect, because I cannot imagine that the customs authorities would permit such a thing as my hon. friend has mentioned.

SUPPLY—CHARGE OF OBSTRUCTION.

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

Mr. C. L. OWEN (East Northumberland). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I wish to bring to the notice of the government a report in that great Reform newspaper, the Toronto 'Globe.' That paper does sometimes sin a little in reporting the sayings of hon. members on this side of the House, but I admit that it is always very accurate when reporting the sayings of hon. members on the government side. Therefore I take this report as being correct. It is a report of a political meeting held on Wednesday evening in the city of Brantford, where the hon. Minister of Customs, Mr. Paterson, is reported to have said :

> In his department there were 1,800 men who could not get their pay because the Tory obstructionists would not vote supplies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OWEN. The Hon. William Paterson knew, when he stated upon the hustings in the city of Brantford, that his supplies had been voted by this House before he left Ottawa on Monday evening for Brantford. Therefore it was very unjust and unfair for him to endeavour to mislead the people in his own city by making them believe that

we would not vote him supply required to pay the men in his department.

Mr. EMMERSON. Where is the Supply Bill ?

Mr. OWEN. I am coming to that in a few moments. I notice also that the employees in the postal service have been finding fault because their salaries have not been paid. If I take the Toronto 'World' —and that good paper is generally correct —I see that the whole amount of the post office supply was voted the 22nd May last —the full amount of over $5,000,000. I am given to understand that the trouble is that the government have not brought down their Supply Bill, and until that Bill is brought down this money cannot be paid out in salaries. It is very unfair and unjust for a minister of the Crown to go around the country trying to make the people believe that the opposition are obstructing.

An hon. MEMBER. What are you doing now ?

Mr. OWEN. Why, it was only about a week ago that the Minister of Customs brought down his estimates. We held him up a week and were justified in so doing, because he was asking for $100,000 more this year than last and could not give any satisfactory explanation what he was going to do with it. He said that a lot of men had worked overtime but he could not tell who they were or what they were doing. All he could say was that they had sent in affidavits. What kind of an explanation was that to give ? Then he wanted $50,000 more but could not say what that was for. He said it would be nice to have that amount on hand. But we do not approve of that way of voting money and the people will uphold us. Before voting money we want to know how it is going to be spent. I submit that the fault lies with the government in not having brought down its Supply Bill. How can we concur in a Supply Bill before it is submitted to us ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I regret that my hon. friend did not deem it expedient to wait until my hon. colleague the Minister of Customs returned and was in his place.

Mr. OWEN. I was hoping he would be in his place this morning.

Mr. FIELDING. No doubt my hon. friend hoped that the minister would withdraw his valuable voice from the political campaign. But if, in the exercise of his judgment as a citizen, my hon. colleague sees fit to absent himself, as other hon. members are doing, in the exercise of his rights as a citizen, that is no reason for attacking him in his absence. It is no reason why, if the hon. gentleman has anything to say against the minister, he should not wait until my hon. colleague is in his place. I can assure him that he will have difficulty in persuading the country that the Minister of Customs would make a statement before any public audience which was not made in good faith and could not be substantiated. He is too well known for any one who knows him to assume that he would do anything of the kind. I repeat that not a dollar of supply has been voted for the Customs or Post Office Departments.

Mr. OWEN. Have not all the supplies that have been asked for been voted ?

Mr FIELDING. They have not been voted at all.

Mr. OWEN. Have they not passed this House ?

Mr. FIELDING. They have not. I again say that they have not been voted. Not one dollar of supply has passed this House.

Mr. OWEN. Did they not pass this House in Committee of the Whole ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. OWEN. Then the fault lies with the government in not having brought down a Supply Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend contend that every time we pass an item in the Committee of Supply we must immediately bring down a Supply Bill ? Last night we passed a couple of hundred thousand dollars for the Department of the Interior, and according to my hon. friend's view we should immediately bring down a Supply Bill converging these items.

Mr. OWEN. Are you sure you have not used that money for any other purpose ?

Mr. FIELDING. We have not. There is no power under Heaven could get a dollar of that money until the votes pass through their several stages in this parliament—not only of this House but the Senate as well. When my hon. friend says that we did not bring down a Supply Bill, he is mistaken. We did some time ago, and after the usual procedure it became law ; but surely he will not seriously say that every time we pass an item we must bring down a new Supply Bill ? Such a contention is preposterous. The Supply Bill is usually brought down after we have passed all the estimates. The estimates are then consolidated into a Supply Bill which is duly presented. But the hon. gentleman assumes that the moment the Post Office items were passed we should bring down a Supply Bill, then later on bring down another Supply Bill when the Customs estimates are voted, and so on with each department. My hon. friend must see that the argument he advances is entirely unwarranted.

Mr. OWEN. I notice that we passed last month over $11,000,000 of Supply through Committee of the Whole. Was it not worth while to bring down a Supply Bill covering these items and thus enable the employees to obtain their wages ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not disposed to discriminate. I am not disposed to make fish of one and flesh of another. The public officials and others who have claims against the government in the different departments and provinces have all equal rights and I do not propose to discriminate among them. I do not propose that the employees in one branch shall be paid for their services and the others not.

Mr. OWEN. I have not forgotten that the Minister of Finance did say a few months ago that we have no rights in this House.

Mr. FIELDING. That phrase for a time seemed to do my hon. friends opposite some good. I will be glad to repeat the same statement and give my hon. friends the benefit of it once more. Every member of this House and every group of members has just as much right as the majority accord to them, and no more. That is true to-day as it was true then. But the trouble is my hon. friends opposite have abused their rights. The trouble is that we have got into the habit of permitting an easy going method of procedure whereby hon. gentlemen opposite are permitted to delay the business of the House to an extent that would not be allowed in any civilized country outside of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. It was just such difficulty that compelled the mother of parliaments to adopt a procedure which allows the majority to rule. But it is difficult to bring some people to understand why the majority of this parliament should not rule. Let it be understood that if men on both sides would realize their responsibility, if they would realize their obligations to the State as well as their party interests, they would admit that this parliament has allowed a latitude and freedom of discussion which enables any half dozen men in this House to hold up any one measure the whole session. It was never supposed that any member would abuse that privilege the way hon. gentlemen opposite are doing.

Mr. OWEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he remembers the hold-up in 1896 ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but in the so called hold up in 1896 there never was an hour when the necessities of the public service were not provided for. In all the discussions in 1896. supplies were available, the public servants were being paid, the public works were going on, contracttors were getting their money and they were paying their workmen, and these, in turn, were paying the grocer, the butcher and the baker—all the wheels of government were turning and there was no obstruction. That is not the condition to-day. Supplies that were held up in 1896 were the supplies of a future period, and there was always abundant money for the immediate purpose of the government. That is not the situation to-day. To-day, by the exercise of a privilege that this House mistakenly has given to the minority, a privilege which is not granted in the mother country, a privilege which is not granted in the corresponding body at Washington, a privilege more liberally interpreted in this House than in any other legislative body in the world, hon. gentlemen opposite have been able to hold up the supplies and prevent the people of this country from getting the money which is their due.

Mr. D. A. GORDON (East Kent). Mr. Speaker, the innocence of hon. gentlemen opposite is certainly most notable. I think the time appropriate to discuss at some length the question of obstruction so that we may see where these hon. gentlemen stand. Before I finish, I will take opportunity to refer to the rules that have been adopted in the British parliament, and I think it will be seen that hon. gentlemen opposite stand in exactly the position in which the Minister of Finance has put them to-day so far as their relation to the voting of supplies is concerned. I fully realize my inability to discuss this question from either a legal or technical standpoint, but must content myself with viewing it from the standpoint of the plain, ordinary business man dealing in simple parlance with the organized tactics that are daily pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite for the purpose of obstruction. It is a time-honoured custom, on going into Supply, for an hon. member to discuss any question affecting his constituency or the country at large, to air a grievance or complaint. This rule is a most salutary one and, particularly in the earlier part of the session, the greatest latitude of debate in this respect should be allowed and should be taken advantage of by members on both sides of the House. This is consistent with free speech, as it affords ample opportunity to discuss questions of importance. On this freedom we pride ourselves. But we should jealously guard our discussions and in no way permit them to interfere with the transaction of public business. When this good rule is broken, when freedom of debate is taken advantage of, not to discuss matters of urgency or importance, but simply to delay or block

the despatch of legitimate business in the House, then, Sir, I submit, the freedom which is so abused should be curtailed in some way. It is my humble opinion that, after a certain stage in the session, such discussions as I have referred to should not be permitted on more than one day in the week, and even then only for a limited time—at most for an hour or two.

Although the government, as is well known, was ready with its work at the opening of this session, practically nothing has been done to date; in fact, any reputable business house in the country could transact in six weeks' time as much business as we have put through here in six months. Generally speaking, I believe the average voter throughout the country feels disposed to hold the government responsible for the delay, not understanding clearly our methods of procedure, not realizing that a dozen men—or two men, for that matter—can hold up indefinitely the voting of supplies or the transaction of the country's business. Under such conditions, it becomes, in my judgment, our duty to find such a solution of this difficulty as will effectually overcome the evil we have to face. We are sent here to legislate for the country's benefit and generally to assist in the transacting of the country's business. We believe it to be our duty to assume any responsibility necessary to attain these ends and to render an account of our acts not to the opposition in this House but to the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to put myself on record as advocating the adoption of such rules as will enable the House to proceed with the business of the country, giving that business preference in all cases, and shutting off the long, windy speeches, which, at best, are only for party purposes and cannot serve the best interests of the country in any sense. Year after year the length of the session is growing greater. In order to make the comparison clear, yet as brief as possible, I have made up the figures in 10-year periods.

Mr. MONK. Is not my hon. friend (Mr. Gordon) delaying the House by this long disquisition ?

Mr. GORDON. I hope that, in the end, it will have the effect of facilitating the business greatly. In the period from 1878 to 1887, the average length of the session was 100 days, and the average length of each day's sitting was 3 hours and 34 minutes. From 1888 to 1897, the average was 114½ days, and the average sitting of the House was 7 hours and 9 minutes. From 1898 to 1907, the average session was 169 days and the time of the average day's sitting was 7 hours. Now, to make a comparison, I have taken the figures for South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria. The figures are as follows :

	Average length of session days.	Average length of days sitting hours minutes.
South Australia, average for 25 years of..	82	4:30
Tasmania, average for 25 years of....	83	4:28
Victoria (previous to 1880)....	64	6:51

Now, as to the tactics pursued here, we on this side are not alone in complaining. We find that newspaper organs representing the Conservative party also complain. In this connection, I would take the liberty of reading an article which appeared in the Montreal 'Star,' a paper well known to hon. gentlemen opposite :

So far as we can gather from the sleepy reports which the papers have been able to give us of the 'terrible struggle' which went on at Ottawa during the last three days of last week, it was a fight for more readiness to bring down information. Now an opposition is certainly justified in demanding the fullest information. But the minister who was behind with his 'information' explained that his department was getting it ready as rapidly as it could, and that he would soon lay it on the table. He did not refuse to give the information; he promised to give it.. . . The result was the opposition kept parliament sitting, at great cost to the country, through three weary and empty days while they protested against a minister who could not turn out information faster than his clerks could work. Obstruction is the heaviest piece of siege artillery available to an opposition. It is, moreover, a gun which can very easily blow itself to pieces. At Westminster it has blown itself to pieces, and that is a free parliament. At Washington the very pieces have been buried out of sight, and the minority lies helpless at the feet of the majority.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY. That is what you would like to have.

Mr. GORDON (reading) :

The opposition should think of this before it runs out its hundred-ton cannon to brush away the fly.

I believe the House would agree, and not only the House but the country, that these hon. gentlemen opposite have been every day bringing out their 100-ton guns to brush away flies.

If the minister positively refused information, then the situation would be changed. If the information, when it comes down, reveals scandalous wastefulness or worse, then we shall expect the opposition to make the most of it. But it will only weaken its power to attract public attention to great wrongs if it insists upon flagging the fast express of parliament every time it wants to ask a mail clerk why a letter has been delayed.

Now in view of what has transpired, it is easy for us to realize whether we are drifting when, on many occasions, a

whole day is taken up in voting a single item of a few thousand dollars. As the country develops, the envy and jealousy of our opposition friends appear to increase because such conditions exist under Liberal rule. Let me refer the House for comparison to a vote recorded on page 150, volume 3, in the proceedings of the English parliament. There it will be found recorded that a vote for £31,234,235 was put through immediately under the proceedings in the British House of Commons. I wish also to place on record certain rules adopted by the British House of Commons, and also comments by authorities, showing the causes which led to their adoption. I have selected the extracts which I thought most pertinent. On page 339 of 'May's Parliamentary Practice' I find the following :

The rules of parliament are designed to afford every legitimate opportunity of discussion, to ensure reasonable delays in the passing of important measures, and to guard the rights of minorities; and freedom of debate has been maintained and observed by the rules and usages of both Houses, with rare patience and self-denial.

Mr. LANCASTER. Whose language is the hon. gentleman reading which speaks of the rights of minorities ?

Mr. GORDON. May on Parliamentary Practice.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will he send the book over to the Minister of Finance for his information about the rights of minorities?

Mr. GORDON. If my hon. friend will be patient he will see what this leads up to.

But of late, these salutary rules have been strained and perverted, in the House of Commons for purposes of obstruction. Such a course, if persisted in, would frustrate the power and authority of parliament, and secure the domination of a small minority, condemned by the deliberate judgment of the House and of the country. That it was unparliamentary and opposed to the principles of orderly government was manifest: and on the 25th of July, 1887, it was declared by the Speaker 'That any member wilfully and persistently obstructing public business, without just and reasonable cause, is guilty of a contempt of the House, and would be liable to such punishment, whether by censure, by suspension from the service of the House, or by commitment, as the House may adjudge.'

Mr. LANCASTER. What about the hon. gentleman's own course at this minute ?

Mr. GORDON. If the hon. gentleman will only have patience, the much needed light will come :

That a revision of the standing orders must be made to secure the due transaction of public business, and to maintain the dignity of the House, became obvious. The matter was considered by a select committee in 1878, and a standing order was passed, 28th February, 1880, amended 22nd November, 1882, for the suspension of a member from the service of the House, on question put forthwith, who shall be named by the Speaker, or the chairman of a committee of the whole House, whether he be the chairman of Ways and Means or any other chairman, for committing the offence of disregarding the authority of the chair, or of abusing the rules of the House by persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the House, or otherwise. Suspension under the standing orders as amended, 22nd November, 1882, lasted on the first occasion, for a month; the second, for a fortnight; and on any subsequent occasion, for a month; but these periods of time were taken out of the standing order in the course of its amendment in session 1902 with a view to the substitution of other periods. As these, however, were not agreed upon by the House, the suspension of a member under the standing order continues for the session unless the House terminates it sooner. An amendment of the standing order made on the 7th March, 1901, provided that if through the refusal of a member who had been suspended to withdraw from the House the Speaker has to call the attention of the House to the fact that force was necessary to compel obedience to his direction, such member is thereupon without further question put suspended during the remainder of the session. Notices standing in the name of a suspended member are removed from the notice paper of each day as it is made out, as long as the suspension lasts. Suspension carries with it exclusion from the precincts of the House. The offence must arise in the House, and be dealt with at once. No motion can be made that a suspended member be heard at the bar.

Temporary provision was also made by the urgency resolutions of sessions 1881 and 1882, to facilitate the consideration of several important Bills; and in subsequent sessions resolutions have been agreed to by the House prescribing the conditions under which, and the times at which, the outstanding stages of Bills should be concluded.

Limitations were also placed by standing orders No. 22, 23 and 30, passed during the session of 1882, amended session 1888, upon obstructive motion for adjournment, and vexatious divisions, and provision was made by standing order No. 19 to check the irrelevance or repetition in debate. These standing orders, during session 1888, received increased stringency; and the transaction of business was also furthered by providing for the classification, on the notice paper, of Bills other than government Bills, after Whitsuntide, and for the appointment of motions for the introduction of Bills, and for the nomination of select committees at the commencement of business. By standing order also, with few exceptions, the Speaker leaves the chair forthwith for a Committee of the House.

On page 605 we find the following :

In session 1896 the practice was introduced of devoting a day in each week to the business of supply, and of limiting the time to be allotted for that business during the session. This practice, which was carried on with various modifications under sessional orders until

1902, was in that session embodied in the standing order, Business of Supply. Under this standing order the Business of Supply must be the first order of the day on Thursday as soon as the Committee of Supply has been appointed and the estimates have been presented, while not more than twenty days, being days before the 5th of August, are allotted for the consideration of the annual estimates for the army, navy and civil services, including votes on account, to which additional time, not exceeding three days, before or after the 5th of August, may be allotted by order of the House. The days allotted do not include any day on which the question has to be put that the Speaker do leave the chair, or any day on which the business of supply does not stand as first order, or any day occupied by the consideration of estimates supplementary to those of a previous resolution, or of any vote of credit, or of votes for supplementary or additional estimates presented by the government for war expenditure, or for any new service not included in the ordinary estimates for the year.

As has been already stated on page 259, on an allotted day, after the orders have been entered upon, no business other than the business of supply can be taken before eleven o'clock except a motion for the adjournment of the House under standing order No. 10, or opposed to private business, and no business in committee or procedings on report of supply can be taken after eleven o'clock, unless the House otherwise order on the motion of a minister of the Crown, moved at the commencement of public business, to be decided without amendment or debate. This is also the case even if a general order exempting business from interruption understanding order No. 1 is in force.

Of the days so allotted, not more than one day in committee shall be allotted to any vote on account, and not more than one sitting to the report of that vote. At eleven o'clock on the close of the day on which the committee on that vote is taken, and at the close of the sitting on which the report of that vote is taken, the chairman of committees or the Speaker, as the case may be, must forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the vote or the report.

At ten of the clock on the last day but one of the allotted days, the chairman is directed to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the vote then under consideration, and then to put forthwith the question with respect to each class of the civil service estimates that the total amount of the votes outstanding in that class be granted for the services defined in the class, then in like manner to put severally the questions that the total amounts of the votes outstanding in the estimates for the navy, the army, and the revenue departments be granted for the services defined in those estimates. At ten of the clock on the last (not being earlier than the 20th of the allotted days) the Speaker is directed to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report of the resolution then under consideration, and then to put forthwith with respect to each class of the civil service estimates, the question, that the House doth agree with the committee in all the outstanding resolutions reported in respect of that class, and then to put a like question with respect to all the resolutions outstanding in the estimates for the Navy, the Army, the Revenue Departments, and other outstanding resolutions severally.

On the days appointed for concluding the business of supply, its consideration may not be anticipated by a motion of adjournment, and no dilatory motion may be moved on proceedings for that business and the business may not be interrupted under any standing order.

The standing order also provides that any additional estimate for any new matter not included in the original estimates for the year, shall be submitted for consideration in the Committee of Supply on some day not later than two days before the committee is closed.

An instruction to the Committee of Supply cannot be moved, as following the Speaker's ruling, 'nothing can be brought on in that committee of which notice has not been given in detail, by the estimates laid before the House.'

The rules of the House governing the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means are to be found at page 921 of the last edition of May. Some of these rules are as follows:

15. (1) As soon as the Committee of Supply has been appointed and estimates have been presented, the business of supply shall, until disposed of, be the first order of the day on Thursday, unless the House otherwise order on the motion of a Minister of the Crown, moved at the commencement of public business, to be decided without amendment or debate.

(2) Not more than 20 days, being days before the 5th of August, shall be allotted for the consideration of the annual estimates for the army, navy and civil services, including votes on account. The days allotted shall not include any day on which the question has to be put that the Speaker do leave the chair, or any day on which the business of supply does not stand as first order.

(5) On a day so allotted, no business other than the business of supply shall be taken before eleven, and no business in committee or proceedings on report of supply shall be taken after eleven, whether a general order exempting business from interruption under the standing order (sittings of the House) is in force or not, unless the House otherwise order on a motion of a Minister of the Crown, moved at the commencement of public business, to be decided without amendment or debate.

(6) Of the days so allotted, not more than one day in committee shall be allotted to any vote on account and not more than one sitting to the report of that vote. At eleven, on the close of the day on which the committee on that vote is taken, and at the close of the sitting on which the report of that vote is taken, the chairman of committees or the Speaker, as the case may be, shall forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the vote or the report.

(7) At ten of the clock on the last day but one of the days so allotted the chairman shall forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the vote then under consideration, and shall then forthwith put the question with respect to each class of the civil service

estimates that the total amount of the votes outstanding in that class be granted for the services defined in the class, and shall in like manner put severally the questions that the total amounts of the votes outstanding in the estimates for the navy, the army, and the revenue departments be granted for the services defined in those estimates.

(8) At ten of the clock on the last—not being earlier than the twentieth, of the allotted days, the Speaker shall forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the report of the resolution then under consideration, and shall then forthwith put, with respect to each class of the civil service estimates, the question, that the House doth agree with the committee in all the outstanding resolutions reported in respect of that class, and shall then put a like question with respect to all the resolutions outstanding in the estimates for the navy, the army, the revenue departments, and other outstanding resolutions severally.

(9) On the days appointed for concluding the business of supply, the consideration shall not be anticipated by a motion of adjournment, and no delivery motion shall be moved on proceedings for that business and the business shall not be interrupted under any standing order.

The Speaker of the English House has, under the rules, been entrusted with power to check obstruction which renders it impossible for one, two or a dozen members to prevent the transaction of public business. What has been found effective in England should be given a fair trial here and that without further delay. Briefly, Mr. Speaker, in England the object constantly in view is the transaction of public business and the rules of the House there are so framed as to prevent obstruction, unreasonable delay and tedious repetition. The protection of the rights of minorities is left largely in the hands of Mr. Speaker, but the protection of the House as a whole is his no less imperative duty. The closure may be moved for in either the House or the Committee of the Whole, but Mr. Speaker shall not put the motion if he considers it an infringement on the rights of minorities. If the closure is adopted, the vote is at once taken and the discussion is at an end.

I cannot see that any good purpose would be served by filling pages of 'Hansard' with statistics or quotations from every land on this question. We are living in a practical age and should adopt such rules as will reasonably meet our conditions. Canada to-day is, I believe, practically the only country where there is absolute license in debate. In this regard benighted Russia is in advance of us, the Douma having recently introduced an innovation with a view to keeping wordy oratory to a limit of time. A red lamp is lighted in front of a speaker, and it is automatically extinguished when ten minutes have expired.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman's light would have been out some time ago.

Mr. GORDON. As far as the member for North Toronto is concerned, I would fear the results.

Mr. Speaker, before closing I desire to enter my strongest protest against hon. members opposite interfering with the transacting of the country's business, by means of obstructive tactics such as has been resorted to during the past six months. We believe many members on both sides of the House would welcome a change in rules, and trust now that the time is opportune, that the House will agree to such changes in the rules as may be necessary to prevent in future such wanton waste of time. If this cannot be done then speaking for myself, I believe the government should take the matter in hand and show the country that while they have been patient there is also a limit to which patient endurance will not submit, and that the country will no longer suffer what we have been forced to endure during the past six months.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln). As I am anxious that the proper business of the House shall be conducted, and unlike my hon. friend who has just sat down do not wish to take up the time of the House by talking of matters entirely beside the question before the chair, I desire first of all to say a few words in protest against the language of the Minister of Finance who replied in a very impatient and angry manner to the perfectly proper matter which was brought up by the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen), and then I shall say a word or two in regard to the remarks of the hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon). As I said, the question brought up by my hon. friend (Mr. Owens) was a perfectly proper matter to deal with on a motion for supply. The Minister of Customs has seen fit to leave his duties in the House of Commons and to leave his department to enter a provincial campaign in the province of Ontario. He has not been talking on provincial politics but, according to a 'Globe' despatch, he talked of nothing but Dominion matters. The 'Globe' despatch devotes an inch and a half space to Mr. Paterson and all of that refers to what he said on federal politics. The Minister of Customs is improperly away from this House, and when my hon. friend drew this matter to the attention of the Minister of Finance, he should have thanked him and apologized and promised to do better, if he could, in controlling the noise and thunder of the Minister of Customs and keeping it in this House, in order to get the business done and not allow him to go out of his sphere into provincial politics, during a session of this House. The Minister of Customs, speaking in Brant, as reported in the 'Globe,' said:

> There were 1,800 men who could not get their pay because the Tory obstructionists would not vote supplies.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend from Cape Breton says 'Hear, hear.'

Mr. JOHNSTON. Sure thing.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well, he has forgotten, as the Minister of Finance seems to have, what happened. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman who is so fond of applauding everything said by the 'Globe' or any of the ministers whom he so blindly follows, was awake in the House when the Minister of Customs ceased to do his work here two or three nights ago. The Minister of Customs got all the supply he asked for through.

Mr. JOHNSTON. When ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Three nights ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Why not the night before?

Mr. LANCASTER. He didn't ask for it the night before.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Pardon me, he did.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Customs brought down the information which he promised on the second night and he then got through five items and the sixth item he was asked to allow to stand so that the member for Brantford might be present. The Minister of Customs stated that under ordinary circumstances it would be reasonable to let that item stand, but he pleaded with us as a matter of courtesy to pass the item and let him go because he had made an arrangement to be out of the city next day, and he went with the consent of the opposition who according to his own admission had the right to keep him here. The Minister of Customs went to Brantford and made his speech, and when it is brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for East Northumberland, the Minister of Finance gets excited and undertakes to read my hon. friend (Mr. Owen) a lecture about bringing up the matter in the absence of the Minister of Customs. But what was the Minister of Customs doing in Brantford? He was talking to the electors who did not know what was taking place in this chamber about what had taken place here, and he was talking to them behind the backs of every member of the opposition, who had they been present would have shown where he was wrong. The Minister of Customs was talking behind the backs of the members of this House who were absent at Ottawa attending to their duties while he was neglecting his.

Mr. FIELDING. Has my hon. friend not been absent on the same mission as the Minister of Customs?

Mr. LANCASTER. Not for one minute during the whole of this campaign, because I thought my duty was here.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has been frequently absent from his place in the House and I assumed he was engaged in that work.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Finance had better not assume what he knows nothing about.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not assuming anything when I say the hon. gentleman has been frequently absent. I know that.

Mr. LANCASTER. My total absence from this House has been 12 days since last November. Has any one got a better record than that? Let the Minister of Finance look at his own supporters ; let him look at the member for Welland (Mr. German). How many days has the member for Welland been here to look after the interests of the Niagara district? Before the Minister of Finance undertakes to talk to people on this side of the House he had better know the facts. We all know the Minister of Customs is absent in the provincial election campaign.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The reference to the hon. member for Welland is not fair because that hon. gentleman has been ill all this session.

Mr. LANCASTER. That statement is not correct because I have seen the member for Welland in court half a dozen times this session. I have known the hon. member for Welland to be attending to his private business every month except the last month. I understand he was ill during the last part of May, but he was attending to his own private business up to that day to my certain knowledge. What is the use of the hon. member for Hamilton trying to mislead the House about that matter? But my difficulty is with the Minister of Finance who, because he is not satisfied with the way in which the people of Canada view the actions of the government——

Mr. FIELDING. But I am satisfied.

Mr. LANCASTER. He knows the people of Canada do not approve of the actions of the government and so he gets excited and finds fault with the opposition. If the Minister of Customs made that statement at Brantford as reported in the 'Globe,' he made a misleading statement. I do not say that the statement is wilfully untrue, but I do say it is not a fact and the member for East Northumberland was only discharging his duty when he brought the question to the attention of the House, and the Minister of Finance blames the hon. gentleman for talking behind the back of the Minister of Customs. But the Minister of Customs is talking behind the back of every member on this side of the House and talking what is not correct. Now, these supplies have been voted by the Committee of the House, but the Minister of

Finance complains that no Supply Bill has passed. Does he expect the leader of the opposition to draw up his Supply Bill for him?

Mr. FIELDING. When we asked the leader of the opposition to consent to a vote on account the leader of the opposition refused.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as the appropriations for the Department of Customs are concerned, and it is with them we are dealing, no Supply Bill has ever been asked for. The Minister of Finance did ask to have the rules of the House suspended in order that one-eighth or one-fourth of the total Supply Bill might be passed at once and without discussion. That was assented to last March ; it was not assented to later.

Mr. FIELDING. If the rules of the House require to be suspended for that purpose why should they not be suspended? But it is implied whenever you attempt to facilitate business in this way that the rules of the House will be suspended and all that I asked hon. gentlemen opposite to do was to give us a vote on account for the customs and for every other department, and that was refused. If that vote had been granted as we asked it, or had the opposition given us the vote of one-fourth which we originally asked for, to-day the departments would have money to pay the public service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was not refused in the way in which the hon. gentleman states.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say in what way it was refused. I say it was refused.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We asked, before we should consent to the suspension of any rules of the House, that we should come to an understanding about a certain very controversial measure which had been brought on for discussion in this House nearly five months and a half after the opening of the session, and brought on with the full knowledge that it was an extremely controversial measure which would produce great discussion.

Mr. FIELDING. The fact that my hon. friend differs from us regarding a certain Bill respecting the province of Manitoba is no possible excuse for failing to give supplies to pay the postmaster down in St. John.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as the postmaster in St. John is concerned, the supplies for him have already been voted in this House.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is incorrect again; the supplies have not been voted by this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as I am concerned all have been voted that have been asked for.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is wrong; they have not been voted by this House.

Mr. LANCASTER. I was anxious to let the Minister of Finance go on because he is proving my case every time he opens his mouth. He admits now he did not ask——

Mr. FIELDING. Would my hon. friend permit me——

Mr. LANCASTER. Let me finish my sentence.

Mr. FIELDING. I ask my hon. friend to permit me——

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not going to be interrupted by the Minister of Finance when I am in the middle of a sentence. I am perfectly willing to let him get as excited as he can when I have finished, but I am not going to be interrupted in the middle of a sentence, because it does not do justice to the people who sent me here and who know that I can frame a sentence correctly. The Minister of Finance knows that too, and he does not want the sentence finished. He knows the Minister of Customs has not asked for any Supply Bill to pay these customs salaries.

Mr. FIELDING. I said that on behalf of the Minister of Customs and on behalf of every minister of this government I applied to the hon. members opposite through the proper channel to ask them to consent to a Supply Bill, first for one-fourth of the estimates. The hon. gentlemen refused, but agreed to vote one-eighth. That was done. Whatever credit they are entitled to for it I frankly give to them. When that was exhausted, I called for a further vote on account of customs, the Post Office and every other service of the government, and hon. gentlemen opposite —I do not debate their reason, that is their business—refused.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Customs did not say what the Minister of Finance has just stated, but the very opposite. He said that in his department there were 1,800 men who could not get their pay because the Tory obstructionists would not vote the Supply. He knows that that is not correct ; he knows that the supplies for those 1,800 men were voted the very night before he left here to go and interfere in the provincial elections. He must have had that fact in mind when he went to Brantford, and it is no wonder that the Minister of Finance cannot find any other way of getting around it than by getting angry.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think the hon. gentleman should accuse me of getting angry. I am not angry.

Mr. LANCASTER. Appearances are very deceptive, then. The hon. gentleman should take a stage manager with him, so that we would not think he was angry when he was not. We must be judged more or less by our actions in this House, and the Minister of Finance must expect to be judged by the tones he uses. If the Minister of Customs wanted to make a statement to the Brantford audience in good faith, why did he not say what the Minister of Finance has just said ? What he should have stated was that the supplies for those 1,800 men and every thing he had asked for had been voted the night before he left, and that it only needed the Supply Bill to put it into full effect, and that the government had not yet asked for the Supply Bill. I shall be curious to hear what the hon. Minister of Customs will say when he returns to this House. He is a gentleman for whom we have always had the highest respect, and I do not think that he will be willing to live under the imputation of having made a statement so absolutely deceptive. The Minister of Finance says you cannot bring down a Supply Bill every day. If he will look through the statutes of this parliament during the last seven sessions, since I have been here, I venture to say that he will find that there has not been one year in which there has not been more than one Supply Bill, and in some years there have been three or four. If the hon. gentleman wanted a Supply Bill in order to get the money for these 1,800 employees, why did he not ask us if we would pass a Supply Bill ? He knows very well that we would. He knows that as soon as an item goes through the Committee of Supply, our opposition to it ceases, and we always allow a Supply Bill to go through in five minutes, whenever it is brought in. The Minister of Finance must not try to deceive the people of this country ; they are too intelligent to be deceived by that sort of thing. We have passed, as has been pointed out, between eleven and twelve million dollars. Why, then, has the Minister of Finance not asked for a Supply Bill, if he wants this money ? The hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon) had the temerity to refer to the fact that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not able to get his estimates through for two or three days. He forgets entirely that the whole trouble was that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries wanted us to take his word instead of bringing down some original papers which we wanted to see. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had exercised any common sense, he would have withdrawn his item and said that it was not reasonable that he should ask this House to vote it when the original papers were asked for and were not produced. The hon. member for East Kent intimated that the department were making up the papers as fast as they could, and that the clerks were overworked. The hon. gentleman knows that we were not asking for any copies, or for one minute's work to be done by any clerk in the department, but that it was the original papers we wanted to see, the papers on which the minister was relying for the statements he was making, before we allowed that large and very contentious item to pass. The hon. member for East Kent also, following the Minister of Finance, undertakes to give us some advice as to what we ought to do in discussing the business of this country, and he quotes an authority who is dead against what the Minister of Finance said about the rights of minorities. Let us settle this matter if we can, seeing that the hon. member for East Kent, for some reason, does not want the Minister of the Interior to get through any supplies this morning. The hon. gentleman got up at 11.30 o'clock and stopped supply by making a speech about amending the rules of the House with regard to matters which should have been attended to a year or two ago when the rules were being amended. The hon. gentleman says the rights of the opposition should be curtailed but does not propose any amendment defining in what respect they should be restricted. We had from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) over and over again the statement that the minority in this House have no rights except what the majority give them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are these hon. gentlemen who interrupt not satisfied with that declaration of the Minister of Finance or are they convinced that he is talking nonsense when he says the majority have no rights in this House?

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman continues to repeat that I said the opposition had no rights. I said nothing of the kind. I said that every member of this House has the rights which the rules of the House, passed by the majority, give him.

Mr. LANCASTER. We had a lively discussion on that question, and the Minister of Finance said that we have no rights except what the majority chose to give us.

Mr. FIELDING. That is right.

Mr. LANCASTER. Now the hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon) says our rights should be curtailed.

Mr. GORDON. We complain that you are abusing and going beyond your rights.

Mr. LANCASTER. If we have none at all how can we go beyond them? The Speaker could prevent our exercising any rights if we have none. When the Minister of Finance said that we have no rights he said what was not true, and now we have the hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon) making a speech to prove that the Minister of Finance was all wrong in his statement and that the rights of the minority should be more curtailed than they are. But he is thus opening up a very large question indeed; and if that question be discussed until midnight, it is entirely his fault. The hon. gentleman said, on the motion to go into Supply, that he had an important question to bring up which should be settled. But he did not move any amendment, and therefore we are completely in the dark as to what method he proposes to curtail our rights. I apprehend that he himself has been taking up the attention of the House simply for the purpose of obstructing Supply. When he talks of preventing members of the opposition from discussing matters which are properly before the House, he should have backed up his speech by a motion so that we might have some idea of what he proposes this House should do in order to accomplish the object he aims at. He should have moved an amendment in concrete form and in not doing so he has been guilty of discourtesy to this House. He urged that before going into Supply, the rules of the House should be amended. In this way he was obstructing Supply, and yet he does not submit any motion which would indicate exactly in what way he proposes to curtail our rights. And while raising such an important discussion and thus taking up valuable time, he expressed the hope that this discussion would not delay the House too long. But if he were sincere in not desiring to waste the time of the House, why did he not move an amendment so that we might know what he means? Possibly the hon. gentleman is one of those many members from the province of Ontario who are convinced that their usefulness as members of this House has gone and that they stand no chance, or very little chance, of being re-elected. Possibly he feels that he cannot expect re-election if he undertakes any longer to support this government through thick and thin, and therefore is seeking a pretext which will enable him to go before his electors and claim that he is not backing up the government in everything. True the government were complaining that the opposition were preventing Supply going through, but the hon. gentleman wants to be able to say that he has acted as an independent and was not going any longer to follow the Laurier government in that regard. How else can we account for the fact that when the government is asking for Supply, we find him raising such an important question now as that affecting the rights of members of this House to criticise the conduct of the government. For my part I protest against the hon. gentleman arguing that the rules should be amended and then sitting down without putting his ideas into the concrete form of an amendment to the motion to go into Supply.

Mr. GORDON. Was it not the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Owen) who started the issue?

Mr. LANCASTER. Not at all. That hon. gentleman simply drew attention to a statement of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), which was utterly unfounded, and which he made while neglecting his duties in this House in order to take part in a local election. Had the hon. member for East Kent not interfered my hon. friend from Northumberland would have made his statement, which did not take him five minutes, we would have had the answer of the Minister of Finance and my reply, and we would have been in Supply an hour ago. But the hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon) stood up in his place; and in order to show the people of his constituency that he was not entirely in the hands of the government on this question, he raised the issue of amending the rules of debate without at the same time iudicating, by a motion, in what respect he would have them amended. Had it not been for his interference in the discussion and for his bringing up a question so open to discussion, we would have been in Supply at twenty-five minutes to twelve. The hon. gentleman in fact blocked the Supply and prevented the Speaker leaving the chair, and he did this by raising the question of interfering with the rights of the minority, although his leader, the Minister of Finance, has declared that the minority have no rights.

Mr. GORDON. The hon. gentleman finds fault with me for taking up half an hour of the time of the House. but how many hours has he taken up this session?

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not pretend to know, but I do say that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is the first member of this House who has said that I wasted time by speaking here. He may have plucked up courage enough to say that here, but I venture to say he will take it back if he should meet me at lunch time. He has said to me in conversation, not once only but half a dozen times, that if all the members of the opposition talked as little and as sensibly as I do there would be no waste of time. Now, I do not care a button which of the different opinions the hon. gentleman expressed is his real opinion. All I say is that he ought to have a conservative mind and say the same thing whether he is in the House or out of it. He ought not to be so

good a supporter of the Laurier government as to say one thing at one time and a different thing at another time. I am not influenced one way or the other by the hon. gentleman's opinion, I do not speak in this House with a view to either winning or opposing such opinion concerning myself. I think that like other hon. members on this side I speak only when it seems to me in the interest of my constituents and the country that I should speak. But, when we are in Supply and a cabinet minister refuses information, refuses even to produce original documents, would the hon. member say that we should allow that Supply to go through without getting the information to which the country is entitled ? The hon. gentleman's argument is that the rights of the opposition should be curtailed according to the wish of the Finance Minister or any other member of the government who may have certain business he wishes to put through. What would become of responsible government if that view of the case should prevail ? The government undertakes to do something knowing that the people are against them, and knowing that the feeling against them will be the more increased the more the matter is discussed. The hon. gentleman would say : Gag the opposition. If this could be done, there would be no object in people electing members to check and criticise the government, for the opposition would be deprived of the opportunity to perform that function. What would be the result ? There would be a petition to the King to reconsider the constitution of the country. If the hon. gentleman knows anything about public rights he must know that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Give it to him.

Mr. LANCASTER. Give what to whom? If I could give the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) some knowledge of the duty he owes to his constituents—who, I understand, are not very anxious to send him back after the approaching elections—it would be a good thing. But what the hon. gentleman says does not affect me, for he no more than the hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon) gives me sincere advice. The hon. gentleman is willing that the country should be dealt with by the government as the government pleases. But we are not in that position. The people have the right to know what is to be done with the taxes they pay to this government, and it is the duty of the opposition to see that that information is supplied. It would suit the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) very well at present to have the government all-powerful. But after the next election, he will come to the conclusion that the opposition should have some rights.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is just a quarter to one. Does the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) think he can talk it out ?

Mr. LANCASTER.

Mr. LANCASTER. I will try, if it will accommodate the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Only a quarter of an hour more.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am willing to sit down now if I have convinced the House of the correctness of the position of the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) in raising this important question. And the hon. members who are interrupting me are doing no good to the country as a whole by taking the position that the Minister of Customs, or any other minister, is justified in leaving the House, especially at a time when business is so pressing that morning sittings have been ordered, to take part in the provincial election and to complain to the public about the business here not being done. I wonder that some good intelligent Reformer, did not ask the Minister of Customs why he was not down here doing what he could, at any rate, to have the business put through. In fact, that may have happened, but the 'Globe' has not seen fit to repeat it. And the Minister of Customs has not represented the matter fairly before the country, in complaining that the money of which he spoke was voted.

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, no.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what he said. What is the use of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) denying it ? The money was voted in Committee of Supply. It could not be available without a Supply Bill, but the Minister of Customs did not propose a Supply Bill. So he is misleading the people when he says he cannot get his 1,800 men paid. In view of the statements made by the member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) concerning the rights of the minority, I thought it well to discuss this matter, but I understand that some hon. gentlemen desire to speak, so I will give way.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, it is not in keeping with the eternal fitness of things that the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) should represent Lincoln and Niagara—that there should be so much wind-power located so near the magnificent water-power of Niagara Falls. This question has come up, and I do not think the House could be better engaged than in discussing the situation that has developed here during the last two or three months. I take it that this government was sent here by the people, with a majority of 60 or 70 members, to transact the public business. I also take it that if the rules of the House do not enable this government to transact the business of the country as against a weak minority, the sooner the rules are changed the better. I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite should strive so valiantly to justify the hopeless and in-

defensible position in which they find themselves to-day. They have simply brought the parliament of Canada into disrepute by their actions during the last two or three months. Now they are trying to argue that they have not held up Supply. Why, Sir, they have systematically held up Supply ever since this House began this session. Every time the government has endeavoured to get Supply, some senseless, silly resolution has been moved by some hon. gentleman opposite, and the discussion continued until we find that, after five or six months of session, we have been unable to carry on the business of the country. Let me say in all seriousness to this government, that the responsibility attaches to them to see that the business of the country is carried on; and let me also say that if hon. gentlemen opposite persist in the course they have been pursuing for the last two or three months, the sooner the government realizes the fact that the people of this country expect them to carry on the public business, the better it will be for this parliament and for this country. Let me call attention to the fact that a similar situation developed in the imperial parliament a number of years ago, and the then Speaker, exercising an authority which the House did not give him, but acting in the best interest of the country, put the question immediately without any authority by the rules of the House. A similar situation has developed here, and if the House does not transact the business it ought to transact, business that a majority of this House is no doubt willing that it should do, and which the people are now insisting upon, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, you will have to do what a distinguished Speaker did in the imperial House, and put the question without being so authorized under the rules of the House. Let me take up a minute of time by putting on 'Hansard' the position which the British Speaker thought it his duty to take at that time:

> A crisis has thus arisen which demands the prompt interposition of the chair, and of the House. The usual rules have proved powerless to ensure orderly and effective debate. An important measure, recommended in Her Majesty's speech nearly a month since, and declared to be urgent, in the interests of the state, by a decisive majority, is being arrested by the action of an inconsiderable minority, the members of which have resorted to those modes of 'obstruction' which have been recognized by the House as a parliamentary offence.
>
> The dignity, the credit, and the authority of this House are seriously threatened, and it is necessary that they should be vindicated Under the operation of the accustomed rules and methods of procedure, the legislative powers of the House are paralyzed. A new and exceptional course is imperatively demanded; and I am satisfied that I shall best carry out the will of the House, and may rely upon its support, if I decline to call upon any more members to speak, and at once proceed to put the question from the chair.

No doubt that was a drastic course for the Speaker to take, and it was not until a year afterwards that the imperial parliament amended the rules of the House by adopting closure. I say, and say most emphatically, that the minority of this House have absolutely no rights but what the majority choose to concede them. I also say that the rules of the House as at present constituted can only continue so long as the majority wishes them to continue. I am bound to say that when a minority of this House attempts to obstruct business, and attempts impudently to dictate to the majority what legislation shall be introduced and what legislation shall be passed, the sooner the rules of the House are amended the better it will be for the government of this country. Let me quote an authority which even hon. gentlemen opposite will appreciate. In introducing the closure in the imperial House, in 1882, the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone said, as will be found on page 1145 of the British 'Hansard' of that year:

> There is but one sound principle in this House, and that is that the majority of the House should prevail.

And again later on he says:

> But God forbid that we should see so vast an innovation introduced into the practice of this House, applicable to our ordinary procedure, as would be a rule of the House under which the voice of the majority was not to prevail over that of the minority.

So you see, Sir, that the situation which has developed here is that the minority have said to this government—they cannot get away from it now—that unless certain legislation, good or bad, wise or unwise, is withdrawn, they will refuse to allow the business of the House to continue; that unless certain legislation is withdrawn we are going to be here until the snow flies; that unless certain legislation is withdrawn they will vote no Supply to this government. Now, that is the position they have taken; it is an intolerable position, a position that this House and this government, if it recognizes its own dignity and importance, cannot yield to for a single moment. I do say in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that we would be much better employed at the present time in discussing, but not discussing for very long, the question of amending the rules of the House so that the business of the country may be proceeded with. I say more than that, Mr. Speaker, that while the people sent this government here with a large majority to do the business of the country, if they do it well, it is all right, if they do it badly, they must answer to the people therefor. But the people are not going to stand by and see this government held up by a hopeless minority, while we

sit here month after month incapable of carrying on the public business.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). I have five minutes before one o'clock, and I presume it is well to utilize it so as to save time.

Mr. FIELDING. Will my hon. friend be able to finish before one—otherwise we might as well call it one.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I will not be able to finish. The Minister of Finance said with reference to a statement made by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) that the Minister of Customs has had just as good a right to go into his own constituency and talk at a provincial election as my hon. friend from Lincoln had, or any other private member of the House. Sir, I claim that there is a great difference between the position of a cabinet minister and that of a private member. If a private member absents himself from the House, $15 a day is deducted from his sessional indemnity. It may be the case with the ministers. But the people of this country are paying the ministers, besides their sessional indemnity, $7,000 a year to stay here and attend to public business. They are not supposed to vacate their seats when parliament is in session, and run away to take part in provincial politics, as the Minister of Customs is doing. It has been the practice of other ministers to absent themselves for two or three weeks when they ought to be here to answer questions relating to their departments. They are being paid by the people of this country their sessional indemnity of $2,500, and $7,000 in addition, to be here and attend to public business. What would be said by any bank or any other corporation in Canada if one of their chief clerks, without saying a word to anybody, left his office and went out into the country whenever he saw fit, to take part in politics or in any other outside business and at the same time draw his salary from the company? The company would soon dismiss that servant as the people of Canada will, on the first opportunity dismiss the ministers, saying: We are paying you $7,000 a year to stay in your place while parliament is in session, yet nine out of thirteen of you have been away taking part in the provincial elections. Will the Minister of Finance say that it is right to have the Minister of Customs go away and defraud his employers of the services for which they are paying him?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say that is what it amounts to. No cabinet minister has a right to go away when the people are paying him $7,000 and expecting him to perform services in return for it.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the House rose at one o'clock I was trying to convince the Minister of Finance that he was in error when he stated that the Minister of Customs had as good a right to be away stumping in the provincial elections as had the member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster).

Mr. LANCASTER. And I was not away stumping.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Hon Edward Blake and the Hon Alexander Mackenzie always claimed that the Dominion government had no right to interfere in provincial elections, but the present Liberal government has repudiated that great plank of Liberalism, and to-day we see the ministerial benches empty and the ministers away stumping Ontario and Quebec notwithstanding that the people of Canada pay them $7,000 a year and their indemnity besides to stop here and transact public business And yet the Minister of Finance says the ministers have as much right to be absent as have the members of the opposition but if the members on this side are absent they are docked $15 a day, while the pay of the ministers goes on.

Mr. FIELDING. The ministers are docked too.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not on the $7,000.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is the leader of the opposition docked?

Mr. LANCASTER. He is never away.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice by the Auditor General's Report that the ministers draw their full indemnity and yet we have questions on the Order Paper day after day and the government has to ask them to stand because the ministers are not ready with the information and these questions have to be reprinted from day to day at a cost of thousands of dollars to the government. The statement made by the minister of Customs at Brantford is not correct in any particular. The government has no good reason to put the blame on the opposition because some of the civil servants have not got their pay.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is cruel to blame the opposition.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes it is cruel, and the country does not believe it is the fault of the opposition. This government is trying to mislead the people about that. Parliament was called on the 27th of November and although the law states that the Auditor General's Report shall be laid on the table a few days after parliament meets yet when we returned after the vacation in January the Auditor General's Report was not yet printed. And when complaint was made the Minister of Finance said the

Auditor General was an officer of this House and the government had no control over him, whereas the fact is that the ministers were perambulating the country and they did not send their departmental reports to the Auditor General, and hence he could not present his report and parliament could not consider the estimates. To-day we see that some of the most important legislation of the session is not brought down yet by the government and it ill becomes them to blame the opposition for delay. The Minister of Finance stated it never before happened that the civil servants could not get their pay but let me quote to him this article from yesterday's 'Citizen' as to what occurred in 1895-96:

Civil Servants outside the city anxious for their pay.

Toronto, June 3.—The postal clerks and employees of the civil service have begun to feel the need of cash. In some branches of the service notice has been given to cut expenses in every way and to travel only where it is absolutely necessary, as the funds at the disposal of the department are small.

The letter carriers and clerks who are receiving from $1.25 to $1.50 per day cannot stand the strain long, and in some cases have been obliged to negotiate loans at high rates of interest to tide themselves over. The civil servants are hoping that the experience of 14 years ago will not be repeated, when they were compelled to go without any pay for a period of seven weeks.

Now I want to show the Minister of Finance what happened in 1896 when the Liberals then in opposition would not allow a dollar to be voted and when after the 30th of June of that year the civil servants were without their pay for 7 weeks. I quote from 'Hansard' of September 3, 1906, from a speech made on a resolution moved in this House by Mr. Foster in the session held after the elections.

No, Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary control is the vital point. The unforeseen character of the expense is the condition precedent to the Governor General's warrants being issued. If hon. gentlemen are excused in the case of these warrants, they could, sir, have prorogued parliament until the 19th day of October, and taken another Governor General's warrant; they could have gone on until January; they could have gone on until they were brought up by the statute which makes it necessary that parliament shall meet at least once every year. You must look at the consequences which follow on the line which has been adopted; and if one step is allowed—and by parity of reasoning, the second step may be taken on the same principle—it is time that this House without taking into account any predilection, should make its voice known with regard to a principle so important and so vital, a principle in which the people of this country are most interested at this present moment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move:—

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out, and the following added instead thereof: 'the sixth session of the seventh parliament, met on January 2, 1896, and on the 27th day of the same month the government submitted His Excellency's message transmitting the estimates for the year 1896-7, which were forthwith referred to the Committee of Supply.

That these estimates provided appropriations for the foreseen and necessary salaries and contingencies of the several departments of government and for the maintenance and construction of public works and for other services.

That on the 28th of January the House was asked to go into committee of the whole for granting supply, and to consider first the appropriations for departmental salaries and contingencies.

That neither then nor on the several occasions thereafter when the House was asked to grant supply did the opposition agree thereto.

That appeals were made by the government setting forth the urgent necessity for making provision for the ordinary and regular expenditures for the approaching fiscal year, or in view of the impending dissolution and of the fact that the new parliament could not possibly assemble before July 1st and would probably meet shortly thereafter, for a part thereof.

That despite these repetitions and although the circumstances were well known and there was ample time at the disposal of the House, supplies for the year 1896-7 were refused and parliament rose on the 23rd day of April without the supplies being granted.

I would ask the Minister of Finance if he ever read that before, and if he did he would not make the statement he made to-day. In this case the Liberal opposition refused to grant a dollar to pay the civil servants of Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was money voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was money voted up to the 30th June and after that the civil servants went without their pay for six or seven weeks.

Mr. FIELDING. We were talking about what happened when the Conservatives were in power but that was under a Liberal government and we were not discussing that.

Mr. TAYLOR. This shows what the Liberal opposition did in those days—they refused the Supplies without cause, while we have cause. It goes on:

That parliament was dissolved and a new parliament was summoned to meet for the despatch of business on the 16th day of July, 1896.

That the government resigned office on the 10th day of July, 1896, and the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier was called upon by His Excellency to form an administration which he undertook to do.

That thereafter, parliament was on the 13th day of July, 1896, prorogued to meet for the despatch of business on the 19th day of August, 1896.

That by chapter 29, 49 Victoria, Revised Statutes of Canada, the Governor General in Council is empowered to issue special war-

rants authorizing the payment of money not previously voted by parliament under the following circumstances only, to wit:

If when parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building, which requires an immediate outlay for the repairs thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the minister having charge of the service in question, that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required.

That on the 16th dav of July, 1896—the date when parliament had been summoned to meet for the despatch of business—His Excellency was advised to issue his warrant for the expenditure of $1,067,576 for departmental salaries and contingencies, and on August 18—one day before the actual meeting of parliament—was again advised to issue his warrant for $935,561 for similar expenditures, and that these warrants did issue and that the sums named were accordingly placed at the disposal of the department.

That these amounts were not called for by any accident to any public work or building, nor were they required for any expenditures which had not been foreseen, and which could not have been provided for, but were used to pay ordinary salaries and contingencies, for which parliament had been asked to provide, and which had been refused by the House of Commons.

That, under these circumstances, this House is of the opinion that the issue of the said warrants was in contravention of the well understood principles of parliamentary control, an abuse of the powers vested in the Governor General in Council by the said Act, and a usurpation fraught with danger to public liberty and constitutional government.

That was the amendment moved by the ex-Minister of Finance. Sir Richard Cartwright replied, making a very long speech, in which he tried to justify the action of the Liberal opposition in refusing the Supplies, but he made a very lame case of it indeed. However, that is an answer to the Minister of Finance and to the arguments of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. And now the Minister of Finance and the government are trying to make the people believe that the opposition are responsible for the civil service not getting their pay. Who is responsible? This government met parliament on the 28th of November. They had not the Auditor General's Report down complete until some time in February or March. The Election Bill, which is now the bone of contention was introduced on the 9th of March. So that the government had four months before that Bill was introduced, which was plenty of time in which to have passed their entire estimates. Why did they not put through their Supplies then? Simply because they had been in Europe spending their holidays and neglecting their work, for which they are paid $7,000 a year, and had not their work prepared when the House met. The government are responsible, and they alone. We did not know anything about the Bill. It was not printed for several weeks afterwards. The second reading and the explanation of the Minister of Justice took place on the 5th of May, when this House had been in session more than five months, in which time the opposition would have voted every dollar of the estimates for the civil service of the country if the government had been ready to go on with them. The civil service and everybody else in the country must know that if the estimates have not been passed, it is due entirely to the negligence of this government in not being prepared with their work, and in not having the Auditor General's Report ready, so that the opposition could properly criticise them. The discussion on the Bill was adjourned until the 6th, again until the 7th, again until the 8th, again until the 11th, then until the 12th, then until the 13th, and lastly until the 18th of May. That is the time that this iniquitous Bill has been before parliament. Then hon. gentlemen opposite quit and said, now we must get some Supplies. The opposition, out of the kindness of their hearts, had voted them a month and a half of Supplies, enough to carry them until the 15th of last month. That was done before this Bill was brought down; but when they saw the iniquity of the Bill, they said, with the country behind them; No; a government that would introduce such an iniquitous measure as that should not get a dollar to spend in this country. They knew that they had been kept in power in the last election—in Manitoba by the thin red line and in Ontario by ballot-stuffing and fraudulent ballot boxes, only two of which my hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Porter) was able to discover. We do not know how many there were, but we think a great many were used in the province of Nova Scotia. With bribery and corruption, switching of ballots and the thin red line, they managed to carry themselves into power. And now they know that the Conservative party has got on to that, and they want to do something that is even worse than ballot switching and the thin red line. They have introduced this Bill simply for the purpose of keeping themselves in power. What is the Bill? They want to destroy the secrecy of the ballot, so that they may use the money they collect from contractors and the people from whom they purchase goods——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I withdraw that statement if it is unparliamentary; but the only interpretation you can take from the reading of section 17 in the Bill——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The objection I understand is that the hon. member is discussing a Bill which is on the Order Paper, and which is not the question now under discussion.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then we will discuss it outside, and tell the people of this country what it means. The Bill is before the House, and the opposition have a right to refuse the Supplies until it is withdrawn or is so amended that it will not be a weapon in the hands of this government to enfranchise every navvy who is working on the Transcontinental Railway in the province of Quebec, the province of Manitoba and the other provinces. The opposition have that right, and they will maintain that right as long as they can stand and endure before they will allow such a measure as that to pass, and deprive the honest electors of this country of the secrecy of the ballot.

An hon. MEMBER. Now we have it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, our hon. friends have it. It is due to them, and not to the Prime Minister, that such a Bill was introduced.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. Four or five years ago, these same men from Manitoba tried to bring in a similar Bill, but the Minister of Justice of that day said : No, I will never be a party to introducing such an infamous measure. The right hon. the First Minister denied any knowledge of any such Bill having been framed or contemplated, but the Bill itself, printed in the Government Printing Bureau—which is controlled by the right hon. gentleman—was read here the other day by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) ; and it was that Bill—exactly the same Bill as was brought down to-day—which the then Minister of Justice refused to introduce. To-day, however, we have a Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), who was brought up at the feet of ex-Premier Ross, of Ontario, and taught to do his dirty work in that province——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not use such an expression.

Mr. TAYLOR. I withdraw it, but the Bill is there and speaks for itself, and the name of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is attached to it. It was he who introduced it this session. I have read an article in to-day's Montreal 'Gazette' which describes the way this government have arranged the ballot, and it is for the purpose of enabling the government to manipulate the ballots at their will and get themselves again returned to power, that we have had this measure introduced. Here is the article from the 'Gazette' :

Winnipeg, June 4.—(Special)—Rev. Dr. John Pringle, a prominent Presbyterian divine, who has been in the public eye for some time owing to his fearless exposures of corruption in the Yukon, has arrived in the city as a delegate to the Presbyterian assembly.

I have, as a minister, got out into the open because of the present Yukon conflict, and I intend to stay. The half has not been told. The next three months I will have free, and when the members of the government have said their say in their endeavour to discredit my statements, then I will vindicate my statements.

One must have lived in the country itself to know in what standard it has been dragged to under the administration of the past few years. There have been other instances of corruption, of graft and immorality, and of scandalous action, but all of them have been a high standard of goodness as compared with the Yukon. A man may filch from the public treasury and violate a good many of the crimes in the code, and yet pass for honest in the Yukon, I can cite instances which people would not think of believing. I could tell of facts which reek so of immorality and corruption and sensuousness that they dare not be put in public print, all of which concerns government workers, and they are all facts that for decency sake dare not be put in print, and are being daily practised in the far north. These are facts which I intend to bring forth on the public platform for the benefit of Canada. I am not affording information for party ammunition, although it is impossible for me to avoid it being used as such. No man who had an atom of self-respect or a trace of decency could pass by the practices that are being perpetrated.

Immorality is so rife in the country that there is no standard of right and wrong. Public funds and the people's money have been wasted and stolen from where it belongs. Men have been disfranchised by the hundreds, aliens have been brought into vote in elections who had no right, and affairs have sunk to a level which has shamed this country'e name.

So far as I am concerned the fight is only beginning. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his ministers have the facts before them, both from letters I have written them and from interviews which I had with them. I know of one instance where in an election contest there were eight names on the list. On election day 120 voted at the booth.

How came it that 120 voted when there were only eight names on the list ? That could have been done only through the manipulation of the officers of this government in order to have the government candidate elected.

One man I know voted six times. I have proof for every word I utter and every accusation I make. This is equally at the service of the government at Ottawa, if they dare to make an investigation. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Sifton both have information which I gave them in a personal interview in 1904, and which in itself would be sufficient to discharge every official there. The franchise instance which I have just cited is one of the mildest of those connected with voters' lists. Most of the other matters are unfit to appear in print.

'No matter what the cost,' said Mr. Pringle, 'I have an aim in view which I intend to carry out. I have only begun the fight, and I

hope to prove to the people facts which show an adminstration unbelivedly corruptible. I have no personal feeling against any Yukon official. The fault is at Ottawa, and they will have to be responsible.

Then, speaking before the General Assembly in Winnipeg, the Rev. Mr. Pringle thus referred to the immorality in the Yukon :

Rev. John Pringle, of the Yukon, spoke of the conditions surrounding missionary work in the northern field. Mr. Pringle made only a passing reference to the charges he has advanced regarding the moral conditions in Dawson and the conduct of some of the officials. 'I may have been unwise,' said he. 'I may have said things unwisely, but I have tried to do right, and I have spoken the truth.'

In the conference, before his brother ministers, Mr. Pringle reiterated that every word he had spoken was the truth, yet we have ministers of the Crown in this House contradicting him. He declares, as a minister of the Gospel, that every word he spoke was true. Then he went on to say:

Mr. Pringle declared that he did not take these things into the pulpit in the Yukon. In the pulpit he preached the Gospel to those who came to church, not to be denounced but to be encouraged, and to be helped. When he had anything to say on the outside he took off his clerical collar and donned his moccasins and sweater and went on the public platform, where he could be answered. However, Mr. Pringle promised that at a later stage of the conference he would have something to say, so that those who expected to see him in his fighting clothes need not be disappointed.

And Mr. Pringle tells us that he has not told one-tenth part of the truth yet. He asked the government to grant him a committee, and they will not grant it. They sent instead an official to the Yukon to hear what people had to say, they did not take the statements of these people under oath, and then they attempt to force upon the people of this country a law which would deprive them of the secrecy of the ballot and empower this government to appoint their own officials to manipulate the lists and compel every navvy in their employ to cast a vote in their behalf. The opposition would be worse than serfs if they did not most determinedly oppose such a Bill, whose only intent is to defraud the electorate. We do not want anything unfair.

Mr. SPEAKER. That Bill is not under discussion.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am now talking about the franchise in Manitoba.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman was discussing the Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am pointing out what this government want to do. The province of Manitoba has the fairest franchise on its statutes of any province in the Dominion, yet this government want to take that franchise away. This government want to appoint their own men to make up the election lists for the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia and the unorganized districts in Quebec. The opposition would be worse than serfs were they to allow any such legislation to pass. So far as I am concerned, I have told the right hon. the First Minister that I am prepared to stay here and fight that Bill with the only weapon we have. The government want their estimates through in order that they may then force through this iniquitous Election Bill by means of their huge majority. They want to introduce the closure. Let me tell them that the people will insist on the rights of parliament being respected and maintained. The Minister of Finance says that the minority in parliament have no rights except what the majority choose to give them. He is confounding power with right ; but we have shown the government that when they refused to bring down original papers, we were in a position to compel them to do so. The government withheld this Election Bill until they can get their estimates through. They had it before the House from the 5th to the 19th May, and then they laid it aside in order to get their estimates through. They want to run through their estimates and then take up this Bill. But our constitution gives the opposition the right to ventilate their grievances before granting Supply, and this Election Bill is simply an outrage on the rights of a free people.

And whenever the government wish to remove that grievance, they will have no trouble in getting Supply, but until they do, I am satisfied that the opposition will use the weapon which law and constitution places in their hands. My belief is that not only Conservatives, but nine-tenths of the honest Liberals, justify the stand the opposition have taken and are taking, and would justify them if they did not vote a dollar even to pay the civil service. For the civil servants and the people at large know that it is the government and not the opposition that are responsible for the delay. As I have already said, they have allowed five months to pass with nothing done. The opposition did not hinder them ; there was no obstruction until this nefarious Bill came before parliament. In every way possible, the opposition helped on the work of legislation. But the government had no legislation ready ; they simply marked time ; the House met and adjourned. The government had not put in their accounts to the Auditor General in time to have the Auditor General's Report printed for the use of parliament. If there is delay in paying the civil service, that delay is the fault of the government and not the fault of the opposition. Now, I hope the Minister of Finance will rise and apologize for having attacked my hon.

friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) and told him that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), although paid $7,000 a year to stay here and attend to the people's business, had just as good a right to go stumping in a provincial election as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) who did not go at all. Why, look at the seats of members and supporters of the government to-day. There are only four or five ministers in their places and many of their supporters are away taking part in the election campaign on Monday. And when the returns of that election come in, I fancy that the government will be glad enough to withdraw this obnoxious legislation and allow the business of the country to proceed.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). It is really very amusing to see the attempt that hon. gentlemen opposite are making to get out of the hole that they find themselves in on this question of Supply. If my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had been here in the earlier part of todays's sitting, he would not have taken the stand he has taken. This discussion was launched by the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) complaining of the action of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) in taking part in the campaign in Ontario. The hon. gentleman took exception to a statement made by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) on Saturday last, that the Tory opposition in this House were withholding the Supply necessary to pay the salaries of Customs officials. We had the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) taking up an hour and a half of the time of the House trying to prove that the opposition were not blocking Supply. Now, we have the hon. member for Leeds taking up an hour and a half declaring defiantly: We are blocking Supply.

Mr. TAYLOR. The House opened this afternoon at 3.05 o'clock, and it is now 3.40. So, I spoke, just 35 minutes. But the hon. gentleman's statement is about as correct as any thing we hear from that side of the House.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) started at five minutes to one. The House rose at one and sat at three and it is now twenty minues to four. So the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) has been talking for three-quarters of an hour. So I stand corrected—the hon. gentleman has only taken three-quarters of an hour to say: We are blocking Supply we will continue to block Supply. I give my hon. friend credit for being honest in the matter. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) I believe was the first to state, as he did about a month ago, that the opposition were justified in taking what he said was the only constitutional course of blocking Supply until obnoxious legislation was withdrawn. That was repeated by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and has been re-echoed all over the country. The member for Leeds boldly stated it here last week.

But now the members of the opposition are getting scared. Last week, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) took an hour and a half to prove that the opposition were not blocking Supply. Today, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) tried to maintain the same position. What are the facts? We are told that there is to be an election in Ontario and an election in Quebec——

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) ought to know; he was out stumping.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not vote in either of these provinces, but I take the hon. gentleman's word as to the election. As I have said, members of the opposition are getting scared. About a week ago, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) tried for three or four days to get Supply to pay the salaries of the officers of his department. In the course of that discussion, the hon. member for Leeds said: Withdraw sections 1 and 17 of the Election Bill and we will give you Supply in a few minutes. But then they found that there was an immense vote in Ottawa dependent upon that Supply for a living. And they got scared—and virtuous. And now their cry is: For God's sake, give these people their money; we have voted it why don't you give it to them? Then, it was stated that no militia camps could be held because there was no money. And these hon. gentlemen got scared again, and I should imagine from the statement made by the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) that they are begging him: For God's sake, hold the militia camps. They are very anxious that all votes of Supply that can benefit them should be put through, but they will refuse to grant any thing that will not secure votes for their side. The action of these hon. gentlemen raises the question fair and square: Can the government of this country, whether Liberal or Conservative, afford to be placed in such a position as that? Can any government afford to place itself at the mercy of an opposition and virtually declare that, if the opposition do not like any thing contained in legislation that is introduced, all the opposition has to do is to withhold Supply and the government will back down? carried out in practice and you have a country ruled not by the majority but by the minority. The facts in this

case are very short. About March 1, a Bill was introduced providing for amendments to the election law. In the first week in May the second reading of this Bill was moved and the opposition opposed it. I am not going to discuss the merits or demerits of that Bill. Nor will I deny the right of the opposition to oppose a Bill that they believe to be unjust. But I do say that they have not the constitutional or moral or equitable right to say: Unless you will withdraw those provisions of the Bill which we regard as objectionable, we will deprive the Ottawa civil servants, the contractors, every man or woman who is paid by this government throughout the Dominion of their pay. There is no use trying to get away from it; there is no use in these hon. gentlemen saying: We will let you pay the Customs officials for fear we shall not get their votes in the pending election: take the money to hold the militia camps for fear we may not get the votes of those interested. These hon. gentlemen would like to get away from this, but we will hold them to it—the plain question is whether this country is to be ruled by the majority or by the minority. Concede what these hon. gentlemen now contend and you establish a precedent under which any future opposition can demand the withdrawal of any section of any Bill under threat of withholding Supply. Can any government, I say, afford to be placed in that position? Will the people of Canada justify any government in allowing itself to be put in that position?

It is no wonder the members of the opposition are trying to recede from this position. The course they took during the last week shows that they are trying to recede from it. They persistently obstructed Supply for three or four days over the vote to pay the civil servants in the Customs Department, then they gave in. Ever since then they have, by foolish and silly questions, delayed the granting of Supplies for hours, and finally have allowed one or two small items to go through in order that they might be able to say to the country: We are not blocking Supplies. Take their course last night. The Minister of the Interior brought in a resolution to grant $200,000 for the payment of certain salaries. I am willing to admit that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) had a right to ask the question with which he started the discussion, I am willing to admit that probably a quarter of an hour could be reasonably spent in the discussion of that question. After that, we had a spectacle which would not be tolerated in any other parliament of any civilized country in the world—we had three hours of obstruction, three hours taken up in every possible way, from the leader of the opposition down to the hon. member from Macdonald (Mr. Staples), for three hours and a half all sorts of silly questions were asked, and finally they granted the $200,000.

Mr. STAPLES. I want to ask the hon. gentleman who says: 'Down to the hon. member for Macdonald,' does he not think that the questions which the hon. member for Macdonald asked last evening are quite as intelligent as the stuff he is getting off at the present moment?

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. member wants an honest answer I shall have to tell him that I do not think so, and I think that every honest member of parliament on either side of the House will agree with me in my conclusion—except possibly the hon. member himself. Now, Sir, when the next item came up, as I said before, what did the opposition do? They deliberately blocked Supply, and then allowed the item to pass so that they might go to the country and say: We did not block Supply, because we gave you the $200,000. I ask again: Can any self-respecting government afford to be placed in this position? I say there is only one solution to this question; if this opposition, or any other opposition, chose to pursue such a course, the inevitable consequence will be the closure. I am not the first one to advocate the closure. I am going to quote to the hon. gentleman an authority coming from their own party, I am going to quote to them an article from the Montreal 'Gazette' of June 1, in the form of an editorial, a portion of which reads as follows:

> It is not the use, but the abuse of the right of discussion that creates public weariness and leads people to upset the natural order of things and to think of the government which acts as of more importance than the parliament that only talks. So, probably, the mass of the people, without knowing much about the situation, would approve of a plan which promised to shorten the session of parliament by checking the flow of unreported talk, Closure began in the French parliament. It was adopted by that of Great Britain. It exists in the Congress of the United States. These are in their way the three leading parliamentary bodies in the world. What they have agreed to accept may be expected to come in other popularly ruled countries.

To my mind that is the proper doctrine. I am sorry that it has become necessary that we should discuss the question of closure. Hon. gentlemen opposite, and more especially the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), have tried to show that this is not the first time Supply has been blocked in this parliament in order to prevent obnoxious legislation going through, and they have referred to the conduct of the Liberal opposition in 1896. But I want to tell the hon. member, and he knows I am telling him the truth, that it is not a parallel case at all. The records of this House can prove that there was no blocking of Sup-

ply. As a matter of fact parliament expired by effluxion of time on the 24th of April, and Supply was granted up to the 1st day of July following. The opposition gave the then government Supplies up to the first of July, and there was plenty of time between the 24th day of April and the 1st day of July within which to hold an election, to call parliament together and vote Supply. Therefore, I say that is not a parallel case. It is just as well that the people of this country should know that it is not a parallel case, and I hope the members on this side of the House will not forget to show the people that it is not. I am glad this question is beginning to be agitated. I am much obliged to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Owen) for bringing on this discussion. It is a question that needs to be discussed, it is a question on which the people should have more light. I think the people ought to know that if the civil servants cannot get their pay, if contractors cannot get their pay, if the railway navvies, as the hon. member for Leeds calls them, cannot get their pay, if the merchants and others from whom the government purchase supplies cannot get their pay, the people ought to know who is responsible for it. The idea of talking such nonsense as some hon. gentlemen do here, that they are not blocking Supply! I ask you, Sir, has there been an instance since this session began on the 28th of November last, when the government have asked for Supplies that they have not been met by an organized system of obstruction? I am safe in saying that in nine-tenths of the cases where the House has been moved into Committee of Supply they have been met by some sort of a ridiculous resolution, in many cases pressed on to a vote; if not pressed on to a vote, then by a ridiculous discussion, such as we have witnessed the last fortnight. The whole day has been taken up by discussion, and then along about midnight we get into Supply. Still hon. gentlemen opposite get up and say they have not blocked Supply. Take the last month. While the Minister of Public Works was trying to get his estimates through, we sat here night after night while they were blocking Supply, and towards the small hours of the morning perhaps one or two small items would go through. Now they come down and say: We are not blocking Supply, we want the employees of the Customs Department to get their pay, we want the militia to get their pay. But while they say so, all the time they are blocking Supply. Then they find fault with the Minister of Finance because he does not come down with a Supply Bill every other day, while they are only willing to allow a small item of $200,000 to get through in the course of a day. It is just as well that the people should know who it is that is blocking Supply. Let me give you two instances of what occurred when I was in New Brunswick last week. I met two contractors, one of them doing some work for the Grand Trunk Pacific, and another building a wharf in the county of Northumberland. Both of them have progress estimates amounting to thousands of dollars; and although they have been obliged to borrow money from the banks, although they have incurred liabilities while doing the work for the government, they could not get a dollar. Why? Because this loyal opposition won't allow them to have it, and because this opposition have deliberately pursued this policy of obstruction and have refused to let the estimates go through. They want to stop the construction of every public work in Canada, and it is just as well that the people should know upon whom to lay the blame. The blame is to be laid at the doors of the opposition, and not at the doors of the government. Therefore I say that this is a matter which ought to be discussed thoroughly; and I believe that if the opposition determine to persist in this unpatriotic, unworthy course, the next move the government will have to take is to adopt the closure. And I now say to the government that in my opinion, while I think that is the only course they can pursue, it is one that will be sanctioned and approved by the people of this country. Let the government start in at once to change the rules of this House, if it takes months to do it, in order to adopt the closure. While I say this, I do not claim that the opposition have no rights; I admit they have rights in this House, they have rights in every parliament. They have a right to discuss any question, they have a right to ask questions when the government are asking Supply and they are entitled to all possible information, but there is not a man of them, except the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), who has intimated that the government have withheld any information which would justify them in taking the course they have taken. They have a right to discuss all these questions and then they have a further right to demand a vote upon any item; but that is all they have a right to do, and the people of Canada are justified in asking that they shall be reasonable and when they have exhausted these rights allow the business of the country to proceed. Therefore I repeat that it is useless for them to attempt to withdraw from the position. Either they have to take the position that they will block Supply deliberately, as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has done and stand by it and be responsible or take the other course and say: We will act constitutionally, we will discuss these questions as they should be discussed and when we have discussed them to that extent we will vote against

these measures and leave it to the people to say whether we have acted rightly or wrongly.

I feel that this is a matter of such importance that we should hear from more members on this side of the House. I feel further that it is up to the government, to use a slang expression, to take more drastic measures than they have in the past unless this policy of deliberate obstruction is withdrawn in a very short time.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). We have listened to quite a lecture from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. We are not unaccustomed to it, as during this session there has been hardly a day that some hon. junior member of the Liberal party has not seen fit to tell the opposition how they should conduct the affairs committed to their hands. For my part I prefer to be guided by the advice of those in whom I have confidence and by my own judgment. I have been absent from the House for a couple of days and have met a great number of intelligent people, Liberal and Conservative, and I venture to say that the voice of the people has come back to the members of the government and they know pretty well what they are up against now, and so, as the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) has just said, they are glad of an opportunity of speaking to-day and so they may be. The government to-day realize that if they can possibly get any excuse for talking and beclouding the issue until after the elections in Ontario and Quebec, it is better to do so than even to get Supplies through. Who are obstructing to-day? Who but the Minister of Finance and those who, at his instance, have taken up the time of the House. Was any hon. gentleman on this side opposed to going into Supply? Is there anything to prevent us, except the organized system which has developed among the supporters of the government, from going into Supply? I understand that in my absence Supply has been granted from day to day, and there is no reason, so far as I know, why we should not have been in Supply at 11.30 this morning, had it not been for the excited and unnerved speech of the Minister of Finance, followed by the long and in some cases utterly irrelevant speeches of hon. gentlemen who support him. Now that the Minister of Finance should be unnerved and excited is not surprising. If he knows the pulse of the people of Canada to-day it would be surprising if he was not unnerved and excited. If he could calmly, as a statesman, reason the questions that come up from time to time in his old time way it would be surprising to me. He knows perfectly well that the current of public opinion has set so strongly against the government that it is absolutely necessary they should resort to any plausible excuse for tiding over the difficulties pressing on them, pending the two elections which they know will have such an important bearing on the election they will soon have to face themselves. They want to try and modify the feeling of want of confidence that exists in the electorate to-day. The fact is that the government are at sixes and sevens on almost every point they have to deal with, and that they are so on this very question of Supply is perfectly evident from the statement of the Minister of Finance to-day. The Minister of Finance would like the House to understand that the Minister of Customs was right in his statement that he was prevented by the action of the opposition from paying the 1,800 officials in his department. On May 26 at 3 o'clock in the morning an item of $1,705,000 was brought up for us to vote. To show you that the Minister of Finance has not one leg to stand on in his contention that there is anything to prevent those 1,800 people from being paid, I refer to the 'Hansard' and find that an hour and a half later, at the close of the discussion, the minister said :

> I want to pay these men to-day. This is the day that we issue our cheques. We do not want them to be delayed, we want to issue our cheques if possible to-day and we want you to grant this item of $1,705,000.

And so it was recognized that if we would grant Supply the money would go immediately to these employees. On the 29th, the next time it came up, the greater part of the item having gone through, he said :

> Let the whole item go through because I do not think I can use a part of it. I do not know that the Auditor General will issue the cheques unless the whole item is passed.

Therefore he pleads to let the amount go through. The leader of the opposition said that it would be no harm to let it stand until Monday when the minister would have the cheques. The minister said:

> Yes, but it is discriminating between the inside and the outside service. But will I get it on Monday so I can issue the cheques?

He was told that he could in all probability and he received the amount which was granted on the statement that it was necessary to issue the cheques at once and that the Auditor General would allow the cheques to issue as soon as the item was approved of by this House. And so he would have done if he had confidence in the administration. But it appears by the press that the Auditor General does not see his way under present conditions to allow it unless the Supply Bill passes. The leader of the opposition said at that time :

> Let the $40,000 item stand.

Mr. FIELDING said :

No, it would stop the whole item. The several items constitute one resolution, so that there would be nothing to report.

But now, when they find that the Auditor General, for reasons that are sufficient to himself and in which he may be perfectly justified, refuses to allow the cheques to issue until the Supply Bill is introduced and passed, these gentlemen assume another attitude. Why do they not bring down a Supply Bill? They have brought down Bills for infinitely smaller matters than this, and there is no reason why they should not bring in a Supply Bill. As a matter of fact, I claim it is absolutely their bounden duty to introduce a Supply Bill at once. They have made the statement that we were preventing the holding of militia camps. They know that we were never asked for a vote for that purpose and when we ask them to take action they hesitate. They do not know what they want or do not want, but meantime slander the opposition by innuendoes and statements in their press.

Is it worth while to introduce a Supply Bill? Let us see what we have passed within a little more than half a month. On May 15 we passed $533,000 of estimates for the Minister of Public Works. On May 20 we passed estimates amounting to $1,104,975. On May 22 we passed $5,479,110, a pretty big day's work. On May 29 and June 1 this item of the Minister of Customs was completed and by it we have passed $1,815,187 which, with the amount already passed, made a total vote on that item of $2,074,075. On June 2 we passed $198,548 and on June 3 we passed $216,293. Not counting the hundreds of thousands of dollars we passed yesterday we have in 15 or 16 days at six sittings of the House voted $9,347,113, and that money is immediately available for the government and for the men.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just one-quarter of the annual expenditure under the Conservative government.

Mr. LENNOX. That may not appear a great deal of money to these gentlemen opposite with their wild ideas of expenditure and ghastly extravagance, but under ordinary circumstances it is a very large sum. And they can add to that within 24 hours, because if they bring down any reasonably non-contentious items they will be passed at once. There is no disposition on the part of the opposition to absolutely block Supply, but in view of the disclosures we have had this session, last session, and the session before, the government has shown itself absolutely undeserving of the confidence of the people and in the public interest the opposition must carefully scrutinize these expenditures. The Minister of Finance has again reiterated the statement that the opposition have no rights except such as the majority at his back see fit to concede and the member for Yale-Cariboo has endorsed that statement, while the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has adopted a more rational view. Well Sir, it will be a poor day for Canada and it will be a wretched opposition when the opposition will consult the government of the day as to what they shall do and how they shall criticise the expenditures of the country and the policy of the government. It is the duty of the opposition to guard the public treasury, to watch closely the progress of public business, to scrutinize the acts of the government, and in the honest discharge of that duty there should be no hard and fast rule laid down to bind them. The opposition are to-day only too anxious to take the verdict of the people of the country on whether they have been faithfully discharging their duty, and on whether the government should be allowed longer to remain in power. I have very great respect for the hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon) both in his personal and public capacity, but I must say that he had a very ungracious task assigned to him this morning by some members of the government in having to go through an argument in which he evidently took no interest and which I doubt very much that he himself appreciated. I venture to say that no one in the House thinks that argument of the hon. gentleman had any relevancy whatever to the practical issues we are discussing to-day. The hon. gentleman said that the opposition had on occasions come out in their war paint, and he asked why should they use 100 ton guns to shoot flies. Well, I would like to know that too. Look at the flies on the other side of the House. It used to be flies on the wheel but now it is flies on the run or it will be as soon as the people of Canada get a chance at them. When the time comes that these gentlemen on the other side of the House are sitting in opposition, and that time will be soon if we can judge of the public sentiment, I wonder if they will advocate the principles we hear them advocate to-day. You talk about killing time by delivering long and irrelevant speeches, as being obstruction, and yet the supporters of the government are the chief sinners of this session. For some purpose or other they have been constantly delivering important speeches which have had no relevancy to the question before the chair, and this I attribute to the fact that the government were not ready with public business, and so their supporters had to come to their aid and cause delay. Where is the Civil Service Bill, so long promised? Where is the Land Bill? It was introduced just one week ago although we had it up last session and presumably the government should have introduced it the very first day of this session; but it has been delayed until the

7th month. It is an intricate Bill and one which will require to be well considered and discussed. It is no secret that on these questions with regard to which we on this side are opposed to government, there have been dissensions amongst the supporters of the government themselves, —want of harmony in their ranks—and therefore in order to get time to bring the warring factions of the Liberal party together the government has delayed its measures. Does the Minister of Finance think that we are going to enter a blind pool every time he asks us. He wanted one-quarter of the total Supply without the items being discussed and the leader of the opposition granted him one-eighth. After letting the whole time run until, as the Minister of Customs said, the last day for payment of these officials had arrived, they come and asked us to give another one-eighth, another blind pool. If we had granted that, they would have wanted one-half, and we would have come practically to the end of the session without one important item of legislation being brought down and the whole of the Supplies voted without our knowing what those Supplies covered. I protest against that. The hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, (Mr. Carvell) thinks we should be limited to a quarter of an hour in discussing important questions. I do not think we are to be told that we are to have a quarter of an hour or half an hour or anything of that kind. We are sent here to be our own judges of the course we pursue. I put myself in the judgment of the people, and not in the judgment of the hon. gentlemen opposite as to what course is proper. Each member must judge for himself what course he should take on the various measures as they arise.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the hon. member adhere to the principle laid down by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that the opposition will and ought to resist the granting of Supplies until the Election Bill is withdrawn?

Mr. LENNOX. That is just another illustration of the fact that the supporters of the government cannot appreciate either what the opposition say or what the trend of public opinion is in many cases. The hon. gentleman utterly fails to understand the significance of the argument of the hon. member for Leeds. The hon. member for Leeds, as I understand him, propounds this principle, that when an iniquitous measure is brought in, one that is far reaching in its consequence, one that is totally indefensible, one that should not be passed in the interests of the people as a whole, not some little side issue that affects a small number of people, but a great measure that affects the dearest rights and privileges of all the people of Canada, the opposition should use every legitimate means in their power to prevent such legislation being passed.

Mr. CARVELL. Just one more question. Does the hon. member contend that the absolute refusal to grant Supplies is a legitimate means of opposing the proposed legislation?

Mr. LENNOX. There are times when it would be quite proper for an opposition absolutely to refuse to grant Supplies, and I think we are probably approaching very close to that time now. I do not say that we are actually up against it. I say that when the government have acted in such a way all along the line that the opposition can have no confidence in their administration, and have no reason to believe that the public moneys will be honestly expended in the interest of the people, then we have reached a time when it is not only the privilege, but the incumbent duty of the opposition, to stand firm as one man and present a united front against the passage of any Supplies. I hope we won't come to that condition; but I do say, feeling the responsibility of my words as a member of this House, that we have approached perilously near it. I say, looking all along the line of this administration, and seeing how it is marked by extravagance, and it does not stop at extravagance—by reckless extravagance—that would not describe it either—but by acts which I shall not characterize in this House, but which are well known to the public—I say the administration of this government, in almost every department, is marked by things which indicate that the people have lost confidence in it; and the members of the House knowing more of their administration than the people outside, but not more than I hope the people will know very soon, I say it may become the duty of the opposition to stand firm as one man and refuse to grant Supplies to the administration. We are not at that point yet; we are not yet at the parting of the ways; and, on the other hand, I think we ought to be almost at the point of granting Supplies this afternoon. I hope we will get into Supply now, unless as a matter of fact the government want to distract public attention unless they do not want anything done this afternoon. But if they want to tide over the first of next week, as I think they do, then we may expect that the suggestion of the hon. member for Carleton will be followed, and that we shall have more oratory from the government side of the House. Answering the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, let me refer to other authorities on this question of withholding the Supplies. Sir Richard Cartwright, in 1896, discussing a similar question, said :

These gentlemen were responsible for the good government of the country while they occupied seats on the treasury benches. They knew perfectly well long before the 1st of April that there was not the ghost of a chance of their getting the Remedial Bill through under any condition of things.

I pause there to say that these hon. gentlemen who introduced the Bill that has been referred to, left it until the 9th of March and then until the 6th of May, and they knew perfectly well that there was not the ghost of a right to get it through under any conceivable condition of things.

They knew perfectly well that there was not a ghost of a chance of their getting their estimates through.

These gentlemen held this Bill back, and so created the same kind of difficulty as that which Sir Richard Cartwright is here dealing with, knew perfectly well that the fiscal year expired on the 31st of March, and they did not introduce this contentious Bill until the 9th of March.

They knew perfectly well when the fiscal year expired on the 1st of July that they could not get Supplies, as they had lost control of the parliament.

Is there any doubt about this administration having lost the control of parliament? They have not only lost control of parliament, but the confidence of the people, and it is because they realize that to-day and do not know where they are at that they do not know what is the wisest thing to do. Whenever the Finance Minister gets up now to speak, he has lost his old time vigour and firmness and is utterly unnerved and unstrung, and talks in that exciting, uncontrolled, unmeasured style I so much regret to see.

Mr. TAYLOR. Lost his head.

Mr. LENNOX. I will not say that; but he is going to lose his position very soon if we can get the general elections on. Sir Richard Cartwright went on to say:

What would honourable men have done in such a case? What would men imbued with the spirit of British usage and precedence have done? Why, Sir, they would have dissolved the parliament they could not control, and found out whether or not they did enjoy the confidence of the people of Canada.

Hon. gentlemen opposite suggested that they would dissolve parliament. They let it go out in the press that they would do so; but when the time came they had not the nerve to dissolve parliament, because they did not want a speedy trial and a speedy conviction. Further, Sir Richard said:

More than that, they would have taken care to have dissolved in such time that they might have had their elections early in May, and met early in June at the very latest, in order that parliament might deal with the questions which it was clearly impossible for parliament to have dealt with at the time I have referred to.

I have also under my hand utterances by the Prime Minister, but they are very voluminous. I will just take a statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), whom I see in the House. He said:

My remarks, Mr. Chairman, are quite relevant. I wish to point out that the government are unable to pass this Remedial Bill into law, that they no longer represent the people, that they no longer enjoy the confidence of the members of this House, and therefore, that parliament would not be warranted in trusting to them the expenditure of $1,000,000 to boodle with.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. Sometimes we are called to order in this House. This hon. gentleman used the expression 'boodle' and applied it to the transactions of the government and was not called to order. He declared that the government of that day, which had been elected by a large majority, had so demonstrated their unfitness that he would not trust them with the expenditure of $1,000,000. Are we therefore to be censured for not being disposed to trust this government, whose disregard of all honesty and decency is so evident with the vast sums they are asking us to vote in the dark? I am prepared to vote Supply. We want to co-operate with the government in voting Supply. We have to call on them to bring forward the necessary estimates—estimates in the interests of the people. Speaking for myself, I am not very much in sympathy with the remarks of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) regarding the contractors. The contractors are a dangerous element in elections. If this election Bill of the government is to go through, we ought to scrutinize these matters very closely. The distribution of large funds to contractors on the eve of the elections in Ontario and Quebec is very dangerous, and I am convinced it is better not to disburse these large amounts to contractors until after the elections. Of course I can well realize the anger and disappointment of some supporters and members of the administration over their failure to have the supplies voted before a general election. But if you will look along the line of the discussion, you will find that there has been no instance in which the opposition have been obstructing the passing of reasonable estimates. We have certainly demanded a certain amount of information, but the trouble is that when the opposition are

ready to grant Supply the government are not prepared to go on. Just as happened yesterday and the day before, whenever an offer is made to facilitate business, the government show that they are utterly unready. They realize that they are far behind with the necessary legislation—legislation they have promised and must pass this session if they are going to discharge their duties at all—and then they set up speaker after speaker to obstruct business and in this way tide matters over until after the provincial elections in Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). I do not very often trouble the House, and I can assure the gentleman who has just spoken that I have not been put up to obstruct legislation or delay proceedings. I was going to say a few days ago what I intend saying now, but unfortunately for myself I mentioned the election Bill and was ruled out of order. To-day however it is pretty hard to tell when one is out of order after what I have heard. I do not intend to mention the election Bill any more than to say a little about the position in which we are to-day. When I was a young man I joined a society, and one of the first things impressed upon my mind—and it was continually impressed upon me at the opening ceremonies—was that I should yield a cheerful compliance to the constituted majority. I had the idea, from my experience in societies and organizations of one kind and another ever since, that the majority should rule, and that when a man finds he is in a hopeless minority, he should fall in with the majority or at least give way when he sees he cannot get the majority to think as he does. But it is entirely the opposite in this House. There does not seem to be the majority rule here. When a certain Bill was brought into this House—I have to be very careful, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to discuss the Bill—which affected one or two provinces, all the representatives from the province to which I belong, were quite agreeable to the provisions of the Bill. They were agreeable at least to its going into committee, and in committee they would no doubt lend a hand in altering some of its provisions. But the majority from the province of British Columbia, which is one of the two affected, were quite agreeable that this Bill should pass its second reading. In the other province affected, seven of its representatives were willing that the Bill should be proceeded with but three objected. The opposition took up the view of those three and have proceeded on the assumption that those three gentlemen are possessed of brains of such a superior calibre that their opinion and judgment should have far more weight than the opinion and judgment of the other seven. Well, I do not think that is at all in accord with our ideas of responsible government. Those men should have yielded cheerfully to the opinion of the majority—a majority elected in the same way as they were. In my province there was no protest against the election of any members. They were all elected in a straightforward manner so far as I know, and I have heard very little objection from my province to that particular Bill. Therefore I do not see why the House should be tied up as it is simply because three members from one of the provinces do not like the provisions of the Bill. But even if every member on the opposition side objected to the Bill, they are only one-half as many as those who are willing that the Bill should be proceeded with. We have heard a good deal about the opinion of the man on the street. Well, let the members of the opposition take the opinion of the general run of men on the street, and they will find that these men are wondering how a government, with so strong a majority, can be held up as this government has been for some time past. On this question of holding up, we find contradiction among our opponents. One section says that the government are not held up, that they are willing the government should go ahead, and that it is the fault of the government when they do not get ahead with their Supply. But one or two others threaten that the government will not get a dollar unless they drop that election Bill. What are we to understand from this? My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has told us that he had gone up and consulted his constituents and they instructed him to come down to Ottawa and fight this election Bill to a finish and that they would get up a subscription to pay his board bill, if he were not able to pay it himself, so that he might stay here until the snow would fly.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the opinion of the man on the street.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY. I would like to ask: Who are these people from Leeds? It seems to me that my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) thinks the sun rises and sets in his constituency. I would like to ask him some day to follow the sun and proceed west, and he will find that it takes five days and nights on a railway train to find out where the sun sets in this Dominion. And he will find constituencies all along that line each one with just as intelligent a population as that of the constituency of Leeds, and who have sent a majority here who are as well able to form a judgment as any of the people of Leeds. We have been taunted this afternoon with taking up the time of the House and keeping the House from getting into Committee of Supply. I am not going to be guilty of that. I am one of the 'bur-

docks' on the back benches—that, I think, is the elegant expression which was used by an hon. gentleman not very far from where I sit—I am not very often heard from nor do I obstruct or take up the time of the House. But I would ask the opposition to consider this matter seriously, to think for themselves how the man on the street is likely to view their proceedings in this House. It is wonderful the prophetic view of these gentlemen and how they can tell exactly how the people regard every matter and what is to be the result of the next election. But we have heard the same thing over and over again for many elections back. And still the results have come far short of what these hon. gentlemen would wish. I think that after the next election they will find the result about the same.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). Like the last speaker, (Mr. Kennedy) I seldom address the House. Nor should I detain hon. members long. But there are times when even the quietest member in this House should rise in his place to protest against the way business is conducted. The question now under discussion was brought to the attention of the House this morning by the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) in a speech of five or ten minutes. And we have found hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House ready to carry that discussion along; every time a member on this side has risen to speak to-day, he has been answered in a long speech by an hon. member from the other side. I was glad to hear the hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon), for like myself he seldom troubles the House, and I am sure that his only reason for rising to speak was that he thought that what he was to say was of importance to the House and the country. Such a member should always be listened to.

Now, in the first place, when we came here—and it is nearly seven months ago—we expected that the work of this parliament would be ready to go on with. But what do we find after seven months? We find that the most important legislation of the session is only now being prepared for our consideration. Could there be a more important subject, for instance, than the Hudson Bay Railway? That is a subject that should be discussed here with the very greatest care. We should consider the course that road is to take, for it would be a very serious matter if it were built in the wrong position. My own opinion is after considering carefully all that has been said in the long discussion of the matter that the road should go directly from Prince Albert to Fort Churchill. Then, we have the Civil Service Bill—another question that will require time. In the third place, we have this disputed question in regard to the election law. All these things are being brought before us after seven months of sitting? Why were these not all ready when we came here in November? In the county of Huron we have a county council composed of business men and farmers, and I would undertake to bring them here and they would finish the business of this parliament, do everything that has to be done here, and do it well, in six weeks. I am ashamed to think that we have sat here all this time and accomplished so little. It is not that we do not go through the form of working, for we sit here such long hours that we actually endanger the health of members of the House. There is only one factory in this Dominion that I know of where the employees are expected to go to work at eleven o'clock in the morning and work until three or four the next morning, and that is this factory on Parliament Hill where we empty windbags and manufacture laws. I think that if we were to try to get our speeches into condensed and concise form, it would be much better. Why, Sir, Mr. Chamberlain has delivered some of the best speeches ever delivered in the British parliament in half an hour. And here we are on both sides—there is no use in finding fault with one side more than with the other—making speeches of four and five hours duration. Do you think any body will ever read them? Do not you think that the people who read 'Hansard' in after years will say that we spend forty times as long in expressing our ideas as we have any need to do? At the origin of parliament, you know, Mr. Speaker, the struggles that were gone through to establish the rights and privileges of the body of representatives of the people. The sword, and even the stake and the axe, had to be met and overcome that we might have certain privileges and advantages. And I am sure that even the opposition has its rights that were gained in those struggles. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite should say that the opposition has no rights except such as the majority choose to allow them. In fact, I do not think they meant what they said. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) admit that members of the opposition had some rights. This parliament takes up more time in legislating for six millions of people than is occupied by the British parliament in legislating for four hundred millions. I am only speaking for myself, but I should be very much pleased to see the speeches cut down. In the United States Congress, I understand, a member speaking on an amendment is limited to five or ten minutes. I think that it would be a good thing if our speeches could be made equally short. I believe also that the Speaker should leave the chair at twelve o'clock at night, just as he does at six o'clock in the evening. If these changes were made, I believe we should make better progress. It is some-

thing terrible what the members here are expected to submit to. I came down here from the county of Huron three years ago on the tenth of last January, and five of my neighbours came with me as members of this House. We were all strong, healthy men—I was the oldest and most worn-out man of the whole six. And where are the men now? Three of them are dead and buried and other men sit in their places. We six were the representatives of the three Hurons, the two Bruces and North Wellington. All must have been strong able-bodied men, or we could not have gone through the labours of a political campaign. But long hours, irregular meals and worry did their work. Why, it would appear to be more dangerous to come to this parliament than it was to go to South Africa and fight the Boers—the death-rate here is much greater than it was there. Let me draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that, since 1904, we have had the following deaths amongst us: Messrs. McCreary, McIntosh, Proulx, Clarke, Sutherland, Demers, Johnston, Prefontaine, Bland, Laurier, Martin, Stockton, Cochrane, Gunn and Lovell—fifteen men taken away in that short time. I have no doubt at all—and I am sure the medical men on the other side will back me up in this—that this room is an unhealthy place. We get here no direct sunlight; and we know that sunlight is necessary for health. Take a potato and plant it in a cellar where there is no light, and though you may have moisture, good soil, proper temperature and all other necessary conditions, what will be the colour of the stems? The stems will be pale and sickly.

I think it would be well to change the rules of the House. For instance, we should have short, concise speeches. Let it be understood that when we have something to say we say it and then sit down. A gentleman about to address the House was asked how long he intended to speak on a certain subject, and he said, 'If I know nothing about it, it will take me three hours; if I understand it fairly well, I can get through in an hour; and if I know it perfectly well, I can get through in half an hour.' I think there are some members here who speak sometimes when they do not understand very well what they are talking about. I think there should be a time limit for speeches, with perhaps some way of giving a special privilege to members under certain circumstances. I think the rules of the House might be changed in that direction. I think also that the government should have their business ready when parliament opens so that we can get right down to work. The government cannot get out of this whole difficulty by trying to throw the blame on the opposition. A certain amount of blame may be attached to the opposition. I think, however, it is a good thing we have a 'Hansard,' because that 'Hansard' will show, this year's 'Hansard' at any rate will show, that the members on the government side of the House have taken up as much time as we have, and perhaps more. There is no use denying what is put down in the 'Hansard.' All the important measures of the government should be ready at the beginning of the session. There is another thing we should not forget, the health of the members ought to be considered. If we are to be kept here so many months every year it will soon become impossible for a poor man to come here at all. In fact any man who has business, or anything to do outside this House, can scarcely afford to come here now, because he has to stay here so long that it spoils his business. We will not be able to get good men to come to parliament as long as the sessions are as lengthy as they are now. I formerly thought that all the men who come to parliament were great men, but I am obliged to confess that my opinion has undergone a considerable change since I came to this parliament. My idea was that we had here two hundred and fourteen men, the greatest men probably in the world, and I came to my first session in awe and trembling. I am beginning now to think that after all they are not such great men. But I suppose that is a consequence of my view point. Now I want to say also that long sessions are causing more deaths than used to take place when the sessions were shorter. I find that during the first ten years when the sessions were shorter, there were only twenty-five deaths, while during the last three years there have been fifteen deaths. It is, however, not only a question of health, but one of business. I hope therefore we will not go on in this fashion like a lot of school boys. I think if the government gave the back benchers a chance to settle this question, and allowed the front benchers to go off on a picnic, both the members of the government and the leaders of the opposition, we on the back benches could get together, and I am satisfied we would settle this whole thing and finish up in about two weeks. I did not get up to talk long, and I do not intend to transgress the rules that I am recommending the House to adopt.

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

Contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign agencies, and general immigration expenses, including salaries of extra clerks at head office, $710,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the minister why this large appropriation, nearly three-fourths of the total $920,000, is offered to us under the item of contingencies? Is it not possible to give a more definite idea of the purposes to which this is

to be applied? I suppose it is an old custom.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I do not wish to be held responsible for the method in which the item is placed before the House; as my hon. friend has said, it is an old custom. While it is possible that in many particulars the House might fairly be asked for a definite amount, on the other hand, it is a fact that the expendiures covered by this part of the vote are variable in their character, owing to circumstances and conditions uncontrollable by the government. If the amount were divided up and apportioned to different purposes, it might be found that by reason of changed circumstances one item would be more than was necessary while another would fall short of the requirements. That is probably the reason that prompted the former government to present the estimates in that way. Of course, we are able to give a statement of the sum that has been voted for the former year, and to give to the House our expectations in regard to the sum that we ask the House to vote now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thoroughly agree that this particular item is one which embraces an extremely varied expenditure, but I would have thought that if you left $150,000 for contingencies it might meet the requirements. I would not press that very much if the minister with his experience in the department thinks it necessary to have the vote in this form. If he would, however, give the heads of expenditure last year and briefly the heads of expenditure this year, I think it would assist matters.

Mr. OLIVER. If I might finish what I was about to say, generally we are able to state to the House our expectations or intentions in regard to the amounts we ask for, but in this item, if circumstances arise which render it unnecessary to make an expenditure, then when we get the bulk vote we are able to vary the expenditure, whereas if it were voted item by item we would not be able to make that variation, and it would necessarily result in a very much larger total amount being required to be voted so that all possibilities of change would be guarded against. The amount asked for this year is the same as was asked for last year. Of that amount the estimates that we make as to the expenditure as follows: Advertising, printing pamphlets, &c., $178,000. This is for advertising in Canada, the United States, Great Britain and Ireland and the continent of Europe. It includes the printing of what we call literature in all the different languages of the countries in which we are undertaking to do business and indeed, in the immigration work in the United States we require to use printing in different languages, Scandinavan, German and French. The expenditure in the fiscal year 1906-7 on this account was $117,500 for nine months.

Mr. FOWLER. Who gets up that literature, your own officers?

Mr. OLIVER. We just do the best we can. Some of our own officers compile some of the publications and sometimes we engage the services of other parties.

Mr. FOWLER. How much have you paid for outside parties during the year and who were they?

Mr. OLIVER. The matter contained in the atlas of Canada, which has been distributed very extensively, was chiefly prepared by Mr. Carmen, of Montreal. He is a newspaper man employed on one of the papers there.

Mr. FOWLER. The 'Herald,' probably.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is on the 'Star;' he is an editorial writer.

Mr. STAPLES. How many of these atlases were published last year?

Mr. OLIVER. We have published several editions. I cannot give the actual figures, but approximately about 150,000.

Mr. STAPLES. What do they cost per copy?

Mr. OLIVER. The edition that is now being circulated costs 7½ cents apiece in 100,000 lots. Another gentleman who was employed was a Mr. Cliff, a newspaper man of Sault Ste. Marie, formerly resident in the Northwest for many years. Mr. Dean, editor of the Nelson 'News,' contributed the matter for British Columbia that is contained in the atlas.

Mr. FOWLER. He was an unsuccessful candidate in the local election, was he not?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. In how many languages have they been published?

Mr. OLIVER. Seven languages. Mr. Kennedy, of the London 'Times' staff, was engaged during the past winter to do some work, the results of which have only partly been published.

Mr. STAPLES. What would he know about Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. He lived in Canada most of his life, being acquainted with conditions in Canada through his residence here for most of his adult life, and being in newspaper work and now resident in England, it was thought that he would be able to present Canadian facts in a manner that would appeal to the people of the British Islands possibly better than one who was not acquainted with the British Isles.

Mr. FOWLER. That would seem to be reasonable.

Mr. OLIVER. I was very much impressed with some work he did in describing the Northwest the year before in letters which appeared in the London 'Times,' and he afterwards practically compiled the same matter into a publication which he issued at his own cost in the old country. I was very favourably impressed with his grasp of the subject and his method of presenting it, and went so far as to engage him especially to come to Canada during the past winter in order to present the conditions as to labour which existed then. I suggested that by going through the maritime provinces he might prepare something in regard to those provinces in reference to which so far we have been rather lacking in literature.

Mr. FOWLER. Very neglectful of.

Mr. OLIVER. Lacking at any rate. I have already received what Mr. Kennedy has given us in regard to Nova Scotia. It is now in the printer's hands and I think it will be found to be fairly satisfactory.

Mr. FOWLER. I hope the minister has not neglected New Brunswick?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the matter which he has prepared for New Brunswick is in my hands, but I have not handed it to the printer, and I am expecting what he has to say about Prince Edward Island very shortly.

Mr. FOWLER. How much time did he spend in the maritime provinces getting up these facts?

Mr. OLIVER. I think about a month. Of course I must admit that the time is short. It seemed to me that this gentleman had particular ability in that line. We were doing the best we could to get the facts with regard to these provinces as well as we could gather them and present them in a form that would commend these provinces to the minds of the people in the old country for whom we think there is a desirable field there.

Mr. FOWLER. Some men could gather such information in a month and others would need six months, just depending upon the ability of the man. If Mr. Kennedy having had a long experience from residence in Canada is a clever man he ought to be able to present these facts in such a way as to be attractive to the English readers.

Mr. OLIVER. That was my idea. He is not a cheap man by any means.

Mr. FOWLER. It depends on his ability whether he is a cheap man or not. What will it cost?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the whole cost will be about $1,500 or $2,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What time will he occupy in that work?

Mr. OLIVER. I can hardly say. It was an experiment and it appealed to me as being a good idea. As we propose to spend a considerable sum of money in publications which will present these provinces to the people of the old country we think it is by no means waste to spend a good deal of money in getting the right matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a sound principle because the printing and distribution will cost the same whether the matter is good or bad. I agree that it is worth while to try the work of a man who understands the view point of the people among whom the literature is to be distributed. I think the minister has made a wise move in that.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose this literature is first written in English and translated into the various languages?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. What are the seven languages?

Mr. OLIVER. English, French, German, Flemish, Holland (Dutch), Danish, Swedish, Norwegian and Finnish.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I see that the London 'Advertiser' was paid for printing 50,000 copies of the land reports. In what form were they printed, and were they intended for distribution in eastern Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. That particular pamphlet was intended for distribution especially in Great Britain.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Are the subagents resident in the United States working under our salaried agents at different points?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Was any portion of this vote used for paying for these new Doukhobors that have come to the country?

Mr. OLIVER. No. I presume my hon. friend refers to reports in the newspapers as to a carload of Doukhobors having some trouble with regard to their passage money.

Mr. FOWLER. I think it was a train load.

Mr. OLIVER. I can assure my hon. friend that so far as any information we have in the department goes no Doukhobors have come to this country, and if any have come they have certainly come without cost to the government and without any inducement being held out by the government in any shape or manner. We are informed that one family arrived about two months ago, but as they did not come within the requirements of our present regulations

which are somewhat stringent, they were excluded.

Mr. FOWLER. How long has the government ceased to encourage the immigration of Doukhobors?

Mr. OLIVER. I might answer that by saying seven years, but to make it plain I should say that the arrangement entered into with regard to the Doukhobors was a single effort in relation to a certain special colony or section, and was supposed to be made in the joint cause of religious liberty and the beneficial settlement of the Northwest. It was not carried any further.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). How many of the Doukhobors migrated last year to British Columbia?

Mr. OLIVER. We have no official information. Our immigration branch is not responsible in regard to the colony as now constituted. But I have heard through the ordinary channels that about 100 heads of families have recently gone to British Columbia to occupy lands which have been purchased there on behalf of the community.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood that an order had been issued by the department compelling the Doukhobors who desired to live in the communal condition to give up the lands that had been issued to them. Is that correct?

Mr. OLIVER. That is hardly the way I would care to have the matter put. The Doukhobors made homestead entry for certain lands in 1903, but did not comply with the homestead conditions.

Mr. FOWLER. Were those entries made by the individuals themselves or by some person on behalf of them.

Mr. OLIVER. They were made just as other entries were at that time allowed to be made, that is to say, they were proxy entries. Ostensibly they were made for the individual Doukhobors, each of whom made his entry in exactly the same terms as other people, and signed his application in just the same way.

Mr. FOWLER. Afterwards?

Mr. OLIVER. No. The entrant was not required to be in bodily presence in the land office, but he had to sign his application personally and he became responsible for the affidavit contained in the application.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there not such a think as a blanket entry which the individual did not have to sign?

Mr. OLIVER. No. When the Doukhobors came to the country certain lands were set apart as a service, upon which they alone might secure homestead entry. Up to 1903 few if any of them had made entry. In 1903 they were informed by the department that if they were going to retain control of those lands, or any part of them, they must make entry for them. In accordance with the negotiations that then took place, they made entry in the way that I have mentioned, on the ordinary forms, and these forms were accepted, and their entries stood in the book against those lands subject to the ordinary homestead conditions.

Mr. FOWLER. What precaution did you take to make yourselves sure that the signature to the application was that of the individual, and that some one person did not sign 100 or perhaps 200 applications? Did you have them witnessed or sworn to?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think the affidavit requires witnesses.

Mr. FOWLER. The applicant has to swear that he is the person making the entry?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, as I understand it. At any rate, the entries were made, and the people who made the entries, in the large majority of cases instead of breaking away from the community system, as had been expected, were rather more confirmed in the community system than before, and were not conforming to the terms of the entry, as the law required. The matter was under consideration for some time; but the upshot of it was that in the early part of 1907 a commission was appointed to visit the settlements and to find out how many of these people were conforming to the requirements of the Homestead Act. The Rev. John McDougall was the commissioner, with Mr. Mavor, a clerk in the employ of the lands branch of the Interior Department, and Michael White, a man of Russian birth and German parentage, who understood the Russian language and was educated in English, as interpreter. They examined the conditions carefully, and ascertained how many people were conforming to the terms of the Homestead Act and how many did not wish to conform, as nearly as they could. They made a calculation as to how much land would be required to give to those who did not want to conform to the terms of the Homestead Act, enough land to cultivate and occupy and make a living upon. It was found that during the seven years that the Doukhobors had been in the country, their total cultivation amounted to about five acres per head of men, women and children. Before we appointed this commission we had arrived at the conclusion that we could not and would not be

justified in maintaining their homestead entries against lands in regard to which the duties were not being fulfilled, and that if they refused to conform to the requirements of the law by individual ownership and cultivation, there was no recourse but to cancel their entry and leave the lands open to entry and occupation by other persons. At the same time, we had to recognize that the people were there, and that they had been living from the products of their fields for some seven years—because I may say that, with the exception of the expenses incurred in connection with their coming to the country and their first year's residence here, they have been no cost to the government in any shape or manner.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the cost of their first year's residence ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that. They were responsible for certain advances which were made, but I cannot say just how the account stands. But since then they have been entirely self-supporting, and not only that, but they have been reasonable contributors to the general productiveness and therefore the wealth of the country. We found that they would not conform to the requirements of the Homestead Act. Their religious belief absolutely precludes private ownership of anything particularly private ownership of land ; they abhor the idea.

Mr. FOWLER. That being the case, why did these people make these applications for the homesteads ? Either they must have been deceived when they made them or else they were false to their religion, or they have changed their views since.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it was a little of all three. When our commission visited them, they declared that their religious belief prohibited the private ownership of land. That was in the early part of 1907. They were then more than self-supporting. They were adding measurably to the production and wealth of the country, and we did not consider that we would be justified, although they were not conforming to the requirements of our homestead laws, in taking action which would amount to saying to them: You must get off the earth. We did not think we would be justified in doing so, as a matter of common humanity. Those people had been then five or six years in the country, they had five acres per head under cultivation, they had been supporting themselves successfully and accumulating a little wealth off that area, and if we continued to their use say three times that much land, we thought they could have no possible grounds of complaint, and they would have abundance of opportunity for reasonable expansion as their population increased. Therefore around each village we gave a reserve which would aggregate in area fifteen acres per head of the people resident in that village.

Mr. FOWLER. About seventy-five acres to a family.

Mr. OLIVER. Their families are small. They hardly average as large as those of the surrounding settlers. First we cancelled all the entries, we cleared the books of the entries made by the Doukhobors who were not conforming to the homestead conditions, and in the vicinity of each village, including the site, we held in reservation land aggregating fifteen acres to each resident for the benefit of that village. We said we would hold that in the hands of the Crown for their use and benefit, so long as they saw fit to use it and we saw fit to let them have it. That was not done by agreement but of our motion. The remainder of the land held under entry by them, saving that held in conformity with our homestead law —because quite a considerable number did conform with the homestead law—was declared open for homestead entry. We announced in the newspapers that on June 1. 1907, there would be open for homestead entry to the first applicant at the counter the land thus cancelled in a certain township; that on the second day, the land in another township would be opened, and so on until all the land which had been cleared off the books had been offered to the public for homestead entry. All of the land has not been taken because some of it is not desirable. Still there was quite a rush for the land, and the great majority of it was taken up.

Mr. LAKE. Odd as well as even-numbered sections?

Mr. OLIVER. In the York district their reserve included the odd sections as well as the even. In the Prince Albert district, they only had the even sections. The odd-numbered sections were held for other settlement.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Who were associated with the Rev. John McDougall ?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Maber of the Interior Department and Mr. White as interpreter.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. About how long were they occupied?

Mr. OLIVER. What my hon. friend is asking me now has to do with the lands branch, and the officials present are not able to give the information at the moment.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. We can defer any discussion on that until those estimates come up. I observe that the Rev. John McDougall, was paid for services $3,910 and there was advanced him for expenses $4,600. When these estimates come up, I shall ask for further details.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that the same Rev. John McDougall, who figured in the newspapers a little while ago as speaking very eulogistically of this government? Perhaps that newspaper did not come to the attention of the minister. We shall perhaps be able to see some reason why the reverend gentleman should speak of this government in such very high terms.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure he had every reason to speak in the highest terms of this government and so would every other honest man.

Mr. FOWLER. He had nine thousand reasons—good crisp Dominion bank bills.

Mr. OLIVER. That hardly applies to the subject before the House. I may say that this matter was not one to be easily approached. It was an undertaking of very considerable delicacy and difficulty. Now that it is over, it looks quite easy, but I beg to assure my hon. friend that I approached it with anything but confidence. However something had to be done, the question had to be dealt with, and I saw no better way to deal with it. Whatever my hon. friends may think of the amount paid the Rev. Mr. McDougall or the commission, my belief is that the money was well spent in getting a satifactory settlement of a difficult and delicate question, affecting a very large area of very valuable land.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I wanted to ask about. He cancelled their entries and gave them fifteen acres in the centre of the village for each person residing in the village. Did they thoroughly understand that and are they satisfied with it?

Mr. OLIVER. That is my information. Of course, I cannot say that they were satisfied with it in the first place. Two deputations came down to interview me, objecting to the action we proposed to take. Although their religious views were entirely prohibitive of the private ownership of land, those views did not prohibit, apparently, the community ownership of land, and they were prepared to assert the retention of the control by the community over this area on which they seem to think they had some special claim as a community and were prepared to excite sympathy throughout the country and generally to make as strong a case as they possibly could. However, I think, owing very greatly to the tact of Mr. McDougall and his assistants on the commission, since the work was actually done, I have not heard one word of complaint either directly or indirectly from the Doukhobors or from the public except in isolated instances from people who felt, perhaps, that their particular right was not given the consideration they might have wished.

Mr. STAPLES. How many communities did Rev. John McDougall deal with and where are they located?

Mr. OLIVER. If my memory serves me well, there were forty or forty-one villages. The majority—about thirty—were located in what is called the Yorkton district, that is, north of Yorkton and on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway. Some ten or twelve villages were situated in the Prince Albert district west of Rosthern, also on the Canadian Northern Railway. My hon. friend will understand that when the Doukhobors were located on these lands the lands were distant from railway communication and were not considered valuable to any degree. They were good enough for the Doukhobors, but not good enough for anybody else. But when the railroad was run through these tracts, the condition was absolutely changed. Besides there had been seven years' residence of the Doukhobors, during which time the fertility of the soil and the suitability of the climate had been demonstrated. So when the road was constructed these lands acquired a very great value—not only an actual, but a speculative value. We had not only the difficulty of dealing with the Doukhobors, who thought they owned the land or ought to own it, but we had also the difficulty of dealing with the people who saw in it a very considerable cash value which they felt that they would like to handle, and thought it was theirs by right as citizens of the country who were first on the ground to get it.

Mr. STAPLES. I think the principal objection of the people in these respective localities was that the holding of these lands by the Doukhobors retarded development. I had occasion to travel across that country and know the most valuable lands in these districts that had been located upon. People of other nationalities who went there found that they could not carry on their farming operations successfully in the same locality owing to the difference of habit and custom, and so they naturally asked the government to deal with the matter in some way. Are all these districts dealt with? Have all these questions been settled?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. Well, now that is over, perhaps the minister would say whether he thinks that the system the government adopted by way of cancellation and reopening these homesteads was the best way in the interests of the people? The reason why I ask is that I know a good many people who went from Manitoba to that section to secure homesteads and who underwent a good deal of hardship—they had to wait day by day upon the officials who were dealing with these homesteads, and many, when they got to the place where they had to make application, had

to wait for hours in the rain before they could be admitted to the building where applications were to be filed. The Liberal press at that time gave great encouragement to all to go there and get a homestead, representing that all they had to do was to go there and there would be no difficulty. Consequently many went and spent a great deal of time and money, and underwent, as I have said, a great deal of hardship, and I think that about 80 per cent of them came away without being able to secure a homestead. This was due entirely to the manner in which the press of the country represented the facts at that time. There was quite a loss to people, some of them right in my own locality. I think the government might have adopted a different system. Even had the minister followed the system in vogue in the United States in opening up tracts of country, I think the results would have been better. It is all over now, but I do think that the government might have adopted a better system in throwing open these holdings.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that any important purpose will be served by discussing the matter now. But it appears that the only objection that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) makes to the system adopted by the government to make these lands available is that it was too popular—too many people applied for homesteads. But I think that when we offered the land to the first comer, advertised the fact that it would be available to the first comer, and opened it up township after township so as to minimize the rush, we did as well as my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) could have done had he had to deal with the same conditions.

Mr. STAPLES. I did not pretend to suggest a policy. But I did refer him to the policy adopted in the United States, and I think that the people there get just as well satisfied as the men did who went out to get these homsteads.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister (Mr. Oliver) has spoken very highly of the services of the Rev. Mr. McDougall. But the minister's commendation, high as it is, is scarcely in proportion to the salary which the reverend gentleman receives for these services. I am sorry to differ in opinion from the minister, for very often I agree with him in the work of his department—and that is something that I cannot do with the heads of some of the departments—but I must say that I think these results could have been obtained just as well without the services of the Rev. Mr. McDougall. I think this result could have been obtained just as well without the services of the Rev. Mr. McDougall as with his services. It would appear to me that these people being of a peculiar religious faith, the introduction among them of a gentleman who represented a different faith, would naturally antagonize them; and perhaps a layman would have had a far better chance of succeeding in allaying any suspicion or ill feeling they might have had, than would a gentleman wearing the uniform of the church. As to the agreement that was made, as to the disposition that was made of these lands, I do not know that I have any fault to find with that at all. I think the government was generous with these people in allowing them to remain on this land that they had cultivated, perhaps not too generous. But I do think that the money that was expended in connection with this mission was absolutely thrown away. The same information could have been gathered by the inspectors which the hon. gentleman employed, and their reports should have been sufficient for him to act upon. His own officers could have reached the same result without any additional cost. This government is altogether too fond of issuing commissions in order to reward their political friends. We saw in the papers the other day that the Rev. Mr. McDougall had given this government a clean bill of health; there seemed to be a mutual service and the reverend gentleman was no doubt well recompensed for his services. It seems to me that these gentlemen must have lived at a pretty expensive rate, since the expenses amounted to close upon $5,000 for the party. In the party there were only three persons. Mr. McDougall himself, Mr. Michael White, the interpreter, and Mr. Major, the officer of the department. Their expenses amounted to $4,600. I suppose it was thought prudent to travel in a magnificent style so as to impress the Doukhobors and to make them think that this new religious leader occupied as high a position as Mr. Peter Verigen did in the minds of the Doukhobors. As regards the land settlement, I think the minister acted properly. If these people choose not to conform to the regulations of the land department, it was right to take the lands from them; and again, having come under the conditions which they did, and being in the country, it was necessary to do something with them, and perhaps the minister took the wisest course in allowing them the 15 acres per head. Have these Doukhobors votes?—because it would look as if the government thought that would be a nice way to obtain control of the votes of these communities.

Mr. OLIVER. No, they object just as strongly to becoming citizens as they do to owning land. To return to the items of expenditure, we are estimating for British bonuses this year, $90,000. In the year 1906-7 we paid $58,000 on that account for nine months. That goes to the booking agents in Great Britain and Ireland. We have not got the figures for the year since

the 31st of March last. But we are asking $90,000 for the current year.

Mr. FOWLER. How many individuals are there to whom this $58,000 was paid?

Mr. OLIVER. There are about 1,800 booking agents entitled to the bonus. We have a printed list of the names. We estimate $10,000 for continental bonuses, that is, bonuses on immigrants from continental Europe. We give bonuses on the same classes as we do in Great Britain, that is, people who have followed agriculture, and who intend to follow it in this country. During the fiscal year, 1906-7, there were no bonuses paid except those paid in winding up the business of the North Atlantic Trading Company. As I have informed the House, we closed business with that company on the 30th November, 1906, and we did not begin to pay bonuses on any other account until some time in 1907. The bonuses which we were entitled to pay in the early part of 1907 had not accrued until the close of that fiscal year, therefore there is nothing shown as having been paid in bonuses during that fiscal year except those paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company, which were earned before the 30th November, 1906.

Mr. FOWLER. They have not earned anything since you cut them off?

Mr. OLIVER. No, but they say they have.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they suing you? In that case we will get their names.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know who they are, except that they are doing business under the name and style of the North Atlantic Trading Company. The secretary is S. Cohen. Then, commissions on settlers from the United States, $5,000. In the fiscal year 1906-7, we paid $4,743, $3 per head on men, $2 on women and $1 on children. Seaport expenses at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, North Sydney, Vancouver and Victoria, $10,000. These are the contingent expenses, not salaries. For travelling and living expenses of officers meeting boats and on trains of immigrants, also telegrams, postage, &c., in the fiscal year 1906-7, we paid $5,000. Contingencies and general expenses of United States agents were $65,000. Contingencies and agents' expenses in Canada generally were $25,000. Contingencies and general expenses of agencies in Great Britain and Ireland, including the London office, were $75,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you an agent at Boston and if so have you any means of checking the number of immigrants he sends to Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, we have a salaried agent at Boston. The method we have of keeping track of the number he sends is his weekly report of the reduced-fare tickets which he issues by authority of the railway companies.

Mr. FOWLER. Would that be a good test? Would it not be possible for people simply coming to visit their relatives in Canada to get these tickets?

Mr. OLIVER. If it is good enough to justify the railway companies in issuing reduced tickets it should be sufficiently good evidence for us to accept that the person is likely to become a settler in the west. Last year the number of such tickets was something over 600.

Mr. FOWLER. Where did they go?

Mr. OLIVER. To the prairie west. The purpose of keeping the agent in Boston is rather to appeal to the maritime province people who are settled very largely in Boston and the eastern states. We believe that these are very desirable people, very suitable for settlers in the Northwest.

Mr. FOWLER. They are principally Canadians who wish to come back to Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. Who have gone from Canada to the United States. We think they are possibly more likely to be willing to come into Canada again than native born citizens of those states. Therefore the agency in Boston, differing from those in some other states, is with a special view of appealing to this class of people.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CROWN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 180) respecting the Crown Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Tisdale.

Mr. FIELDING. A few moments ago I received a telegram concerning this Bill. I have no information on the subject other than that contained in the telegram which is addressed to me from Montreal and which is as follows:

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance, Ottawa.

I am advised Crown Life Bill comes up for third reading to-night at eight o'clock. Rodolphe Forget, M.P., now absent from city, has proxies from eighty shareholders of Crown Life who do not favour Bill, certain Montreal policy-holders also disapprove of cutting down of stock and complain of insufficient notice having been given. On behalf of Mr.

Forget and many shareholders and policyholders, I ask that Bill be referred back to committee to give chance for these opposed to be heard.

(Sgd.) GEORGE H. ROBERTS,
A shareholder of Crown Life.

My hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is familiar with the matter and I call his attention to this. I have no other knowledge than that which comes by this telegram.

Mr. TISDALE. Every shareholder had notice at least three or four weeks ago before the Bill was introduced in the Senate. In the Standing Orders Committee there was an affidavit filed that every one of them had notice in addition to the public notices which have now run their full time, that this Act would be applied for at this session. Mr. Roberts, the gentleman who sent that telegram, was formerly connected with the company, but we found it necessary to dispense with his services three or four years ago, and he has since been trying to give us all possible annoyance. The Bill is important to us as an enabling Bill, and therefore I wish to press it. We have to get a two-thirds votes of the proprietors before we can do anything under the Act, and it is most important, in the interests of the company, that we should have a chance of bringing the matter before the shareholders and getting it settled.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest, in view of what the hon. member for Norfolk has said, that we let the Bill go through its present stage, and stand for a third reading. I have no desire whatever to postpone it, but if the statement is correct that the hon. member for Charlevoix has proxies which he desires to use against this Bill, I would suggest to my hon. friend that he allow the Bill to stand until that hon. member can have an opportunity to be present.

Mr. TISDALE. The telegram does not come from him, but from Mr. Roberts. It is most important in the interest of the company that we should get the Bill through so that if Bills are assented to next week, we may save a month or six weeks in the reorganization. I may say that I represent now considerably more than half the proxies, apart from those shareholders who have not yet sent in their answers. A notice of what we were doing was sent to every shareholder. If we have any trouble, let us settle it before the shareholders. We have the burden of getting the two-thirds vote, while our opponents do not require to do anything. Under the circumstances, I would press the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objection to accept my hon. friend's statement and let the Bill go through, as far as I am concerned.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 71), respecting the Standard Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Standard Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. McLean (York).

Bill (No. 170) respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 167) respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonald.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign agencies, and general immigration expenses, including salaries of extra clerks at head office, $710,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What duties does Mr. F. O. Chapman perform in connection with the Immigration Department?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chapman is in charge of the motor bus which travels through England carrying exhibits of Canadian produce and from which literature is distributed.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the government own the bus?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. At six o'clock the hon. minister made the remark, if I caught his words correctly, that the American immigrants to the Northwest were a good class of immigrants notwithstanding the evidence from this side of the House. I do not know what evidence the minister refers to. I wish to state here that the class of American immigrants we are getting in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta is a very desirable class. They are men of experience who come with considerable money and they have shown their ability to get to work and develop that western country. When the minister says there is evidence from this side that we consider them not desirable, I cannot agree with him. I am sure I have not heard any one on this side reflect in any way on those immigrants. Where he got that evidence I would like to know. It would be well for this government to expend a large amount of their appropriations set aside for importing immigrants from the continent and devote it to bringing in the class of American immigrants we are getting. Take the large amount of money given the North Atlantic

Trading Company and other companies of that nature in return for which this country has received little or no benefit and a very poor class of immigrants as compared with the Americans.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure the hon. gentleman's expression of opinion as regards the American immigrants is acceptable to all ex-members of this House.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice in the Auditor General's Report, L—23, a list of special delegates. What are they for?

Mr. OLIVER. A considerable proportion of those are practical farmers who are selected and sent to the old country because of the success they have achieved in Canada. We prefer to send delegates to the old country who have been born there and who have made a success in Canadian farming. These men are paid $100 a month and their expenses. While in the British Isles they are under the direction and control of our immigration service there and are generally employed in visiting the offices of the foreign booking agents. The booking agent makes the announcement that on a certain day a certain farmer from Canada will be at his office and be glad to meet any one who desires information regarding Canada. These men are not generally public speakers, but practical, successful men. And when given the opportunity of meeting practical men in the same business, they put the advantages of Canada in a very direct and favourable light.

Mr. FOWLER. Where do you send them?

Mr. OLIVER. They all report at our head office in London and then the assistant commissioner distributes them according to his best judgment and the localities from which they may come originally, and according also to the energy or reliability of the various booking agents. There may be a booking agent in a certain locality who does not take an active interest in his business, and it would not be worth while sending a delegate to him, and there may be another in a farming locality who may be very active.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they only sent to the British Isles?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but last year we sent a Frenchman to France and a Belgian to Belgium.

Mr. STAPLES. I see in the Auditor General's Report, page L—24, that Mr. Larkin, one of those delegates, received $100 a month and $200 expenses. Another delegate, Mr. A. Shepherd, who is quite a capable man, just as capable as Mr. Larkin, only received $75 a month and $70.30 expenses. Why this discrimination?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say, but $100 is the maximum. No doubt there was an arrangement with Mr. Shepherd, and he was satisfied with the amount paid him. We desire to get men who have a going business and cannot leave without paying others to take their place, and we pay them sufficient to enable them to engage substitutes.

Mr. STAPLES. Mr. Shepherd is one of our best farmers, and he had to leave some one in his place. I heard indirectly that he felt somewhat annoyed on learning that the expense account he put in and the salary he asked had been pared down to a certain extent. He is just as good a man as the government could send from their side of politics. Why he should not receive as much salary as Mr. Larkin and many others, I do not know.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are they all Liberals?

Mr. STAPLES. As far as I know they are, and should be treated equally.

Mr. OLIVER. I really cannot say why Mr. Shepherd was not paid as much as the others, or why his expense account was not as great. I suppose that the fact that he was not paid so much is not an objection to the amount he was paid. At any rate we cannot be charged with extravagance in the case of Mr. Shepherd.

Mr. STAPLES. When Mr. Shepherd was in Europe, he did good service to the country. He paid careful attention to the way our grain reached the foreign market. He brought home samples and exhibited them in the Agricultural Committee. I do not see why he should not receive every consideration at the hands of the government.

Mr. FOWLER. In this list of special delegates, I see a familiar name—Wagner. This delegate is named M. Wagner. Would that be a relative of Philip of that ilk?

Mr. OLIVER. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. FOWLER. Where did M. Wagner go to—to Great Britain or to the continent? I see the amount is stated here as an 'advance' on his travelling expenses. He got his ocean passage of $30 and an advance of $75. How much salary was paid to M.—which might stand for Michael; we will call him Michael—Wagner, and what expenses did he receive besides this advance of $75?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer the question. He was to have his passage paid and he received an advance on expenses. But his accounts were not received for settlement when the books were closed.

Mr. FOWLER. Is he in the employ of the government?

Mr. OLIVER. Evidently, he is one of the delegates sent to the old country—I fancy to Germany, judging by the name.

Mr. FOWLER. I see here also Rev. Mr. Woodcutter, salary four months at $83.33, ocean passages $59.20, and travelling expenses $678.73. How does it come that the Rev. Mr. Woodcutter has such a large bill for expenses, and was paid salary for four months while most of the others were paid for from one to three months? Was Mr. Woodcutter a farmer? Or how and why was he sent?

Mr. OLIVER. His calling is indicated by his title—he is a Roman Catholic clergyman. He is a man of very wide linguistic accomplishments, speaking a number of European languages. He was for a time in our employment at the Winnipeg office as an interpreter. Some time after his continuous employment at the immigration hall in Winnipeg had ceased, it was his desire to visit Continental Europe, and we thought we should be well-advised to put him on the same footing as a farmer delegate, though he is not a farmer.

Mr. FOWLER. In fact, to give him an outing in Europe, you appointed him a special farming delegate, paid him for four months, gave him $59.20 for ocean passage —double what you gave anybody else—and paid him $678.73 for his expenses.

Mr. HERRON. Has the minister had any recent complaint from the south, of agents recommending people to go to any particular section of the country? There were complaints about a year ago from Macleod and that section, of agents somewhere in the United States recommending settlers going into Canada to go to the northern and not to the southern part, on the ground that the south was a poor place for settlers to locate.

Mr. OLIVER. No complaints have come to my knowledge within the past year. As my hon. friend (Mr. Herron) has said, there were complaints about a year ago. I am bound to say that, on inquiry, I did not find that those complaints were well founded.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Can the minister tell me the cost of maintenance of the office in London, England?

Mr. OLIVER. The Auditor General's Report shows that for the nine months ending March 31, 1907, the amount was $26,463.76. Adding one-fourth, you get a very close approximation to the amount we are asking parliament for.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. How many are employed on the staff in that office?

Mr. OLIVER. There are thirteen employees.

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I do not know whether it has come to the attention of the minister or not, but the management of that office has been the subject of certain criticism in the western newspapers. I have seen a number of articles in newspapers published in Alberta, one purporting to give an interview with a gentleman who had recently visited the London office. This gentleman said that he tried to get some information there regarding the province of Alberta. He was handed two pamphlets six years old and could get practically no attention or information about the country. Without taking time to read these statements, I should be glad to send the papers to the minister if he has not seen them.

Mr. OLIVER. I have seen papers which I have no doubt are the ones to which the hon. gentleman alludes. One statement is made by Captain Thomas, of Camrose, and the other by Mr. Blaylock, of Calgary. I referred these statements to the office in London for explanation. I have not received the explanation as yet. I hope that the conditions are not quite correctly represented. But if they are, certainly some rearrangement requires to be made. When I was in that office myself it seemed to me that matters were being handled in a very different manner and a different spirit. We have supplied what we thought was up to date literature. It may be that our supply of up to date literature had at that particular moment been exhausted. We supply literature from this side, and it is possible that the new supply had not arrived at the time this gentleman called. I think there must be some explanation such as that.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The statement of Mr. Blaylock was that he could get no information about the southern part of the province, and all he could find in the offices was a bird's eye view of the city of Edmonton. If what he states is true, while the people of southern Alberta have no objection to Edmonton being advertised in the London office as much as the minister chooses, they do not think the advertisement should be confined to that part of Alberta and that particular city.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the House will see that the two witnesses who have been called by my hon. friend for the prosecution hardly agree. One gentleman complains that he could not get anything up-to-date relating to Alberta and the other gentleman complains because he did get that which was up-to-date and which related to Alberta, because it did not relate to southern Alberta.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What did he get that was up-to-date?

Mr. OLIVER. A view of Edmonton, as he says. If the description he did receive at the immigration office was a little out of the actual facts, the complaint of Capt. Thomas was that the information was too far out of date. In regard to the statement of Mr. Blaylock, I think I saw some discussion in the newspapers about it, and my opinion would be that some enterprising people of Edmonton had sent to the London office some advertising matter on their own account, and that Mr. Blaylock had seen it there. If the people of Calgary chose to send anything advertising their city it would receive the same prominence. I want to assure the House that none of the publications sent out by this department, place Edmonton in the light that my hon. friend speaks of, as compared with any other city in Alberta or in Canada.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I asked the minister if he had seen these complaints, and from what he has said I believe now that he has seen them. Having seen them, I would ask him to investigate them and see if they are well founded.

Mr. ALCORN. I notice in the Auditor General's Report the sum of $92,614 paid for bonuses. This, I presume, is the sum the details of which are given on L—24 and 25, for bringing immigrants to this country. On L—23 is a sum of $19,725 under head of grants made to various corporations and associations. Would the minister give some explanation of this latter sum, and state why those grants were made? They are apparently made to associations connected with immigration, and are expended in part at least upon immigrants after they reach Canada. How does that explanation fit with the grant of $6,000, for instance, to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company? I notice that nearly $20,000 goes to associations in the province of Quebec. I understand that Quebec was in the same position as Ontario with regard to immigration agents, who are paid for the location of immigrants in that province. For what reason is the grant of this very large sum made to associations, and in what way would the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway get their grant?

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad my hon. friend has asked this question. We have had several attempts made in the House, both this session and the previous session, to make it appear that there was some undue discrimination by the immigration department in respect to securing and distributing settlers. The Department of Immigration is interested in securing desirable people to settle in all parts of the Dominion. its efforts and its expenditures are directed in the first place, to inducing the settler to come, and in the next place, to establishing him in the country to the best advantage. The one great difference between the policy of the present government and that of the late government, was that the late government rather confined its efforts to inducing people to come, and did not proceed further to help them to establish themselves in the various parts of the country. This government has adopted the policy of endeavouring to secure the establishment of the settler in the country after his arrival. It is for that reason that our immigration staff in Winnipeg is so large. We have a commissioner of immigration at Winnipeg, with a large and expensive staff, an immigration hall with a great many appurtenances of different kinds. We have immigration agents and immigration halls at many other points throughout that country, and land guides at many points. All this vast expenditure is made for the purpose of locating the settler where he desires to settle after he has reached Canada. In the province of Ontario we have taken an interest in placing immigrants by establishing employment agencies in the different counties. The agents work on a commission basis, and receive $2 for each immigrant that they place on a farm in their respective counties.

Mr. ALCORN. That policy it seems to me has resulted in the appointment as employment agents of partisan supporters of the government who work almost solely for the $2 a head, and the system does not seem to me to be very successful. If people of a higher standard were employed, such as we had formerly in my own county, I think the results would be very different. The results from that system in the county which I have the honour to represent have certainly up to the present been anything but satisfactory.

Mr. OLIVER. I was not for the moment discussing that side of the question. I was saying that we were making certain efforts in Ontario as well as in the west to place immigrants satisfactorily after their arrival. The expenditure my hon. friend has quoted from the Auditor General's Report as being made in Quebec are for the same purpose and to the same end. They are made on a different method from that employed in Ontario, just as the method in Ontario is different from the method in the prairie west.

Mr. ALCORN. Are there any employment agents in Quebec paid in the same way?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but that is a very recent development and, in fact, can scarcely be considered to be an effective measure as yet, because, as my hon. friend knows, a large part of the population of Quebec is of the French language, and unless there

are French immigrants who come and are available to be placed, there is very little of that to be done. There has been little placing of immigrants in actual practice as yet in Quebec except in the English counties. We have made expenditures in Quebec with a view to having the immigrants whom we induced to come to the country satisfactorily placed in the positions which would be of advantage to them and to the country. The payment to the Lake St. John Railway is one of these payments. The Lake St. John Railway is a colonization railway. It gives communication with points reached by it in the Lake St. John region where there is some agricultural development and where there is industrial development of various kinds. It seemed reasonable that the Lake St. John Railway, being especially interested in the colonization and development of that country, should be considered and dealt with as an active and effective agent for handling and dealing with people desirous of going into that country. There are several societies in the province of Quebec looking to the development of the hinterland of that province, and we have made certain payments to these societies with the same object of having the immigrant on his arrival placed satisfactorily so that both he and the country will be benefited. The payments in Quebec are for the same purposes as in Ontario and the west, but they are made on a different principle because of the different condition of the country.

Mr. ALCORN. In what way do the Lake St John Railway do the work?. Do they place immigrants on their own land or how do they distribute them and find them employment?

Mr. OLIVER. The railway company have no grant of land. The unoccupied land in that locality is owned by the provincial government. In consideration of this grant the railway company gives free transportation from Quebec over their railway.

Mr. ALCORN. Are these French immigrants who are brought in there?

Mr. OLIVER. Some are French, but there are some Belgians and other nationalities as well. Of course, it is natural that a settlement in that province will attract French immigrants, but the settlement is not confined to French. There is a Danish as well as a Belgian settlement there.

Mr. ALCORN. Do the society of colonization and repatriation and the Quebec and Lake St. John Colonization Society deal with the same section of country?

Mr. OLIVER. In the estimates of the current year we are not asking for any money for the Lake St. John Colonization Society. We now confine our grants to the Railway.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. ALCORN. Is this grant of $500 the only grant to the Salvation Army in connection with the work ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, that is not the only grant the Salvation Army get. That grant is paid in the year mentioned, but it relates to services given in a previous year. It provides for the special lectures given under the auspices of the Army, very much as the meetings I have described are held by ordinary booking agents employing farm delegates.

Mr. ALCORN. That would be for services rendered in Europe?

Mr. OLIVER. In England.

Mr. ALCORN. It is here under the head of grants.

Mr. OLIVER. But the service is rendered in Great Britain.

Mr. ALCORN. What other grants are made to the Salvation Army as a body in Canada with reference to immigration work ?

Mr. OLIVER. We are paying the Salvation Army a special grant this year in consideration of their placing immigrants in the four western provinces. The Salvation Army sees to the placing of their immigrants after their arrival in this country. They have a very complete and successful organization, and as they have recently developed their work very largely in the west we have thought it not inadvisable to recognize their services to the extent I have mentioned. West of Lake Superior we have our own staff on salary to look after the placing of immigrants and we do not pay a commission per head as in Ontario. The Salvation Army also has its staff and we pay it a lump sum of $7,500 for the work done in the four western provinces.

Mr. ALCORN. Has the department an agent at Quebec who exchanges foreign money into Canadian money for the immigrants?

Mr. OLIVER. We have an arrangement with James MacNider & Co., brokers of Quebec, to exchange the money of the immigrants, and we pay MacNider & Co. $250 a year, and give them an office in the immigrant building.

Mr. ALCORN. And furniture ?

Mr. OLIVER. The furniture is very limited.

Mr. DANIEL. What arrangement is made for that service in the winter?

Mr. OLIVER. We have a similar arrangement at St. John with J. M. Robinson.

Mr. ALCORN. I have had correspondence from some persons in connection with this matter and they are under the impres-

sion that the profit on the exchange is more than the government grant. Other people are willing to do the work without any grant.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps so. It is very important that this exchange of money should be done by people who can absolutely be depended upon whether it pays them or not. It may be that the business has increased to such an extent that there is a profit in it without any payment by the government. But I presume the payment was made when the business was less extensive and when there was no profit in the exchange itself. We handle a great many immigrants at Quebec and if we can get a competent and reliable person to do his work it is cheap at $250 a year.

Mr. ALCORN. Has the government any information as to what the profits on the exchange are?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. ALCORN. Has the exchange agent an absolutely free hand, or is there any oversight on him?

Mr. OLIVER. He is bound to give the bank rate of exchange. He is there under the eye of the officials and subject to any complaints that may be made.

Mr. ALCORN. He is dealing with a class who are not very likely to know the bank rate of exchange.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Has the minister any information as to the character of the immigrants brought out by the Salvation Army ? The Army officers claim they have brought out suitable immigrants and that none of them have become a public charge, whereas others declare that the immigrants are of an inferior class and not suitable to the requirements of our country. Have any of the Salvation Army immigrants been deported?

Mr. OLIVER. Considering the large number of people who have come out under the auspices of the Salvation Army the failures are very few. There have been instances where some have had to be deported, and there are some others in which the immigrants might be considered undesirable, but considering that thousands have been brought out by the Army it is safe to say that generally speaking the Army immigrants are perfectly desirable. We have had practically no complaint with regard to these immigrants. We find the army a reliable institution who take care of the people they bring out, and if they find they have made a mistake they are as ready to rectify it as we could expect them to be.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I quite believe that the Salvation Army looks carefully after the immigrants brought out under their auspices. I understand, however, they do not confine their efforts to the agricultural class and domestic servants for whom we pay the bonus. The Salvation Army take a proportion of their immigrants from the cities so that the government in paying them a lump sum is paying for a class of immigrants other than those specified in the order in council.

Mr. OLIVER. It is possible to place such construction upon the grant, but after all it is hardly fair because there is no doubt this Salvation Army brings out a very large proportion of agricultural people. It is true that they do not confine their efforts to that class, although we confine our bonus to that class; but the grant we have under discussion now is paid to them in respect of the work they do in distributing their immigrants west of Lake Superior, and I think, everything considered, they are entitled to the amount we pay them for that service, although it is not distinguished in the account from the other branches of their service. So that my hon. friend may claim, if he pleases, that we are indirectly assisting in bringing out people other than the agricultural class. We think that we may claim in fairness that we are not.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is that the only organization or society to which the government gives a grant for the purpose of assisting in the work of bringing immigrants from the old country?

Mr. OLIVER. Allow me to put it the other way. We are not paying them this money to assist them in bringing people out. We are paying them to assist them in distributing the immigrants after they have come out. We are not paying a similar grant to any other society, because so far as I know there is no other society that distributes the immigrants it brings out.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice that you employ a number of clergymen. In the Auditor General's Report is a statement of the expense of employing four clergymen. What are their duties?

Mr. OLIVER. The principle on which they are employed is pretty much the same as that on which the importunate widow secured her desire. There are times and occasions when it is very difficult to do otherwise than accede to the propositions that are made. As I have already said, our principle is to employ practical farmers, but we are not always able to secure the men we want of that class.

Mr. FOWLER. What are these clergymen employed for? They do not understand farming. What pressure did they put on the department to cause themselves to be employed? I do not think the widow story will exactly cover the ground. Is it because they wish to take a trip abroad

for the purpose of their health? There ought to be some reason given for this employment other than the fact that they belong to the clerical profession.

Mr. OLIVER. The reasons which they give, and which may very well be given, are that having lived most of their lives in country districts and in close touch with agricultural operations, they have a very good knowledge of practical farming; and of course, being accustomed to public speaking, they have ability in the way of addressing audiences that ordinary practical farmer may not have. While we do not object to utilizing the services of the clergymen or think lightly of their services, we want to confine our operations as closely as possible to the strictly agricultural class. Therefore, as like attracts like, we expect best to attract that class of people by sending as delegates successful actual farmers, and we employ very few clergymen, as my hon. friend will see.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice that you have employed a doctor—Dr. Pagé, who visited Liverpool, Glasgow, London, Antwerp and Paris, for which he charged $439 for expenses in addition to his ocean passage; and you also employed a Dr. Robins. What do you want doctors for?

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. Pagé is the examining officer at Quebec. He was sent to Europe for the purpose of better informing himself in regard to the sanitary conditions surrounding the emigrants and the diseases by which they are most likely to be affected. He was sent to Europe for the purpose of enabling him to give us better service at Quebec.

Mr. FOWLER. That is, you sent him to Europe to complete his education. I should have thought that he could have got sufficient practice by examining the people affected by trachoma and other diseases who come here. I notice that you sent two agents to Iceland. Why do you send two to that small island?

Mr. OLIVER. We only send one each year, but the two names appear because of the overlapping of the account.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you keep a resident agent in Iceland?

Mr. OLIVER. No. There are large and successful Icelandic settlements in Manitoba, and we send an agent from one of these each year for a period of about six months.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice that you paid the Allan Line bonuses on Icelandic settlers. Why do you do that? The Allan Line does not call at any Icelandic port.

Mr. OLIVER. This is an exceptional transaction which pertains only to Iceland. It is a small country, with a small population, it is not on the ordinary lines of travel and the expense of immigrants coming from Iceland is much greater in proportion to the distance than those of immigrants from almost any other country. They have to make a trip from Iceland to some point in the British islands; they usually come by Leith. Instead of paying a booking agent $5 a head in this case, we have an arrangement whereby the steamship company reduces the fare to the passenger by the amount of $5 and we pay the steamship company. This is the only case in which we bonus the steamship company. In all other cases we bonus the booking agent as an encouragement to his publicity campaign on behalf of Canada. In the case of Iceland, the population is entirely agricultural or outdoor people. There are practically no undesirables in Iceland. Therefore we have made a special arrangement in their case.

Mr. FOWLER. Then this is partially assisted immigration?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but that is the only case.

Mr. FOWLER. Who pays the expense of sending a deported immigrant back?

Mr. OLIVER. The steamship company.

Mr. FOWLER. How is it then that we pay so much to these steamship companies for bringing them back?

Mr. OLIVER. The railway and steamship companies have to bear the expense, provided the immigrant is deported within the year. But if he has been here more than a year, the steamship company returns him at a special rate called the charity rate. There are also cases in which it is impossible to locate the steamship company by which the undesirable immigrant came, and in such cases we pay the charity rate.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you not deport the undesirables from the points of debarkation such as Halifax, Quebec and Montreal? Why then all these charges?

Mr. OLIVER. If an immigrant does not pass the examination at the port where he lands, the steamship company has to take him back at once free of charge. But if he passes the examination and gets into the country and then we find he is an undesirable, we have to pay the costs of transportating him to the sea-board. Then if we can determine by what line he came and he is deported within the year, the company must carry him free. Otherwise we pay the charity rate.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice on page L—26 that 15,000 copies of the Halifax Chronicle,' a Dominion Exhibition number, were paid for at seven cents each or $1,132.50. What was that for?

Mr. OLIVER. That was a number of the paper descriptive of Nova Scotia, its advantages and resources, and as we had not at that time published any literature having special reference to Nova Scotia, we thought it was not improper to purchase a portion of this issue and distribute it in the British Isles.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that the issue of which some ten tons still remain over in the immigration office in London, much to the annoyance and inconvenience of the officers in charge? There was something in the press to that effect.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid the report my hon. friend has mentioned must have appeared in the 'Halifax Herald.' I have no knowledge of there being any portion of this issue left on the hands of the department in London, and while I have heard many peculiar stories of the unadaptability of people on the other side, I would think that where there are so many opportunities of giving away these numbers, they would not be allowed to remain in the immigration office to the disadvantage of its business.

Mr. HERRON. Has the immigration from the western states increased or decreased from latest reports?

Mr. OLIVER. Last year for many reasons it fell off considerably. This year the increase so far is very satisfactory over last year, but I do not think we have arrived at the volume of immigration of the year before, which was abnormal.

Mr. HERRON. My hon. friend should encourage that immigration because it furnishes us with a very desirable class of settlers, From my observation and experience of these people, they are the best adapted to our western country. It makes no difference from what part of Europe they may originally have come to the United States, they have gained an experience in the western states which is of great advantage to them in our new country. No matter where you find American settlers, you find them adapting themseves to new conditions very much better than immigrants from elsewhere.

Mr. STAPLES. I notice that Mr. Ayotte is employed as an immigration agent in Montana and has received from this government $1,690 for the last nine months ending the 31st of March. What are his qualifications and what does he do?

Mr. OLIVER. His headquarters are at Great Falls, Montana. He is working in the country in which my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) has expressed a desire that we should, at any rate, not slacken our efforts. I believe that Mr. Ayotte is originally from Manitoba.

Mr. STAPLES. What qualifications has he in education and ability?

Mr. OLIVER. I can hardly answer that question. I fancy by the results which we have from Montana, partly through the efforts of Mr. Ayotte and partly through the efforts of others, that he has the necessary qualifications.

Mr. STAPLES. He is a graduate of that notorious class of the Dominion elections of 1904, the Leach class. There were Leach, Ayotte, Ingram and Kneeham, all of whom did great work in disfranchising the electors of Manitoba. And every one of these men, very shortly after the elections, was taken charge of by the government and given a salary, so that they 'each of them' is drawing from the government from $1,200 to $4,000 a year. It is evident that Leach was the principal director and tutor of the class, for he is given the largest salary. According to the Auditor General's Report, he draws somewhere in the neighbourhood of $4,000. I am of opinion—and I think members of the House generally will agree with me—that these men were well rewarded for their great work in the elections of 1904.

Mr. OLIVER. If this gentleman has done so much in disfranchising the Conservative electors of Manitoba, I fancy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) will be well satisfied to have him located in Montana, and will consider it cheap at the price when we pay him a salary of only $900 a year.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Will the minister bring down the papers I asked for as to the distribution of provisions in Gimli?

Mr. ALCORN. While the minister is looking for these papers, I would draw his attention to another of the class referred to by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples), and even more successful in that particular line of work—W. T. R. Preston. I would refer the hon. minister to page L—23 of the Auditor General's Report, where he will find it stated that Mr. Preston was paid $1,127. Where is Mr. Preston now, if in the employ of the government, what is his title and what are his duties? And can the minister say what success he has in the performance of those duties?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Preston is not in the employ of the Department of the Interior, so I am hardly in a position to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Alcorn) the information he desires. I understand, from reports which are as open to my hon. friend as to myself, that Mr. Preston is in the employ of the Department of Trade and Commerce as a commercial agent on the Asiatic coast of the Pacific. He was quite recently in Ja-

pan, but the latest I have heard in regard to him was that he was in either Corea or China, making a trip in the interests of Canadian trade. While not able to answer with authority, the information I have is that Mr. Preston has done good work in the promotion of Canadian trade with China, Corea and Japan.

Mr. ALCORN. I have seen in the newspapers statements somewhat similar to those made by the minister, but I was in hopes that the minister would be able to tell us precisely what Mr. Preston was doing for the large salary he commands at the hands of this government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He must be in Corea. I see the Japanese have sent a large army there.

Mr. OLIVER. I have here the file covering the report asked for by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche). I will send it to him, but I would ask him not to consider it as a return laid on the table of the House, because I desire to keep it on the file in the department. I would like, however, to read the report of Mr. Walker made when his attention was drawn to the extract from the Selkirk 'Herald,' which my hon. friend read here last night. Under date of May 16, he says :

With reference to the inclosed extract from the Selkirk 'Record' of April 25, in which it is implied, if not actually expressed that the Immigration Department has provided relief to settlers at Gimli, with a view of influencing these people politically.

I beg to say in reply that I am entirely responsible for the relief sent to the Galicians and other foreign settlers in the Gimli district, in townships 18, 19 and 20, ranges 2 and 3 east. That I have not been influenced in the slightest degree by any political circumstances, that as a matter of fact, I have no knowledge of the political leanings of the persons referred to, nor do I even know the name of the member of parliament, nor the political complexion of the member of parliament, who represents that district. Such action as I have taken has been done solely in the interests of humanity and in the interests of the successful settlement of that district. It seems to me to be extremely unkind, as I know it is altogether untrue, to add to the sufferings of these unfortunate people, by an accusation of seeking or obtaining help of this character without good reason.

I inclose herewith copies of correspondence relating to this relief, from which you will observe:

That a deputation of people petitioned the local land agent of the district for urgent help.

That the people so petitioning were not speaking for themselves, but for their neighbours, whom they described as almost starving.

That a deputation of these people, aided in their transportation by the railway company, appeared at my office, and appealed personally for succor for their starving wives and children.

That John Lusted, a forest ranger, who lives in the locality, of his own initiative, wrote on the 12th March, among other things: 'There is a great destitution and almost starvation amongst the foreign settlers in that locality' and 'I have found places where people are almost on the verge of starvation, having been two or three days without bread or flour to bake it—immediate relief is necessary.'

That upon such urgent representations as this, I ordered on March 6 (see letter No. 1) Officer Abrahamson to proceed to the seat of the destitution, examine the matter carefully and closely, and report without delay.

On March 11 (see letter No. 2) I wrote Officer Abrahamson to remain and give his personal attention to this relief business. To investigate personally, each and every case, to report on each and every case and see that relief was given only to the most needy ones.

I inclose copy of his letter to me (see letter 3) in which he informs me that destitution of a severe character prevailed, not only among those whom he was sent to relieve, but others were coming and begging to him with the same cry for help.

On the 14th March I reported the circumstances to you (letter 4 herewith, being copy of my communication).

The shocking condition of destitution, verging upon absolute starvation, I found extended to altogether about 138 families in that neighbourhood.

In order to overtake the work satisfactorily, inquiring most rigidly into the merits of each case and to see that personal inspection was made before relief was given, I sent Officer Harvey to assist in the work.

In order further to satisfy myself that the needs of these people were really as serious as my information seemed to convey, I specially despatched Assistant Commissioner Gelley to look over the ground. He verified the reports of my officers, and to assist me in determining the amount and character of the assistance required. Assistant Commissioner Gelley fully bore out and confirmed the report of destitution.

I inclose herewith copy of the joint report of Officers Abrahamson and Harvey as to the work they have done, the number of cases relieved and the character of the relief given. In addition to this, 85 families in the same neighbourhood required assistance. Some of those helped were Swedish and other German settlers. I inclose copy of report by Officer Abrahamson on this last distribution.

In this very necessary work of distribution no help was given excepting what was urgently needed; no help was given excepting what was earnestly asked for; no help was given where the officers had not already satisfied themselves that it was necessary, and no help was offered any one who refused it. Liens were taken in the usual way, and only necessaries, such as flour, sugar and a little tea or coffee were given in any case.

It is regrettable that the crop conditions of last year should have placed these people in such an unfortunate and unenviable position, and it is equally regrettable that irresponsible writers, for what purpose I do not know, should seek to throw discredit upon efforts

made to relieve their very serious and destitute condition.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Were these amongst the new arrivals?

Mr. OLIVER. Of that year and of the preceding year, that is to say, they were people who had come out and settled in a new country, and had not been able to get themselves well established before the bad season put them out of business so to speak.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Was assistance given to any but homesteaders?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. ALCORN. On page L—14 of the Auditor General's Report, under the heading, 'Superintendent's Office, Ottawa,' I notice that a number of men are apparently employed by the department at $4 a day and their travelling expenses. For instance:

H. Charlebois, 103 days at $4; board and lodging, $227; pullman, $124; bus fares, $8; livery, $3; total, $741.70.

J. O. Cowan, 102 days at $4; board and lodging, $264; pullman, $80; car fares, $4.80; care and board of immigrants, $7.50; telegrams, 50 cents; total, $649.75.

K. J. Henry, board and lodgings and horse feed, $204.35; boat fares and meals, $7.10; cabs and livery, $347.75; railway and boat fares, $16.45; sleepers and parlour car, $25.65; small items, $1.07; total, $716.62.

G. A. Johnston, 91 days at $4; board and lodgings, $262.60; sleepers and parlour car, $119; street car and cabs, $4.75; telegrams, $1.25; total, $733.60.

What work were these men engaged in, and how did they come to expend these large sums in travelling expenses?

Mr. OLIVER. Some of the names mentioned by the hon. gentlemen are of men who were employed in accompanying immigrant trains from Ottawa to Winnipeg. It was thought advisable that a government officer should be on board the train to look after the immigrants and to see that things were kept right. At present we do not employ any one in that service. These men were employed by the trip and paid by the day, going and returning, and given their expenses. Mr. Henry is an inspector of immigrant children. We have an arrangement with the British government whereby there is an inspection of children sent out under the auspices of boards of guardians. When they come out to Canada they are placed with farmers who desire to have them, and they are inspected yearly at the expense of the British government. We employ the inspector and pay him, and the British government recoup to us the expenditure.

Mr. ALCORN. Are these men constantly in the employ of the government, or are they engaged to make these special trips only?

Mr. OLIVER. The inspectors of immigrant children are employed by the year, but the men who were employed on the train whose names the hon. gentleman read, were only employed by the trip.

Mr. ALCORN. What was the necessity for their returning in Pullman cars?

Mr. OLIVER. In going to Winnipeg they travelled with the immigrants, and on their return there seems to be no reason why they should not travel comfortably.

Mr. HERRON. They seem to have charged more for travelling than an ordinary traveller who pays his own way.

Mr. OLIVER. We are not now employing men in that service.

Mr. HERRON. Did these men produce vouchers for their expenses, those who travelled in parlour cars, or did the government pay the bill of every man as he put it in?

Mr. OLIVER. They were required to produce vouchers.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface hospitals, $8,000.

Mr. STAPLES. I think that item is one that might be increased. There is no doubt that the hospitals in the city of Winnipeg are taxed heavily by the class of immigrants that are coming to this country. They are people with small means, and if they fall sick when they get here, they have to be placed in a hospital and well cared for. During the first session of this parliament I read to this House a couple of resolutions from the hospital board of the city of Winnipeg calling upon this government for a larger appropriation. At that time I believe only about $2,600 was given, and I am glad to know that the government have increased it. The hospital is carrying on a good class of work and is looking after a class of immigrants coming from the continent who would have no other protection. I would suggest that the item might be still further increased.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I would like to emphasize what my friend (Mr. Staples) has said, especially in regard to the Winnipeg hospital. It is one of the most deserving institutions in Canada. I think it is at present the largest hospital in Canada. I do not remember the proportion of foreign patients to the whole number admitted, but I believe they are in a large majority. I was through the institution a month ago and speaking to some of the head men in charge, and while they were grateful for the increased grant given them, still they felt they were not getting justice. It is a very useful institution and to-day they have not sufficient accommodation to

admit all the patients desiring relief. They wish to extend the hospital if they can secure the necessary aid, and I think, if the government could see its way clear to make a more liberal allowance, it would be appreciated.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very glaid to hear the hon. gentleman speak so highly of the hospital and of the increased grant. I was successful in getting the grant doubled last year, and I am very glad that that action is approved by gentlemen representing constituencies in the province of Manitoba. I shall be glad to use my endeavours to still further increase it, because I fully appreciate the importance of the hospital, especially located as it is at the gateway of that country, at the stopping point of all immigrants from which they diverge in all directions. It makes the claims upon the Winnipeg hospital no doubt heavier than they otherwise would be. At the same time there are claims for hospital aid all over the Northwest, which are well founded, although not as large as those of the Winnipeg hospital. While doing what we can for the Winnipeg hospital we must not do so much for it as to at all detract from the other hospitals.

Mr. STAPLES. What other hospitals receive grants from the Dominion government?

Mr. OLIVER. The following general hospitals: Moosomin, Brandon, Edmonton, Dauphin, Medicine Hat, Calgary, Battleford, the Holy Cross, Calgary; the Presbyterian hospital, Moosejaw; St. Paul's hospital, Saskatoon. These are aided according to the immigrant patients treated, so that of course the aid varies from year to year. I have not a statement before me, but we paid the difference between the provincial grant, whatever it may be, and one dollar a day for non-paying patients.

Mr. LAKE. Did the government find it necessary to give special aid during the past winter to any settlers? For instance what has been done in different parts of Saskatchewan?

Mr. OLIVER. The only case occurring in Saskatchewan was at or near Lipton on the Kirkella branch. We received a letter from the Rev. W. E. Wallace, of Strasburg, stating that there was a somewhat unfortunate condition of affairs there. We made inquiry and by telegraph received a confirmation of that information from our sub-lands agent. We sent an officer, Mr. Wolf, from Winnipeg, to examine into the case and he reported that there was considerable necessity there. We then took measures to relieve it, much of the same nature as those mentioned in the case of Gimli and took liens on the land.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

Mr. LAKE. Were special stores selected to supply these settlers, or were they allowed to buy from their own business men, so as to get the goods at the best prices?

Mr. OLIVER. I think an arrangement was made with one of the leading business men in the neighbourhood for the supply of the goods upon orders. Mr. Walker's report says that the majority, but not all of the orders, were made upon Messrs. Hasting and McLaughlin. He states that he has no personal knowledge of these gentlemen except that they appear to be reputable business men conducting a good business in the locality, and that so far as he can see their prices are not unreasonable. They were charging $2.50 and $3 a sack for flour. He says that had time and circumstances permitted the flour might have been purchased by the carload and sent from Winnipeg which would have been cheaper, but the necessities of the case required immediate relief.

Mr. LAKE. Were they allowed to purchase other necessities besides flour?

Mr. OLIVER. I have here a list of the articles purchased by each settler. The first one purchased five sacks of flour, 50 pounds of sugar. The next purchased 14 sacks of flour, 25 pounds of pork, 14 pounds of sugar, 50 pounds of oatmeal, one pound of salt. Another one purchased 5 sacks of flour, 59 pounds of sugar, 25 pounds of beans, 25 pounds rice, &c.

Mr. LAKE. If you invited competition among local storekeepers you would get more reasonable prices. Have there been complaints of excessive prices having been charged?

Mr. OLIVER. No. I will send over a list of the articles and the prcies to my hon. friend.

Mr. LAKE. Was any special inspection made of the settlers living northwest of Moosejaw ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed we did not have any distribution east of the South Saskatchewan. That was done west of South Saskatchewan. Owing to the severity of the winter the year before last, $30,000 was voted for the relief of settlers who lived far from fuel and other facilities. This last fall fearing a repetition of the year before, we caused a pretty thorough inspection to be made by the homestead inspectors and immigration officers, and they reported that there was no necessity for any special relief in that region. If any was given it would be given by the mounted police.

Mr. LAKE. How many officers were employed in making the inspection?

Mr. OLIVER. Dodds, homestead inspector, Swift Current; Braun, immigration

officer, Saskatoon; Ruffel, immigration officer, Moosejaw; Clouston, homestead inspector, Battleford; Roy, homestead inspector, Winnipeg, and one or two others. We tried to cover the district as thoroughly and as quickly as possible before winter set in.

Mr. LAKE. I have been informed that there are districts south of Moosejaw which are closed to all except certain classes of settlers. Is that correct?

Mr. OLIVER. No instructions are given the land officers to refuse entries from any one.

Mr. LAKE. Are they bound to accept the first applicant?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. In some of the townships which have been surveyed south of Moosejaw there has been considerable delay in getting the survey plan out so that entries cannot be given, and in the meantime people have squatted there which is apt to lead to complications, although not serious.

Mr. ALCORN. Does the lien attach to the homestead or to the land, so that if the original homesteader left a subsequent homesteader would be subject to the lien?

Mr. OLIVER. The officer in the department and I do not agree as to that. He says the lien attaches to the land even though the homesteader looses the land, but my impression is that the lien is charged upon the homesteader.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should it not be attached to the land?

Mr. OLIVER. It was the man and not the land who got the loan. If the advance were made to a private person it would attach to the land.

Mr. FOWLER. And why not in the case of the Crown?

Mr. OLIVER. Because the government is the owner of the land whether the homesteader is there or not.

Mr. FOWLER. The government has expended nothing on account of that homestead and it gives it as a free gift to the homesteader. In order that he may acquire a home the government makes certain advances to him which it charges as a lien against the homestead. If the homesteader is unable to pay all you have to do is to provide that the next homesteader shall take the land subject to the lien. If that is not the law it should be the law.

Mr. ALCORN. In my opinion it would be extremely unfair that a succeeding homesteader should be asked to pay a debt incurred by his predecessor.

Mr. OLIVER. I know that men who became indebted for advances many years ago were not afterwards personally relieved from liability under the lien they gave.

Mr. FOWLER. If you can recover it from him all right, but otherwise it should attach to the homestead. If the subsequent homesteader prefers to take that particular land with the lien on it he can do so, but otherwise he can go somewhere else, and I do not see any hardship in it. I think the government should have a lien and should enforce the lien.

Mr. LAKE. Considerable advances have been made to immigrants for their maintenance after their arrival here. What progress has been made in recovering those advances?

Mr. OLIVER. The following is the statement with regard to that:

Statement of repayments on account of relief advances from July 1, 1901, to March 31, 1908:

Fiscal year.	Amount.
1901-1902	$ 338 99
1902-1903	459 37
1903-1904	1,178 34
1904-1905	1,411 57
1905-1906	2,418 34
1906-1907 (9 months)	1,992 27
1907-1908	2,554 44
Total	$10,353 32

We do not press for the payment of the lien. As my hon. friends who have followed the amendments to the Lands Act will know, we even issue a patent to the homesteader without collecting the amount of the lien; but if he should transfer that homestead, then in order to give a clear title he has to pay us the amount of the lien.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you record the lien?

Mr. OLIVER. The lien is endorsed on the patent, so that it is an absolute security and we are not in danger of losing the money. When the settler makes a transfer, the person to whom he sells sees that we are paid.

Mr. FOWLER. What interest do you charge on the advance?

Mr. OLIVER. Five per cent after the first year; nothing in the first year.

Mr. STAPLES. I understood the minister last night to promise to bring down the information I asked for regarding the persons who received seed grain in Manitoba, and the districts in which it was given. Has the minister been able to get that information?

Mr. OLIVER. I have a list of the names and the acreage which I will give to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. I can see how this system of advancing money to settlers can be

made very advantageous to the government in the way of getting votes. It gives the government considerable control over these new settlers in a country where interest on money borrowed from private persons is from eight to ten per cent, if they can borrow from the government at five per cent. It is quite an inducement to them to vote right, and I have no doubt that the government uses that lever to obtain the votes of these new settlers. With that great advantage in their favour, I should think they would not require this Manitoba Election Bill which works along the same line.

Mr. OLIVER. I can only say that the enormous sum we asked parliament for a little while ago for the distribution of seed grain was not asked, as my hon. friend knows, until the pressure of necessity became so great that it was dangerous to postpone the asking and the getting of it longer. We certainly were not acting hurriedly in that case. My experience is that the advantage is not at all as my hon. friend thinks it is. We really suffer more from jealousy and misunderstanding than we gain from the advances.

Mr. ALCORN. It occurs to me that, if the government are sincere in making these grants in order to meet the necessities of the settlers, the better plan would be to make them as absolute gifts. The waste and mismanagement attendant on the distribution, with the vast distances at which it is made, the character of the people in whose hands the matter rests, and the great expense and work entailed upon the government in keeping a record and in attending to recover the debts, seem to me to be altogether out of proportion to the amount expended.

Mr. OLIVER. The principle which has been followed ever since the first settlement of Manitoba, which occurred under very unfavourable circumstances, which rendered it necessary for the government to supply seed grain to the settlers, has been the principle that any advance should not be a free gift, but should be made on the understanding that it should be repaid. The belief was that to make it a free gift would tend to pauperize those who received it, and that it was very much better to make it as a business proposition.

Dominion lands, chargeable to capital—surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, including $18,000 for irrigation surveys, &c., $800,000.

Mr. FOWLER. We would like to have an explanation of this large item.

Mr. OLIVER. The proposal is to expend this amount as follows. We desire to employ four parties for the survey of the base lines of Saskatchewan and Alberta at $12,500 each. We desire to have one party for the survey of a block of 3,500,000 acres in the Peace River district at a cost of $12,500. That is an area of land in British Columbia adjoining the Alberta boundary, the rights in which are handed over to the Dominion government by British Columbia in connection with the subsidy. One party is out surveying the Yukon and British Columbia boundary. Five parties for subdivision surveys in Peace River district, $12,000. Three parties for subdivision surveys in southern Alberta $8,000. Five parties for miscellaneous surveys $8,000. Three parties, subdivision surveys in British Columbia, $8,0000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that in connection with timber limits ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, we make the same township survey in British Columbia in the railway belt that we do outside. The timber limit survey is made independently of the township survey. Hitherto such surveys were at the expense of the limit holders, but under the new regulations we make them.

Mr. FOWLER. Will that apply to surveys already made ?

Mr. OLIVER. All timber limits held under the old regulations have to be surveyed by the owners at their expense. Under the new regulations, they will be surveyed by the government before they are put up for sale.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the purchaser have to pay the cost of the survey ?

Mr. OLIVER. The government will get out of the purchaser the price and the cost of the survey will be charged against that.

Mr. FOWLER. It is expected that the tenders will include the cost of the survey?

Mr. OLIVER. At present the limit holder has to pay for the survey, so it comes to the same thing.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the average cost per mile of surveying townships in British Columbia in the railway belt ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think I can give that because that work is done on daily pay and the difference is very great between one time and another.

Mr. FOWLER. Has all the railway belt in British Columbia been surveyed into townships ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. FOWLER. In case the base line of the township would be the line of the timber limit, would not the government survey that ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. The government would pay the cost of surveying that line, which would be one line of the timber limit and at the same time the township line ?

Mr. OLIVER. We would have to agree beforehand to accept it from the private owner of the timber limit. We would have to agree with him to accept it before it was done. If he did it and then came and asked us to accept, we would not.

Mr. FOWLER. You would want to have the choice of your own surveyor ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Has there been any change in the regulations lately with regard to the disposal of land ? In former years when certain lands were not open to homestead entry, the land office would accept applications and keep them on file. Then when the lands were thrown open for entry, the first applicant would have priority. I understand there has been a change made recently, if not in the Act, in the regulations or the operation of them, according to which the applicant who first appears in person at the land office will have the priority.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is correct. It was the practice, up to a year or so ago, to hold all applications against lands not then open for entry, and when the land was open for entry, those applications were dealt with in order of priority. But we found that while theoretically that system was all right it did not work satisfactorily in practice. A great deal of the complaints made of favouritism and undue preference given to political friends by departmental officials arose from that system. Therefore at a certain date an order was issued that applications made for land, not then available, would have no standing in priority. It was only after the land became available that applications were considered and stood in the order of priority. That is printed in the regulations we issue now.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I would like to ask the minister again a question which I put to him last session. I then asked the minister what extent, if any, has the government or any department thereof carried on investigations in the western provinces bearing upon the measurements of streams and the conservation of water supplies for irrigation and other purposes by the reservation and withdrawal from sale and settlement of natural reservoir sites. The minister said he had three gentlemen in the field making these investigations. Later on I asked the question again and he said these men had not made any report. Have they made any report yet and could the hon. gentleman give us the substance of what they have reported ? The minister will remember that this question came up at the convention held in southern Alberta, at which a number of people were present greatly interested in this question. One of the officers of the department, Mr. Campbell, attended that convention. What information has the hon. minister to give us regarding what these gentlemen have found and what the government intend doing ?

Mr. OLIVER. Many years ago a general survey of the irrigation country was undertaken by the government of that day. In the course of that survey it seemed fit to make a number of reservations of water reservoirs or sites. Since then it has turned out that several of these reservoir sites were not of value for the purpose and they have been opened for settlement. At present our staff is employed rather in dealing with applications for the immediate operation of irrigation than in outlining a scheme or system of irrigation applicable to the whole country, such as would give the hon. gentleman the information he desires. While it is their duty to get such information as they may of the nature he mentions, so far the more pressing duty of meeting the demands of actual irrigationists have been such as to prevent their doing anything on a considerable scale in that way.

Mr. Campbell, the head of the irrigation branch, has submitted a report to me in which he draws attention to the fact which I have just stated, that the staff we have employed is not sufficient to cover the points mentioned which it is desirable to cover. He draws attention to the necessity of arriving at an accurate knowledge of the available flow of water for irrigation purposes in that country by a thorough gauging of the streams. This is something which has to cover a number of years in order to be of value. Mr. Campbell also draws attention to the desirability of making a more careful examination of the country with a view to reservoir sites. But to cover this work thoroughly and well requires more men than we have in employment at present; and, at a later day, I may have to ask parliament for an increased appropriation to cover that ground and collect information such as my hon. friend wishes to have, which, certainly, is very desirable.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Where can we get the information that has been obtained up to the present time? The minister told me on March 11, 1907 :

> One party was occupied in gauging the rivers and large streams to determine the flow of water therein and in obtaining general information for the hydrograhic branch. The two other parties were employed in gaug-

ing the smaller creeks in addition and in inspecting works in connection with irrigation schemes.

Can the minister refer me to the place where the information already gained is to be found?

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid that the report of the Irrigation Commissioner is not printed yet, but——

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Will it be printed?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that it is being printed. This report will go into the question with a fullness not possible in the general report of the Department of the Interior and will be printed separately. It will give all the information that we have available on the subject. I have not that information at hand. As I have said already, our staff has not been sufficient to go into the side of the question of which the hon. gentleman speaks as fully as is entirely desirable. In the answer to the question I gave, I mentioned that it was a part of their duty to secure such information as he asks for. That is true, but it is also true that, owing to the pressure upon their time of the duties necessary to meet the requirements of irrigation schemes under way or immediately in prospect was so great that they were not able to give satisfactory attention to the other side of the question.

Mr. STANFIELD. Referring to the Auditor General's Report, page L—91. I find that the amount of $8,547.09 is given as receipt from Rocky Mountains park. Is that the total of these receipts?

Mr. OLIVER. The revenue from Rocky Mountain park for the twelve months ending June 30, 1907, was $21,144.04.

Mr. STANFIELD. Where is that shown in the hon. gentleman's report?

Mr. OLIVER. The revenue mentioned at page L—91 of the Auditor General's Report is the total revenue except that from coal lands. The amount derived from coal mined in the park would be in addition to that. Of course, it appears elsewhere.

Mr. STAPLES. A few moments ago the minister was explaining the government's policy in regard to certain lands they were throwing open for homesteads. I desire to call attention to a claim that was sent to me by a gentleman living north of Cypress river in Manitoba. I brought his wishes before the department and I understand that he has been writing letters to the department himself. I understand that this land has been thrown open for homestead, and I would like to know the position in which it stands. This gentleman is Mr. Alex. Campbell, range 12, township 10—I think that is the location, though I am not quite sure. No doubt the minister will know in what position the land is at the present time. Mr. Campbell is a man who settled north of the village of Cypress river a number of years ago. He has raised a large family under a great deal of hardship, and has not been able to give his family such an education as he would like. He is very anxious to get this quarter section for two sons who are now of age. He has been making application in various ways, and has asked the government to promise him that when they threw the land open they would give him first consideration. Can the minister tell me whether Mr. Campbell has got those quarter sections; and if he has not, in what position does he stand?

Mr. OLIVER. What was the nature of the reservation on the quarter-section?

Mr. STAPLES. It was a timber reservation, but the timber has been burnt off for a number of years.

Mr. OLIVER. Speaking generally, the rule we follow is that when we decide to withdraw a reservation such as that, ten days notice is posted up in the land office, and the first applicant for it after the end of the ten days gets the land. Mr. Campbell's application made while the land was still under reservation, would not be considered as giving him priority of right.

Mr. STAPLES. Under these circumstances I would come to the conclusion that Mr. Campbell has not much chance of securing those particular quarter-sections, because they are a considerable distance from a well-settled district, and he has to make application in the Brandon office. From the correspondence I have seen between him and the department, I think he has not been fairly treated, if the government have allowed another person to step in and get these particular homesteads. No doubt the minister could find out for me whether applications have been made for these particular quarter-sections; perhaps he has the information now.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the information at present, but if the hon. gentleman is willing to wait, I will take the name and location and give him the information at a later date.

Mr. STAPLES. I am sorry I cannot give the location of the particular quarter-sections. They are in township 9, range 12, I think.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Campbell's own land is in township 9.

Mr. STAPLES. It is quite close to Mr. Campbell's own land.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The Minister of the Interior referred to certain difficulties incident to allowing applications for land where the land has not been

thrown open. But he must admit that under the present system there is a great deal of room for collusion between the land agent and friends of his, or between the homestead inspector, who knows when the lands will be thrown open and who could easily give the tip to some of his own friends. This could be done, and I think is done at the present time. The present system, to be impartial, should be accompanied by the greatest publicity. Every facility should be afforded the public of knowing the exact date when the lands will be thrown open. Numerous complaints have come to me with reference to this practice. About a week ago, a letter was sent from Edran's post office, Manitoba, to Mr. W. W. Cory, Deputy Minister of the Interior. It is as follows:

Dr. Roche, M.P., has kindly sent to me your letter to him——

I had some communication with the department on behalf of this correspondent.

—re my application for northeast quarter-section 34, township 12, range 13, dated April 28, 1908. Now in the latter part of your letter to him you say that 'there does not appear to be any ground for complaint from Mr. Seaman insofar as the land in question is concerned.' Now I entirely dissent from this statement. What are the facts? Some three or four years ago I, with a number of others, applied for northeast quarter section 34, township 12, range 13. We were informed that the land was not open for homestead entry, but as soon as it was, we would be notified. Now the former policy of your department was that applicants were given a chance to enter according to priority of their application. About a year ago I received a letter on a Friday evening from the land agent that the land was opened for entry, and if I desired to enter I was to apply. The following morning at 10.30 I phoned to the Brandon agent and asked to be permitted to make entry by agent living there, as was formerly the practice, but was surprised to be told by him that Mr. Leslie Sanderson had already entered for this land. Now, Mr. Sanderson had never applied for this land before, and he got private information that it was open for entry before my letter arrived. Now I am aware of the fact that this homestead was given for political services rendered. This land was promised to another man during the last Dominion election, and subsequently he was requested to give up his claim to the fulfilment of the promise, with the promise of a better homestead in another district. He gave up his claim and got another homestead in another place ahead of 17 applicants who had previously applied, whereas he had not previously applied. They were all notified by letter to appear at the land office to enter, but the chosen individual got private information over the telephone, and the individual who dickered in these homesteads was a Liberal member of parliament who boasted that he had the saying of who should get the homesteads. Now I am an Englishman by birth, and I have too much fight in me to tamely submit to this injustice without protest, and for every vote that the favoured individual got, I will get a dozen for the opposition side. This gross political partiality shall cut two ways. Had one of those got the homestead that had made prior application to myself, it would have been right and proper, and I would not have said a word. But the changing of the regulations so that the first person appearing at the land office with his $10 gets the entry, permits private information to be given to favoured individuals, and is an exactly similar case to those Burrows timber deals that we hear so much about. I had hopes of better and fairer play from Hon. Mr. Oliver's administration, but am disappointed. Will you please show Hon. Mr. Oliver this letter, and by so doing you will oblige,

Yours truly,
TOM SEAMAN.

It would appear from this letter that this correspondent had, along with others, applied for this particular portion of land before it was thrown open for entry. He got word by a letter from Brandon that the land would be open on a certain date, and the next morning he 'phoned in and found there was a prior entry, that a gentleman had appeared in person and secured the entry, notwithstanding that he had not been amongst the previous applicants. This is only one of similar complaints which I have had in reference to land in other districts. Certainly this particular regulation may be abused and is being abused by those who have knowledge of when the land will be thrown open. The minister will remember that certain lands taken out of the Riding Mountain timber reserve were advertised publicly as about to be thrown open and scores went to the Dauphin land office only to be told that the order had been cancelled and the lands would not be thrown open. Up to the present they have not been thrown open, but squatters have been permitted to go in there and have been told by inspectors that their rights will be protected. For instance in township 18, range 19, there are quite a number of settlers located not only on the even, but on the odd-numbered sections, and they say they have paid their money into the Dauphin land office, although they have not yet received their certificates. I have not had an authoritative statement from the minister as to whether these squatters will receive priority when they go on homesteads.

Mr. OLIVER. The only knowledge I have of settlers being permitted to occupy these lands which were taken out of the original Riding Mountain reserve is of squatters who were in the reserve as it was originally, squatters whom it was necessary to get out of the reserve in order that the purpose of the Act of parliament might be made effective. It may be fairly argued that the people who went and settled on the land when it was under reservation had no right and could be and should be ejected, but I submit it would not be sound

public policy to act in that manner except as a last resort. Consequently in getting the settlers out of the reserve as established by Act of parliament I have offered to these people a priority of choice in the lands originally reserved but cut out of the reserve by the delimitation laid down in the Act of parliament. We think that is fair and reasonable. If any other people are going in and squatting there they are doing it without permission from us and I cannot guarantee them any protection.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). If what the minister says is correct, that those people who were located as squatters on the reserve are compelled to move out, I agree they should have the land, but are they to be confined to a quarter-section or a half-section of land? Around Clearwater lake, a colony of halfbreeds located as squatters. There might be ten families on one quarter-section. Does the minister think that each family should have a quarter-section in that part of the reserve? The minister's predecessor said that these people should not be looked on as farmers. Is it the intention of the minister to allow that class of settlers to have each the full amount of land ?

Mr. OLIVER. The squatters at Clearwater lake are squatters just as are the other people to whom we have given the privilege I have mentioned. These people have rights that we cannot ignore. I was speaking of people who have no legal right. They may be settled too close together to allow each one a quarter-section, but certainly the others, although far enough apart to have a quarter-section, were not occupying a quarter-section. I have reason to believe that a settlement with these settlers is now being arranged and I would not wish to be committed in the House to any serious or lengthy discussion in regard to them until we get the settlement. I am very anxious to get them out of the reserve and to carry out the will of parliament, and I am not inclined to allow anything that is not of vital importance to stand in the way of getting the lands cleared as parliament, I believe, desires they shall be cleared.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I am well aware that many of these settlers have been notified to vacate their premises on the reserve, but they have been notified so often that they look on it as a farce and have not the slightest intention of leaving. They say they will not leave and do not think the government have power or authority to expel them. I think the minister will have considerable difficulty in ridding the reserve of a considerable number of these squatters. I have here a letter from a gentleman who wished to take up land in one of the townships taken from the reserve. He says :

People are living on the lands in this township and say they have their entries in the Dauphin lands office; yet there has been no amendment in the Lands Act. Please state to me what this is? They are on the odd-numbered sections as well.

It would appear that a number of settlers are going in there notwithstanding the fact that it has not been opened for settlement. Can the minister state that he has any idea as to when those lands will be thrown open to homestead entries ?

Mr. OLIVER. We are using those lands as an assistance in clearing settlers out of the Riding Mountain reserve and as soon as we can clear them out or find that we cannot move them out the lands will be at once thrown open. But we think it will be sound public policy to continue the departmental reservation placed upon them many years ago with a view of assisting us in the work which as my hon. friend has declared, is certainly one of exceeding difficulty in getting the squatters out of the reserve. We cannot put the lands to any better use for the time being.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What publicity will be given about the throwing open to these lands ?

Mr. OLIVER. The same publicity as was given to the intention to throw them open on a former occasion. It will be thoroughly advertised that they will be open on a certain day as in the case of the Doukhobor reserve.

Mr. HERRON. A number of settlers have squatted on the odd numbered sections in different parts of the country and particularly in southern Alberta. Has the minister any policy with regard to the protection of those people who have lived on the odd sections and made improvements? Some of them have applied to the land office for entries but I do not suppose they were accepted.

Mr. OLIVER. It is provided in the Land Bill now before the House that the odd numbered sections shall be open for settlement, but until parliament has declared its will on that point I have no policy at all. The odd numbered sections are under reservation and people who go on reserved lands go at their own risk.

Mr. AMES. Has the survey been completed of the sixteen townships which by order in council of the 17th of January, 1907, were reserved in the Peace River district for the Peace River Colonization and Land Development Company ?

Mr. OLIVER. Some six townships or parts of townships were surveyed some years ago.

Mr. AMES. Has there been any survey recently or will there be one this year?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. AMES. Has the minister any definite information from the surveys as to the agricultural character of the land in these sixteen townships ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are surveyors' notes made when the lines were drawn, but I do not consider these notes made for a different purpose, to be reliable information as to the character of the country.

Mr. AMES. Does not the surveyor generally report on the character of the soil, water, and timber ?

Mr. OLIVER. I believe he does but he is there to make money by running survey lines and he is under no responsibility as to the accuracy of any report he may make on the character of the country. One report might be accurate where another would be inaccurate so that I would not place absolute dependence upon the surveyors' notes as to the character of the land.

Mr. AMES. Is the government taking any steps to secure information as to the agricultural possibilities of these particular sixteen townships ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not at the present time.

Mr. AMES. How does the government intend to deal with that company if they are not in possession of accurate information of the character I have mentioned ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that such information has any particular bearing on the dealing of the government with the company. An agreement was entered into providing that under certain circumstances certain things would be done. The question at issue between the company and the government is : Has the company done these things ? If that is settled in favour of the company there is no difference between us ; if it is settled against the company the government will take such action as the circumstances require.

Mr. AMES. Has the government arrived at any conclusion as to whether they will continue this arrangement ?

Mr. OLIVER. The government has notified the company that in its opinion the terms of the agreement have not been fulfilled, and the matter is under adjustment.

Mr. AMES. When was that notification served on the company ?

Mr. OLIVER. Three months ago.

Mr. AMES. How long were they given to show that the concession should not be cancelled ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know there was any definite time stated. We are awaiting their statement of their position. They demand further time to make their defence on account of the absence of some of their leading men and other causes.

Mr. AMES. The minister stated that knowledge as to the character of that land from an agricultural standpoint had no bearing on the case. A return was brought down to the House not long ago and that, and other information available ought to convince the minister that it would be desirable for the government to be in possession of definite information as to the agricultural possibilities of this concession. This concession was first granted in 1900 and the time for fulfilling the obligations of the company was extended by a subsequent order in council of the 8th of July, 1904, requiring them to locate on the said tract within three years from the first of October, 1904, no less than fifty settlers. I wish to ask whether on the 1st of October, 1907, there had been filed with the department satisfactory evidence that fifty settlers had been located in accordance with the terms of the order in council of 1904.

Mr. OLIVER. Our contention is that there has not.

Mr. AMES. Probably the minister is aware of the statements made in the Edmonton newspapers and some of the American newspapers, to the effect that the commendable purpose for which the company was organized in the first place, viz.: to locate expatriated Canadians on these lands is not being carried out ; and that apparently the company is permitting an American real estate company to exploit their concession. That company is said to be the Kent Realty Company—Mr. Kent being connected with the original company—and last year it took up a party to this concession who underwent great hardships in getting there. When the party found themselves on the concession, they were told that the reason they were brought out was in order that they might condemn the particular sixteen sections as unfit for settlement, in order that they might be exchanged by the company for better sections. If this company is not really fulfilling the purpose for which it secured the concession, but is farming it out to an American syndicate operating for purely speculative purposes, the government should take that into consideration. The minister will see why I asked my question in the first place. It was this : what information is in the department as to the agricultural character of these sixteen sections ? If these are good lands, naturally the government will say these are the sections you

are entitled to and no others. If they are absolutely unfit for settlement the question will be whether the government will allow the company to exchange them for other sections. In settling these questions it seems to me that the government will have to know something about the character of that country. Apart from that, the government should see that the bona fides of the company is lived up to. I would like to know whether the articles in these papers have been taken notice of by the government, and if so what the government intend to do with reference to this transaction.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the question of the character of the land, I have to hold to the first position, that it has nothing to do with the case. The company may have conceived a desire to exchange these particular sixteen townships for some other sixteen townships, but the government has nothing to do with that. It is no part of the agreement between the company and the government that under certain conditions as to the quality of these townships, the company would be entitled to exchange them for some other townships. The company are entitled to these townships, not to any others. They are entitled to them on certain conditions. If they fulfil the conditions, they get the land. If they do not fulfil the conditions, to put it in the most favourable light, it is at our discretion whether they get the land or not. As the question is now at issue between the government and the company, I think it would hardly be advisable on my part to state in detail to the House the attitude and the intention of the government. I think it would be better to leave the elaboration of these particulars till after the matter has reached a conclusion. As I have already stated, our attitude is that the company have not fulfilled their agreement. It may be that they will be able to show that they have made a reasonable attempt to fulfil it, and are entitled to some consideration or leniency on that account. That is a matter to be considered. I can hardly be called upon to say what conclusion we may reach upon evidence which has not yet been furnished to us.

Mr. AMES. The government, as I understand from a return which was brought down a few days ago, on January 4, 1908, notified the president of the company that they would be given thirty days in which to produce satisfactory evidence of their intention to carry out the agreement. That thirty days expired long ago, and seems to have been extended from time to time. Perhaps the minister will tell us how long he intends to extend the time, and when he expects to come to a definite conclusion in regard to this matter.

Mr. OLIVER. The facts that have been placed before the public indicate that these people have gone to a considerable amount of expense in an attempt at any rate to virtually live up to the conditions of their agreement. I do not know that it is sound administrative policy to ignore that fact when the question is one of the settlement of the country, especially a remote part of it such as that—to consider only the fulfilment of the letter of the agreement if there has been a reasonable attempt to fulfil it. It is, as I have said, a matter for consideration as to what discretion the government will exercise. That is, I think, as far as I can go in the matter. We have not pressed these people unduly. We may have been, in the estimate of my hon. friend, perhaps more lenient than we should have been in bringing the matter to an issue. While I am desirous of seeing that the agreement shall be fulfilled, I am also desirous that people who have made considerable expenditure, as these people have, and have had considerable expectations of benefit to themselves as we have had of benefit to the country, should not be unduly or harshly closed out. However, I can assure my hon. friend that the matter will be brought to an issue, and that the rights of the government will be maintained.

Mr. AMES. The point I particularly wish to bring to the attention of the minister is this, that the order in council of July 27, 1901, bears upon its face the evidence as to what was the motive which actuated the granting of this concession. The motive was to induce certain classes of people who had moved out of Canada to come into Canada again, and also to induce certain people who apparently had the intention of moving away from Canada to come up into that country instead. As this company apparently originated in the province of Quebec, I think there is little doubt that it was the original intention of the promoters to endeavour to induce some people from our province to go into the Peace River section. As far as that was the object, every member of this House will agree that it was a creditable and desirable object; but it would seem as though these people were not living up to that intention, but were farming out their concession—to the Kent Realty Company—who, as the hon. gentleman knows, were largely interested in selling Davidson and McRae's land in the central part of Saskatchewan, and the lands of the Canadian Northern Railway—for the purpose of colonization of an entirely different character and class, which seems to me alters to some extent the attitude of the government towards this company. I would like to ask the minister in taking this matter into consideration, to endeavour to impress on the original concessionaires that the original intention should be carried out as far as possible.

Mr. LAKE. What are the terms of the concession?

Mr. AMES. They get the land for a dollar an acre on condition that they put in fifty settlers prior to October 1, 1907, and within five years one hundred more settlers. Then they can buy a certain portion at a dollar an acre, and ultimately a considerable tract at that price. They can begin by buying one-third of the total area, one-third five years later, and the remainder within ten years at six per cent. I think they can eventually acquire the whole sixteen townships by bringing in the settlers as they agreed to do.

Mr. LAKE. The remarks made by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) are certainly worthy of the minister's most serious consideration. It seems to be a very valuable concession, and while the original object is a worthy one, and would be still worthy if carried out, still it will not do to allow this very valuable property to fall into the hands of speculators. I understand the minister to say that he is having five survey parties subdividing in the Peace River country. In what part is he having this subdivision made?

Mr. OLIVER. I said one party for the survey of the fifth meridian to Peace river. That is not on Peace river, but going to it. And one party for surveying a block of 3,500,000 acres in the Peace River district. That is to survey and outline this block of land in British Columbia outside of Alberta, but in the Peace River country. These are all the survey parties I have on this list as being provided for Peace river. We find this year that the demands for surveys to accommodate the new settlers are so immediate and pressing that we cannot spare surveyors to do subdivision surveys in the Peace River district this year.

Mr. LAKE. I must have misunderstood the hon. minister, because I took him down as saying that five parties were doing subdivision work in Peace river and was very much astonished to hear it, knowing the difficulties.

Mr. OLIVER. I have that here, five parties for subdivision surveys in Peace River district, but that is an error. This list was made up at an early date, and our later information is that we cannot afford to send all those parties to Peace river because we need them in the country adjacent to the presently surveyed and settled country.

Mr. LAKE. The minister made some remarks about the surveyors not being required to furnish accurate reports of the country they were surveying. Would he tell us what is the nature of the compact made with those survey parties? I should think that one of the conditions should be that they would give a comparatively accurate account of the character of the country through which they strike their lines.

Mr. OLIVER. The contract surveyor runs the line subdividing the townships into sections. He is paid per mile of line run at certain rates which vary from prairie to scrub and timber. The notes he takes are an indication of the character of the country, so far as they affect the prices he receives for the work. That is information in which he is interested. A contract requiring that he shall report on the general character of the country could not be made effectively because that would be a matter of opinion. As I have said on previous occasions, we consider ourselves well off when we can secure surveyors, whom we can bind down by contract, to run lines as we want them run and give us a fair account of the nature of the work they do. We have sufficient difficulties in securing the surveyors we require for that class of work without insisting on placing further responsibility upon them which we would not have an equal means of enforcing. That is so far as the contract surveyors are concerned. The surveyors running base and meridian lines, who are employed on daily pay, do give some attention to the country through which they run, but their work is so strictly confined to the line of their survey that it has not any very serious value. To overcome that, however, we have now entered upon a system of attaching to the parties running meridian and base lines what might be called explorers, who have special knowledge of the land and its capabilities. Each explorer uses the survey camp as his headquarters, but occupies his time in ranging over the country. His travels radiate from the camp and he turns in his notes every night to the surveyor. In such cases we expect a reliable and fairly full account of the country through which those lines run. Until recently we have not adopted that system. Now that we have adopted it, I think we shall be able to give the information which is so valuable and so much desired.

Mr. LAKE. I suppose that the notes which appear in the Surveyor General's reports must be taken from the reports given by the contract surveyors. It would seem to me that these men, who are digging holes for their surveys and so on, ought to be able to give a very fair statement as to the nature of the soil they go through. All that the minister means is that he does not hold them responsible for an absolutely correct statement of the land through which they pass. But the Surveyor General's reports are based upon the reports of the contract surveyors' reports as to the kind of land they pass through. How much land is under contract to be subdivided during the present season?

Mr. OLIVER. We have under contract survey this year about 250 townships. That is only an estimate.

Mr. LAKE. How many acres would that comprise, about?

Mr. OLIVER. About 600,000 acres.

Mr. LAKE. And what amount of land has been subdivided already up there?

Mr. OLIVER. About 120,000,000 acres.

Mr. AMES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) speaking with reference to the Peace River Colonization Company, I think, misunderstood one point that I was making. He said that if the strict letter of the law was not absolutely fulfilled, it might not affect the settlement. I do not think it is so much the letter as the spirit of the bargain that we are interested in in the case of these concessions. The spirit of the concession was to bring to that north country repatriated Canadians and Canadians from other parts of the country. Taking up this Edmonton paper, the 'Clairion,' I see an article in the January and February number headed, 'Audacious attempt of American Land Corporation to capture a concession.' If the minister finds, on investigation, that this concession, granted for one object, is in danger of being captured by an American land corporation to be used for another purpose altogether, it seems to me it should have a very considerable bearing on the settlement of the case. This is a very valuable concession, when you come to look at it. The grant of 576 square miles means a grant of about 368,640 acres. Now, the condition upon which about half of this, or 176,620 acres could be purchased for $1 an acre on very long terms was that the company should put in, all told, 1,200 settlers as homesteaders. If they can purchase this quantity of land for $1 an acre and sell it for $6 or $7 an acre, that means a million dollars of profit. We do not object to the company acquiring this million dollars of profit, if, in return for it, they fulfil the original idea of the company—viz., placing repatriated Canadians and Canadians from other provinces in that western country. But, if there is to be sold to an American syndicate a concession out of which a million dollars can be made, it seems to me it is about time that that sort of thing was brought to an end. So, I want to call the minister's attention to the fact that the spirit of the bargain which underlies this concession is quite as important as the letter.

Mr. OLIVER. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames), and am glad to find that he agrees with me, that the spirit is really more important than the letter. But I do not agree with him as to the importance of what he seems to consider the spirit of this transaction. In the first place, let me say that this transaction is not in line with the policy of the government at the present time.

Mr. AMES. It is a relic of the past.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a transaction that was entered into a considerable number of years ago, when conditions were not at all as they are to-day. I agree with my hon. friend that it is a laudable purpose to try to secure the settlement of even distant parts of the country, and I suppose he will agree with me when I say that it may well be necessary, and, being necessary, it may very well be proper, that special arrangements should be entered into in order to secure the settlement of these distant tracts. On that principle, many years ago, special arrangements were entered into to secure settlement under the late government and under this government—under this government very few and under the late government very many. This is one of the very few instances under this government. My own impression is that, in the present circumstances of the country and under present conditions, it is not the best policy, in promoting the general settlement of the country, to enter into a special agreement with a special organization for any special class of people to be settled in any special place. I find no fault with the policy that prevailed years ago under different conditions. As conditions change, it is right and proper that our policy should change. My idea is that, under present conditions, our best policy is the principle of the land for the first comer and first come first served. On that principle, I should be inclined to take a somewhat unfavourable view of the claims of this company even on the lines suggested by my hon. friend in as much as it means a special effort on behalf of special people if I understood him correctly.

Mr. AMES. In this case our own people.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, even our own people. My idea is that the value of these concessions lay in securing a nucleus of settlement in the then far-distant, and still distant, Peace River country; a settlement which could demonstrate by the labour and enterprise of the settlers, the agricultural and other possibilities of that vast region. Now, it seems to me that if this company can arrive at that end, whether they arrive at it or not absolutely and strictly within the letter of their agreement, I do not say that we would, but I say that we might, be justified in overlooking their failure to actually live up to the letter of their agreement, without regard to whether they were securing the settlement of repatriated citizens of Canada or the settlement of even a Canadian colony there. I would be inclined to consider them as having fulfilled the spirit of their agreement if they were successful in placing upon their land a colony of a reasonable number, that would achieve a reasonable measure of agricul-

tural success. However, I would much rather have the privilege of dealing with this question of the Peace River colonization according to the practice of the government as well understood, and place the result before the House ; otherwise our dealings may be somewhat hampered, to the disadvantage of the public interest.

Mr. AMES. What is the policy of the government at the present time with reference to granting timber and coal in areas that are not surveyed ? Does the government intend to continue that policy, and what steps are taken to ensure the exact location of berths ? For example, in this same section we are discussing, this Peace River section, the government have seen fit to give, I think, 350 square miles of timber for a mere bagatelle, to J. W. Stewart, who is connected with the firm of Larkin Brothers and Foley. Now what steps are being taken to secure a delimitation of that immense area of timber that has fallen into the hands of Mr. Stewart ? Who does the surveying ? Has the surveying been commenced ? How long has Mr. Stewart been allowed by the department to locate these tracts ? He has secured a practical monopoly of the best timber that supplies this Peace River section, and it will be needed as soon as settlement goes in there. Is it still the policy of the government to grant timber areas in sections which are remote from settlement, and in sections which are unsurveyed ? How does the government deal with timber limits in sections like that, and what is the present policy of the government in granting such areas ?

Mr. OLIVER. With regard to the timber limits secured by Mr. Stewart, my information is that the surveys have been completed by Mr. Stewart, as in all cases, under the former regulations, surveys are made by the persons who acquire the limits.

Mr. AMES. What is the character of that survey ? Does it include township lines and subdivisions ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not. He runs a line, he defines the timber that he has purchased by metes and bounds.

Mr. AMES. Does he lay it down in townships ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, because the townships are not surveyed. But he makes a survey which is a legal survey, and which can be mapped, and is just as definite as if it was made by a township survey.

Mr. AMES. How can you lay it on the map of the department ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not a map maker, but as a matter of fact the limits to which my hon. friend alludes are shown on the more recent maps issued by the department. I am sure he will absolve me from the necessity of explaining how it is done. But I know that the limits are surveyed and appear on those maps.

Mr. AMES. Do you describe the limits with any reference whatever to the townships in which they lie, or do you describe them simply by certain points representing bluffs or hills ?

Mr. OLIVER. By the survey lines, the lines run by the surveyor. The stakes set by the surveyor are the boundaries of the limits, and they are definable on the map, the same as section and township lines are definable.

Mr. AMES. Is it now the policy of the government to survey their own timber limits that they may henceforth grant ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, under our present regulations. They provide that when application is made for a timber berth, or when the government thinks the time has arrived that a certain body of timber should be offered for sale, the regulations provide that it shall first be surveyed by the government.

Mr. AMES. Is that a township survey ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, that is a survey just the same as the survey that is now being made, the only kind of survey that can be made where the township and range have not been defined by running meridian and base lines.

Mr. AMES. Now will the minister tell us what is done in the matter of getting accurate location for coal areas that are today under grant in the Rocky Mountains, for example in the territory at the head of the Brazeau waters ? How are those coal areas located ?

Mr. OLIVER. The system is laid down in the regulations that where there are no surveys coal claims are located by stakes, just as quartz and placer mining claims are located in unsurveyed territory. Two stakes are planted in the ground which define the claim, the claim extends from stake to stake, and for a certain distance on each side. That is the universal system the world over, and answers the purpose for the time being, until a survey such as I have spoken of in regard to timber limits can be made, or until a survey of the section, township and range is made. I would like to change the wording of this item. It now reads :

Surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, including $18,000 for irrigation surveys.

I would like to move that $18,000 read $21,000. It does not alter the total vote, it merely takes $3,000 more out of it for irrigation purposes.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Am I correct in the impression that about two years ago a part of Turtle Mountain was resurveyed, that is, township 2 in range 20 and 21 west of the first meridian? It is very desirable that this work should be completed?

Mr. OLIVER. I would have to inquire at the Surveyor General's office, but I shall give the information next day.

Mr. LAKE. When Dominion Lands are up I wish the minister would give us some information with reference to irrigation projects, the Robbins Irrigation Company's application and several large projects which have been mentioned.

Mr. AMES. Would the minister also take notice that when this matter comes up again we will ask for information about the coal lands purchase of John Howie, the northwest quarter of section 8, township 53, range 8 west of the 5th.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am very anxious personally to stay very late if possible to get some few items of my estimates through. The condition is somewhat serious with men on the canals and with employees of the Intercolonial Railway. The idea seems to have got abroad among the merchants with whom some of these people deal in purchasing their daily bread that these estimates may not go through for quite a while and it is becoming awkward for some of these men. I would like to get these items through so that if the Supply Bill is put through I shall be sure to have them in for these employees. The Intercolonial estimates, so far as the revenue is concerned, are in a different position from any other estimates. The vote of this House simply means that we are allowed to use our own money. The income derived from the road has to be paid into the Receiver General and we cannot use it without a vote. It is merely asking for a release of the money the road has earned in order to hand it back to the employees. I want to be away on Monday, as some of my friends do—and I intend to be away.

Mr. TAYLOR. I might easily get a pair for your vote and allow you to stay here.

Mr. FIELDING. Could you not arrange to put it through to-night in the next 15 minutes?

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a difficulty. The committee in charge of railway matters, Messrs. Barker and Haggart, are not present. I was told to-day that the minister could use money if it is there.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Auditor General will not allow it.

Mr. FIELDING. He must not lay down such a rule ; the committee should be here to attend to business.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. We will proceed with the estimates of the Minister of the Interior. No doubt they will be passed very rapidly, and then probably the Minister of Public Works will follow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 8, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 184) to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—Hon. Frank Oliver.

Bill (No. 185) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal.—Mr. Johnston.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 179) to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 182) for the relief of Hattie Spratte.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo.)

QUESTIONS.

TENDERS FOR DREDGING.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Were tenders called for in 1907 and 1908 by the Public Works Department for dredging in Ontario and Quebec? If so, were tenders received?
2. What were the prices at the different places?
3. What were the names of the dredges mentioned in tenders?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. (a) Yes ; (b) Yes.
2.

For 1907.	Price paid per cubic yard, scow measurement.	
	Rock.	All other materials.
	$ cts.	cts.
At Belle River, Ont	.....	25
At Blind River, Ont	4 00	18½
At Bronté, Ont	2 00	17
At Chenal Ecarté, Ont	.....	20
At Cobourg, Ont	2 50	11
At Goderich, Ont	4 00	25

For 1907.	Price paid per cubic yard, Scow measurement.	
	Rock.	All other materials.
	$ cts.	cts.
At Hamilton, Ont.	2 00	12
At Kincardine, Ont	4 00	25
At Meaford, Ont	2 30	34
At Midland, Ont	2 25	26
At Midland-Tiffin, Ont	2 00	27
At Nigger and Telegraph Islands, Ont.	(Nothing done.)	
	2 00	18
At Owen Sound, Ont.	2 00	20
At Penetanguishene, Ont.	2 00	14
At Point Edward, Ont	0 50	13
At Port Burwell, Ont	2 25	15½
At Port Elgin, Ont.	4 00	25
At Port Stanley, Ont	2 25	15½
At Rondeau, Ont	2 25	15½
In Sydenham River, Ont.		20
In Thames River, Ont.	0 50	13
At Thornbury, Ont.	2 30	34
At Toronto, Ont.	4 00	13½
At Trenton and Dark Channel, Ont.	0 40	14
At Victoria Harbour, Ont	2 00	8
At Waubaushene, Ont.	2 00	13
At Wiarton, Ont.	2 00	20
At Wingfield Basin, Ont	4 00	65
In Batiscan River, Que	5 00	10½
In Bécancour River, Que		16
At Blanche Shoals, Que		21
In Chateauguay River, Que	1 65	22
At Dorion, Que.	3 75	35
In Godefroy River, Que		11
At Hay Island, Que.	2 60	16½
At Hudson, Que	2 00	18
In L'Assomption River, Que.		16
In Maskinongé River, Que	2 50	20
In Nicolet River, Que.	0 40	13
At Pointe Cavagnale, Que.	2 50	26
In Racquette River, Que	2 50	24
At Rimouski Pier, Que.	1 65	61
In River Jesus, Que.	2 60	27½
At Rivière du Loup, Que	0 40	13
At Rivière Ouelle, Que.	2 65	69
In Saguenay River, Que.	2 35	34
At St. Andrews, Que.	2 50	25
In St. Francis River, Que.	5 00	11
In St. Maurice River, Que.		8
At St. Pierre les Becquets, Que.	0 40	13
At St. Placide, Que.	2 50	21¾
At Sorel, Que.	2 50	19
At Vaudreuil, Que.	2 00	18
In Yamaska River, Que.	5 00	10½

Lowest Tenders or 1908.	Prices per Cubic Yard.			
	Scow Measurement.		Bucket Measurement.	
	Boulders.	Other Materials.	Boulders.	Other Materials,
	$ cts.	cts.	$ cts.	cts.
At Blind River, Ont.	3 00	23	3 00	22
At Burlington, Ont.	2 00	20	2 00	20

Lowest Tenders for 1908.	Price per Cubic Yard.			
	Scow Measurement.		Bucket Measurement.	
	Boulders.	Other Materials.	Boulders.	Other Materials.
	$ cts.	cts.	$ cts.	cts.
At Cobourg, Ont.	3 00	18	3 00	18
At Collingwood, Ont.	2 18	75	2 18	75
At Goderich, Ont.	4 00	35	4 00	35
At Hamilton, Ont.	1 50	15	1 50	15
At Kincardine, Ont.	4 00	35	4 00	35
At Little Current, Ont.	1 78	25	1 78	25
At Meaford, Ont.	2 80	34	2 30	30
At Midland, Ont.	2 25	26	1 75	21
At Nigger and Telegraph Islands, Ont.	3 00	95	2 50	65
At Owen Sound, Ont.	2 75	25	2 75	25
At Penetanguishene, Ont.	2 75	19	2 75	19
At Picton, Ont.	1 00	12	1 00	10
At Point Edward, Ont.	1 00	18	1 00	18
At Port Burwell, Ont.	1 50	39	1 50	39
At Port Elgin, Ont.	1 95	22	1 95	18
At Rondeau, Ont.	1 50	33	1 50	31
At Summerstown, Ont.	2 50	23	2 25	23
In Thames River, Ont.	1 00	20	1 00	20
At Thornbury, Ont.	2 80	34	2 30	30
At Toronto, Ont.	1 50	19½	2 00	15
In Trenton Harbour and Dark Channel, Ont.	1 95	26	1 95	18
At Waubaushene, Ont.	3 50	15	3 25	14
At Wiarton, Ont.	2 75	24	2 75	24
At Wingfield Basin, Ont.	3 00	78	3 00	70
			Castover	
At Batiscan, Que.		17		
In Becancour River, Que.		17		
At Blanche Shoals, Que.		21		
In Chateauguay River, Que.	2 25	22	2 00	15
At Dorion, Que.	3 90	35	3 00	18
At Fraserville, Que.	5 00	45	4 75	14
In Godefroy River, Que.		13		
At Hay Island, Que.	3 90	24	3 00	18
At Hudson, Que.	1 95	18	1 95	15
At l'Assomption, Que.	2 00	16¾	2 00	10
In Maskinongé River, Que.	3 90	31½	3 00	18
At Nicolet, Que.	4 00	22	3 00	15
At Port St. Francis, Que.	1 65	22	1 65	20
In River Jesus, Que.	1 95	29	1 65	20
At Rivière du Loup (en haut), Que.	5 00	21	4 75	14
At Rivière Ouelle, Que.	2 50	48	2 50	40
In Saguenay River, Que.	1 95	32½	1 95	30
In St. Francis River, Que.	5 00	18	4 75	14
At St. Lambert, Que.	1 65	22	1 65	20
In St. Maurice River, Que.		10		
At St. Pierre les Becquets, Que.	1 95	29	1 65	20
At St. Placide, Que.	3 90	21½	3 00	50
At Vaudreuil, Que.	2 25	22	2 00	15
In Yamachiche River, Que.	5 00	20	4 75	4
In Yamaska River, Que.	5 00	18	4 75	14

3. 'Hackett,' 'St. Lawrence,' 'No. 5,' 'No. 7,' 'Togo,' 'Trenton,' 'Excelsior,' 'No. 9,' 'Main' (new), 'Monarch,' 'Edmund Hall,' 'No. 1,' 'No. 14,' 'No. 1,' 'Mead,'

'Kingsford,' 'Chief,' 'Hamill,' 'Hamell,' 'Arnoldi,' 'Iroquois,' 'Algonquin,' 'Mohawk,' 'Huron,' 'Oneida,' 'Mohican,' 'King Edward,' 'No. 15,' 'Frank,' 'Prince Louis,' 'Prince Gay,' 'Prince Willie,' 'Duke of York,' 'Pontiac,' 'St. Pierre,' 'T. F. Moore, No. 1,' 'T. F. Moore, No. 2,' 'No. 6,' 'Ottawa,' 'Canada,' 'Hercules,' 'Little Giant,' 'Chateauguay,' 'Central City,' 'Capital,' 'Dominion, No. 2,' 'Dominion No. 3.'

SOULANGES CANAL ELECTRIC POWER.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. Is not the Soulanges canal lit by electricity its whole length?
2. If so, does the government itself produce that electricity?
3. What is the degree of horse-power at the disposal of the government in its workshops on the canal?
4. Why are not the villages of Des Cédres, St. Ignace and Côteau Landing lit by means of the same power?
5. Are those villages situated on the banks of the same canal?
6. Has the member for the county of Soulanges asked that this be done?
7. Have any steps been taken to secure this advantage?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Approximately 250 horse-power is available at present.
4. The department has no information.
5. No.
6. No proposition looking to the entering into a contract with the department for electric lighting has been made by the villages in question or on their behalf by any person.

EMPLOYMENT OF W. S. BUELL.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. Is W. S. Buell, of Brockville, Ontario, in the employ of the government or of the commission appointed to inquire re telephone, &c., in any capacity? If so, what?
2. Has W. S. Buell been paid by the govenment for any services during the past two years? If so, how much, when, for what services, and how was he engaged, by day or otherwise?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Mr. Buell along with Mr. Shepley, K.C., has been retained in the public interest upon the application of the telephone and express companies to the Board of Railway Commissioners, for the approval of their schedule of tolls and rates.
2. He was paid in 1907, $2,514.66; he was paid in 1908, $1,064.53; total, $3,579.19. He was retained for the inquiry, and he is being paid at the rate of $30 per diem and expenses.

SKINNER'S COVE BOAT CHANNEL.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. What was the amount of contract for the boat channel at Skinners Cove, Nova Scotia, who were the tenderers, what is the amount of each tender, and to whom was the contract awarded?
2. When was the work commenced, when was it completed, and what was the total amount paid under contract?
3. What extras, if any, did the contractor receive, for what were extras paid, and what were the several amounts paid as extras?
4. Since completion of the work has any expenditure been made on the same? If so, when were the expenditures made?
5. What were the reasons for making each expenditure since completion of work under the contract?
6. What is the total amount to date paid since completion under contract?
7. Is any further repair or addition to be made to work in current year? If so, what is the reason for such repair or addition, and what is the estimated cost of same?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. (a) $10,965; (b) W. J. Landry, $10,965; A. W. Girroir, $11,200; Hugh McDonald, $12,285; (c) W. J. Landry.
2. (a) 17th June, 1905; (b) 1st August, 1906.

(c) Contract work	$10,965 00
Extras	927 41
	$11,892 41
3. Additional walling and sheathing	$369 91
Extension of protection work, east side	245 00
Extension of protection work, west side	225 00
Additional dredging	87 50
	$927 41

4. Yes, in November and December, 1907.
5. To protect the dredged entrance channel.
6. $822.37.
7. (a) Yes. (b) Construction of pile, brush and stone works at the inner end of pier for the protection of the channel leading to the harbour; also for dredging channel to depth of 8 feet, estimated cost, $6,500.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—AMQUI STATION.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. What sum has been voted by parliament for the construction of an Intercolonial Railway station at Amqui, in the county of Rimouski, province of Quebec?
2. What was the cost of construction of such station?
3. What was the cost of the changing of the Intercolonial Railway line at the time of the construction of the said station at that place?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. $5,500.

2. $5,450.
3. $5,942.71.

RIMOUSKI COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. What sums have been voted by the parliament of Canada for public works in the county of Rimouski, province of Quebec, except for the Intercolonial Railway, during the years 1900 and 1907, inclusive?
2. What sums have actually been expended in the said county for public works, with the exception of the Intercolonial Railway, during the said years above-mentioned?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1 and 2.

Years.	Appropriation.	Expenditure.
Bic Harbour—		
1899-1900	$ 1,500	.....
1900-1	6,500	$ 1,541 39
1901-2	5,400	
1902-3	2,500	1,043 78
1903-4	.....	1 58
1904-5	5,000	5,044 59
1905-6	5,000	4,490 23
1906-7	5,000	5,969 64
Father Point—		
1900-1	5,000	3,402 13
1901-2	15,000	625 77
1902-3	25,000	22,355 85
1903-4	61,000	39,162 26
1904-5	40,000	22,115 58
1905-6	30,175	30,166 52
1906-7	8,000	7,387 95
Pointe des Grands Méchins—		
1903-4	5,000	
1904-5	15,000	3,597 36
1905-6	20,000	727 58
1906-7	20,000	291 56
Les Boules, wharf—		
1900-1	5,000	2,352 73
1901-2	10,000	1 81
Matane, wharf—		
1899-1900	4,000	239 70
1900-1	4,000	3,951 08
1901-2	4,000	1,411 09
1902-3	.....	9 00
1903-4	4,500	2,973 34
1904-5	2,000	1,878 36
Rimouski harbour—		
1899-1900	2,500	2,499 67
1900-1	10,300	7,514 19
1901-2	.....	2,505 32
1902-3	.....	1,323 32
1903-4	50,000	27,236 75
1904-5	30,000	26,576 49
1905-6	30,000	31,081 03
1906-7	21,100	38,474 11
Rimouski post office and custom house—		
1899-1900	.....	17 00
1900-1	.....	2 68
1901-2	.....	8 55
1902-3	.....	29 18
1903-4	.....	119 08
1904-5	.....	25 64
1905-6	.....	26 40
1906-7	1,200	445 86
Rivière Blanche, wharf—		
1901-2	.....	792 86
1902-3	750	750 00
1905-6	1,000	999 83
1906-7	1,500	1,499 97

THE LEE-ENFIELD RIFLE.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. Is the government aware that within the last two weeks on the Rockliffe range, a Lee-Enfield rifle bolt blew back, inflicting an injury on Lieutenant Wolseley, of Ottawa?
2. Is it the intention of the government to call in all the Lee-Enfield rifles issued, owing to the number of serious and fatal accidents arising from the use of that weapon?

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

1. On May 9 last at Rockliffe, Ont., while target shooting the bolt of a Lee-Enfield rifle, in the hands of Lieut. Wolseley, 43rd Regiment, blew back inflicting upon him slight injuries.
2. It is not the intention of the government to call in all the Lee-Enfield rifles issued at the present time.

WHARF AT LAKE MEGANTIC

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Is the government constructing a wharf in the county of Beauce at the point where lake Megantic discharges into the Chaudière river? If so, what expenditure has already been made in this connection and what work accomplished?
2. Who has been the inspector of said work?
3. At what rate per day has he been paid, and for how many days' service?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. (a) Yes.
(b) $970.07.
(c) The crib substructure supporting outer pier was sunk in place and fully ballasted and the stone approach about one third done.
2. P. H. Renaud.
3. At $2.50 per working day. He was paid for 45 days covering all services to 31st March, 1908.

TORONTO HARBOUR CONTRACT.

Mr. KEMP asked:

1. What is the amount of the contract for the new western entrance to Toronto harbour?
2. Was there any provision in the contract that Canadian timber or lumber should be use in the work?
3. Is it the intention of the contractor to use timber or lumber made in the United States?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. $495,000.
2. No.
3. Department is not aware what the intentions of the contractor are; timber supplied must have approval of the resident engineer.

HALIFAX GARRISON COAL SUPPLY.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. How much coal is supplied each year for the Militia Department in connection with the Halifax garrison?
2. What price is paid for hard and soft coal, respectively ?
3. Is it true that the government pays $4.3' per ton of 2,000 pounds, while the imperial government paid the same price per ton of 2,240 pounds
4. Is it true that the imperial government obtained delivery not only in the city but at outposts and forts for the price of $4.35 per ton of 2,240 pounds, and that the present government, in addition to the increased price above-mentioned, pays the cost of delivery to the outposts and forts at a cost of about $1 per ton?
5. What part, if any, of the 12,000 tons is supplied after public advertisement and tender ?
6. How long have Messrs. George E. Boak & Son, or George E. Boak, had this contract ?
7. Is it true that the contract is given to them direct by the department without tender ?
8. What are all the facts in connection with the supplying of this coal and the increase in price to the country, if any ?

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

1. The quantity estimated as required for 1907-8 was 1,532 tons hard coal and 3,-061 tons soft coal. The accounts for the year are not yet closed.
2. $4.35 per ton of 2,000 pounds for soft coal ; $6.20 and $6.25 per ton of 2,000 pounds for hard coal.
3. Yes, the contract with the Imperial government was made in May, 1904 ; that with the Canadian government in January, 1906.
4. The contract made by the Imperial government with the Dominion Coal Company made no provision for an extra charge for delivery outside city limits. It was originally for one year ending May 31, 1905, but was extended from time to time till December 31, 1905. The last extension was for delivery within the city limits only.

The contract made by the Canadian government in December, 1905, after tenders had been obtained, provided that for delivery outside city limits and to outposts, an extra charge of 75 cents per ton would be paid. This extra charge was stipulated for by all tenderers.

5. Twelve thousand tons are not required. In December, 1905, tenders for soft coal were obtained from George E. Boak and Company, and the Dominion Coal Company, for the year ending December 31, 1906.

In June, 1907, tenders were obtained by letter from the Dominion Coal Company, A. T. Weldon, and George E. Boak and Son, for the supply for the year ending June 30, 1908. The contract was given to the lowest tenderers, George E. Boak and Son.

For hard coal competitive tenders were obtained by newspaper advertisement, in June, 1906, from George E. Boak and Company and James Hall, for 1906-7 ; and in June, 1907, by letter from Boak and Son, Dominion Coal Company and A. T. Weldon. The contract was awarded in each case to the lowest tenderer, George E. Boak and Company, and George E. Boak and Son.

6. Since January 1, 1906.
7. No.

BRANTFORD STRIKE.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. Roche—asked :

Has the Honourable Minister of Justice had any correspondence with the officers of the law at Brantford in connection with the strikers who were under arrest recently in that city for picket duty? If so, what was the nature of such communication?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) : During May, 1908, two letters were received from the County Crown Attorney at Brantford and one from counsel for members of various trades unions and a reply was sent to each letter.

These letters discussed the provisions of section 501 of the Criminal Code and the true interpretation of the said section and whether any amendment of the said section was desirable.

PAY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if it is true, as has been alleged, that the employees of the Public Works Department in Hamilton have not received their April pay, and what is the reason ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of it but will make inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably let us know in the afternoon session.

SUPPLY—PAY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

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

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings, N.B.). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a certain misrepresentation which appears in what purports to be a letter issued by the Railway Department to its employees. I am quoting from the 'Daily Telegraph' of St. John, New Brunswick, Saturday, June 6:

Intercolonial Railway employees here have been notified by a circular, a copy of which is posted in the freight shed, that salaries or wages will not likely be paid until further supplies have been voted by parliament.

The circular which bears the name of the late superintendent G. M. Jarvis and is dated from Truro on June 3, informs all concerned

that a letter dated June 2, had been received from the general manager which reads as follows:

I am instructed to advise you that the interim partial appropriation voted by parliament for works and staff under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals, will shortly be exhausted, if not already so, and that no further appropriation has been obtained from parliament at the present date, and to instruct you to notify the several members of your staff of the position, leaving it to their option to decide whether they will continue work on the understanding that no salary or wages will be paid them until further supplies have been voted.

Similar notices are posted at Moncton and elsewhere along the line. A Moncton despatch says: In view of the circular, employees are wondering whether or not they are to receive any pay this month. The office employees, including men in the shippings, train men, &c., have yet to be paid.

What I complain of is that those instructions, issued from the Department of Railways and Canals——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What date ?

Mr. FOWLER. It must have been previous to June 2, because on June 2 the General Manager sent his circular to the different road superintendents. Therefore the instructions must have gone from him before June 1 in order to have enabled him to issue these instructions on June 2. The idea no doubt was to make the people working on the Intercolonial Railway believe that the opposition were preventing them from getting their pay. As a matter of fact, however, the Minister of Railways has never asked this parliament for Supply to pay the employees of the Intercolonial Railway or on the canals. Last Friday night, after the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had moved that the committee rise and report progress, and after midnight when we had been sitting from 11 in the morning, the Minister of Railways—evidently by preconcerted arrangement—rose and said he would like to get some Supply. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) objected that it was very late and that some of the members of the committee in connection with railways and canals, on the opposition side, were not present. The minister demurred to this on the ground that he could not be here on Monday. Well, we know why the minister could not be here on Monday. The minister is not detained by anything in connection with his department from being here; the minister is up in Brockville attending to the provincial elections. The minister has a right, if he sees fit, to take part in the provincial elections, I have no fault to find with that at all. But the minister should not neglect the work of his department in order to take part in provincial elections. We are now going into Supply; if the Minister of Railways were here there would be no difficulty in getting Supply for the employees of his department. But as I say, he has never asked for Supply except in the manner I have mentioned, on Friday night. I say that this instruction that has been issued from the Department of Railways and Canals is absolutely and entirely misleading, and is a misrepresentation of the true situation here. We have been charged with obstruction; and my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) stated the other day that a great many resolutions had been moved by the opposition, who had taken up a great deal of time unnecessarily. Now as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the greater portion of the time of this House. as will be found by an examination of 'Hansard,' has been taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. FOWLER. My hon. friend says oh. I have carefully examined the 'Hansard' from the first of this session in November down to the end of January, and during that time hon. gentlemen opposite have taken up a considerably larger portion of the time.

Mr. CARVELL. Do you include in that the time you devoted in asking questions over Supply?

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has asked a question, I do not know what he means by that. I have taken very little time in asking questions over Supply; in fact I do not think, if there is any person that can be accused of obstruction on either side of the House, that any one can properly accuse me of having unnecessarily taken up the time of this House. I have taken up very little time, less time than my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell); but the short time I have taken up has been far more effective, so far as the general business of the country was concerned, than the much longer time taken up by the member for Carleton, because no man can use more words and say less than that hon. gentleman. Now I have examined the discussion of the various resolutions that were debated, the resolutions which the hon. member for Carleton said were silly and absurd. If they were silly and absurd, it is a singular thing that the ministerial members should find it necessary to talk so much about them. Of course my hon. friend, when he made that remark, did not mean it, he only made it for the purpose of getting a laugh from his friends. I find that on the various resolutions that were introduced in this House and discussed from the time we began to sit in November down to January, the ministerial members occupied thirty-eight columns of 'Hansard' more than the opposition members did —discussing these various resolutions which

the hon. member for Carleton said were silly and ridiculous.

Mr. FIELDING. What was the number in each case, the totals for each side?

Mr. FOWLER. I can give them in detail, I can show the Minister of Finance how much time he wasted. Now take some of the larger questions. I find that on the address, the Prime Minister used up twenty-five columns of 'Hansard'; I find that the Minister of Finance used thirty.

Mr. FIELDING. Not on the address.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, he was the worst offender on the address. Now on the address the opposition used up more columns of the 'Hansard' than did the government, the government spoke 176 columns, while the opposition spoke 275. But in the debate on the immigration question, the Postmaster General was the worst offender, for he spoke 28 columns. The Minister of the Interior, in that debate, spoke 17 columns; total, 54 columns to the government and only 24 to the opposition, a debit of 30 against the government. Then on the motion for the appointment of a fishery commissioner introduced by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), the government spoke 27 columns to the opposition 12, making 15 against the government. On the British Columbia legislation, the government spoke 22 columns to the opposition one. On the original documents discussion, the opposition spoke 35 columns and the government 11. On the Franco-Canadian trade treaty, the government spoke 63 columns and the opposition 44, nineteen against the government. On the seed grain question, the government spoke 22 columns to the opposition 13. On the constitution of the Senate, the government spoke 53 columns to the opposition 50. On the motion of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) on oriental immigration, the government spoke 57 columns and the opposition none; that debate was confined entirely to the members from British Columbia. On the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) respecting the Franco-Canadian trade treaty, the opposition spoke ten columns and the government one. Concerning original documents there were two debates; in the one on the motion of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), the opposition spoke 41 and the government 22. On all these different resolutions there is a total against the government of 38 columns of 'Hansard,' and yet we are charged with obstruction. Now what is true of that time is also true of the balance of the time, and even in greater measure. It is natural that the opposition should occupy more time than the government, because we are here to criticise, to ask questions with respect to these various matters. But in these cases the government apparently desired that Supply should not pass, there can be no other conclusion. The ministers in giving their explanations, have given them very fully, in many cases more fully perhaps than was absolutely necessary, and in this way time has been wasted. But what I object to, Mr. Speaker, is misrepresentation on the part of the responsible minister of a department, when that minister knows very well that he has never asked for any appropriation from this House to pay the employees in his department.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). In regard to the number of columns of 'Hansard' that might be occupied by the respective parties, I have not taken the trouble to make any analysis, but I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that if he wished to go further into the question he should reduce the whole time to the basis of so much per column for the average member, and he will discover that inasmuch as our numbers are two to one, roughly speaking, as compared with hon. gentlemen opposite, I have no doubt he will find that the proportion of time occupied by the average member of the opposition is vastly greater than the proportion of time occupied by the average member on the government side of the House.

Mr. FOWLER. That means nothing.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, if there is any thing in the argument at all that is the only way to examine it. But I confess that I do not attach very much importance to that form of argument. It is not to discuss it that I rise to take exception again, and I do it with regret—I think my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) must have been out when the discussion came up on a previous occasion—but I am obliged again to take exception to the statement he made as to applications for Supply. The hon. gentleman says the Minister of Railways never sought the co-operation of the opposition to obtain Supplies. I state again that the Minister of Railways through me, acting for him officially and for all my colleagues, made application to hon. gentlemen opposite for a further vote on account. We received one vote on account, an eighth, and we desired to obtain a quarter. Hon. gentlemen opposite thought it was better to confine it to an eighth. If we had taken a quarter, as we asked, we should have had money in hand to fully meet the needs of the various branches of the public service. At a later stage we asked for a further vote on account. No particular figure was mentioned. Hon. gentlemen opposite—I am not quarrelling with them on the matter or finding fault, but merely stating the facts—when we made that application in a proper way, informed us that they were not prepared to co-operate with us and grant it.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I desire to say a word or two on

the question of obstruction. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) who has just spoken said it is not a question of the measure of time occupied, and that, I think, is true to a large extent, for surely any person who considers the matter at all carefully will realize that the opposition must necessarily occupy more time, if they are to adequately discharge their duty, than is occupied by the government and their supporters. I entirely dissent from the suggestion that in this matter we are to be measured by numbers. If there were only ten men in opposition here, the duty would rest upon them, with even greater responsibility, perhaps, than if there were a hundred. The opposition, whether few or many are bound to reasonably scrutinize and criticise the propositions advanced by the government from time to time, and it is altogether immaterial whether this work is done by many or by few, and it is really immaterial how much time is occupied, so that the time is usefully employed. I, for one, will not hesitate at any time to take up whatever time may seem necessary to discuss any question that may arise in order that I may fairly place my views before that House or the committee as the case may be. I may say, in passing, that from a hasty and somewhat incomplete analysis of the proceedings of this House during the last six months, I am led to the conclusion that the government have, as a matter of fact, occupied quite as much time as have the opposition. But that is not so material to my mind, as the fact which forces itself upon attention, that, on very many occasions, the government have manifestly put up their supporters for the purpose of marking time, for the reason, evidently, that they had not ready the legislation necessary to bring before the House. It requires no elaborate research to discover that this government, this session, have been notably remiss in bringing down legislation, and that the long time to which this session has been drawn out is attributable mainly to the fact that the government have not put themselves in a position to supply the House with the matters which have to be dealt with before we can prorogue. However, I more particularly desire to call your attention to a statement made and repeated in this House in somewhat varied form—insultingly repeated, I may say—by some distinguished members of this House (not always by members of the government), to the effect that the opposition have been delaying the progress of the House and blocking the Supply by the introduction of ridiculous resolutions supported by ridiculous arguments. Now, Sir, I venture to say that it is our duty to place before the people in a succinct, definite form what these resolutions are—or, at least, the main ones—and let the public judge whether they are ridiculous or not;—and I think that during the progress of debates the public have judged whether the arguments of the opposition are ridiculous or not.

Down to the adjournment for Christmas, the time occupied by the sitting of the House was very fairly distributed. There seemed to be no effort on either side, as far as I can see, to go very deeply into difficult questions. We had, of course, the address; and on that address three resolutions were moved by members of the opposition, resolutions which were voted down by the government, but which, I think, will commend themselves to the public. These resolutions I will not read. The first was that of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) calling attention to absence from the address of certain matters of great importance as to the enormous expenditure and—what I think is evident to every one—the very serious mismanagement of the government on many important questions. Perhaps we could hardly expect that the government, at that early stage, would adopt that resolution. They did not adopt it. Then came the amendment of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) in reference to rural mail derivery, a question which the government will have to face, a question on which, I think, many hon. members will find it difficult to explain to their constituents why they took part in voting down that resolution by a straight party vote. Then came the amendment of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) in reference to the Quebec bridge, a matter which the government will have to explain and answer for, but which I will not discuss here further than to say that, on this question also, some hon. members will find it difficult to explain the votes they gave. There were certain other matters under discussion before the House rose for the Christmas recess. We had the very interesting resolution moved by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) in reference to the hours for adjournment. We had the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in reference to the Anglo-Japanese convention, with a necessary, but short, discussion. Then came the resolution of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. J. T. Schell), a supporter of the government, in reference to the Transcontinental railway. Then we had the very full, interesting and useful debate introduced by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) occupying—and quite properly, I think—a very considerable time and confined, I believe, entirely to supporters of the government—of that I make no complaint. Then we had, concluding the part of the session before the Christmas vacation, the question on the

motion of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in reference to Japanese immigration, in which the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and a number of others took part.

Now as to the resolutions brought forward after we reassembled on January 8, which have been characterized as being ridiculous. The first was very concise—not at all ridiculous in wording—and the government met it and resisted it. This was the motion of the hon. member for St. Antoine which was as follows :

That an order of the House do issue to the proper officer for a return laying upon the table of this House the original applications and tenders in respect of timber berths 1107, 1108 and 1171.

That invoked a short but very decisive discussion. The government took a definite position on the subject, mainly at the instance, I take it—and compelled to it very probably—by the attitude of the Minister of the Interior. And the government's supporters, to a man, by a straight party vote, voted down that resolution and affirmed the principle that the members of the opposition have no right to have access to the public documents of this country. That motion was followed on the 21st by a motion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in these words on going into Supply :

And the question being proposed; Mr. Borden moved in amendment thereto, that all the words after the word 'that' be omitted and the following substituted therefor: 'subject to such consideration of public policy as can be validly urged in any case it is the undoubted right of the people's representatives, in parliament assembled, to be informed of everything necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of the government and for that purpose to have an opportunity of seeing and examining all documents connected with the transaction of public business; and the denial of such right by the government justifies the refusal by this House of further supplies to the Crown.'

That followed very closely upon the resolution I previously read, but, strange to say, this government then, as on many occasions, pursuing a peculiarly vaccilating policy, came down and accepted it. You would have thought that would end the matter, that the matter would have been definitely settled, but not so, Sir.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman in order in referring to a previous debate?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think this is in illustration of the point that is under discussion.

Mr. LENNOX. We found that the government were going back upon the policy they had adopted on the 21st and a discussion which arose was determined on the 24th by a straight party vote in which the government not only went back on their record of the 21st, but every supporter fell into line. The resolution upon that occasion was moved by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, and was :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor: 'subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case members of parliament have the right to have access to all the records of the government and to all archives.'

It is pretty difficult to see in principle what the difference is between that resolution and the resolution of the 21st, but it does not always seem to be necessary to find a difference in order to justify hon. gentlemen opposite in taking a different position. Therefore, we find them voting down that resolution and thereby swallowing themselves on the position which they had previously taken.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that resolution was an exact transcript of a statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. LENNOX. If there was any difference there ought to be the difference of the additional merit which it might possess in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite by reason of the fact that it was a literal transcript of the words of the right hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I ask if the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) is in order?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) will not be permitted to discuss these resolutions.

Mr. JOHNSTON. He has been doing so all along.

Mr. SPEAKER. He can illustrate the point he is making as to delay or no delay.

Mr. LENNOX. That was the attitude of the government on the 24th January, but to follow the transaction, to trace the history of this government as to this——

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I again call your attention to the fact that for purely obstructive tactics——

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman who has first risen has the first point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. D. ROSS. For purely obstructive tactics——

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. D. ROSS. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I assert that my point of order be taken because it would prevent—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is plainly out of order. The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) rose to a point of order and I have not heard what that point of order is.

Mr. FOSTER. In making that point of order he imputed motives——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER.—and it is——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER.—on that point——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER.—that I raise the point of order.

Mr. FIELDING. Let the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo present his point of order and then we will take the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster) point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to know whether the hon. gentleman has the right or not——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Let the hon. gentlemen both take their seats for a moment. If I understand the position it is that the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo rose to a point of order, and in the course of his statement of the point of order he stated that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) who had the floor was proceeding for obstructive tactics. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) then rises in the midst of the point of order that the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo is taking, to take the point of order that the suggestion that the hon. member who has the floor is taking the course he is for obstructive tactics, imputes a motive to that hon. gentleman. That, of course, is a proper point to be taken at any time.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I rise to that point of order and ask you if——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. D. ROSS. In order that my point of order may be properly before the House I have no hesitation in withdrawing the suggestion that they were purely obstructive tactics.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all I want.

Mr. D. ROSS. My point of order is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) is relating the history of numerous debates that took place in this House during the present session and that consequently he is not in order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I may be permitted a word in so far as this is concerned, the statement has been made that the time of the House has been wasted by ridiculous motions supported by senseless arguments. It is perfectly proper to call the attention of the House to the nature of the motions which have been offered during the session.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is the proper position, that he can illustrate the point which the hon. gentleman started out to make, namely, that members of the opposition have not obstructed, by a reference to past debates without discussing them. But if he attempts to discuss any motions that we have had before the House or to make a reference to a past debate otherwise, he will be subject to being called to order.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite recognize, Mr. Speaker, that I have no right, and I do not propose to try to discuss the merits of what has been discussed before. I merely want to show what we have done that has been complained of and the motions which have been characterized as ridiculous and which it is said have been supported by ridiculous arguments. That vote on the 24th was followed by a statement of the premier that he would make a statement on the following Monday, which he did, and which brought us to the position that the government then surrendered unconditionally. On the 13th February, however, we found that the difficulty had arisen in another quarter, and consequently my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) was compelled upon this same question of public documents, to move this resolution :

The Committee on Public Accounts is constituted for the purpose of affording full and free examination and inquiry into the receipts and expenditures of public moneys and the circumstances in connection herewith.

That in the public interest the greatest possible freedom of investigation and inquiry should be enjoyed by the committee.

That any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence, or restricting inquiry should be the subject of appeal to this House, and upon request for that purpose the necessary report of the proceedings ought immediately to be ordered.

By a straight party vote that right was denied. That disposes of the question of public documents. I shall now refer to other resolutions, some of which intervened,

On January 15 we had the resolution of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) which did not occasion a division owing to the fact that amendments to it were moved and so the debate was shunted off. Mr. Cockshutt moved :

That in consideration of the great congestion that at present prevails in the labour market in many of the industrial centres throughout the country, it is highly expedient that assisted immigration, excepting only the agricultural and domestic servant classes, should immediately cease, and that no further bonuses shall be paid to individual agents or companies for sending or bringing in such immigrants. Further, that the time has come for the strict enforcement of the law that requires that only the financially, morally and

physically fit shall be allowed to enter this Dominion as settlers.

Mr. Johnston moved in amendment thereto:

That all the words after 'that' to the end of the resolution be struck out, and the following inserted instead thereof: 'the House approves the policy of the Department of the Interior in confining its immigration operations to the encouragement of the coming to Canada of farmers, farm labourers, railway labourers and female domestic servants.'

Then we had a resolution by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) on February 6 last, which was defeated by a straight party vote. Mr. Lake moved, on going into Supply:

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out and the following substituted therefor: 'in the opinion of this House a committee of nine members should be appointed to investigate, inquire into and consider all matters connected with or relating to the alienation, granting, rental, leasing or other disposal by lease, license or otherwise, since the first day of July, 1898, of any timber lands, or timber berths forming part of the public lands of Canada, or of rights to the same, or to the timber thereon, and to report upon the matters aforesaid to this House, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation.'

On February 11 we had a division resolution moved by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) in amendment to the motion for Supply, as follows:

That all the words after the word 'that' be omitted, and the following substituted therefor: 'in the opinion of this House, the regulations respecting the purchase, sale and distribution of seed grain in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan should be amended by providing that payment for such seed grain shall be made in three years by three annual instalments instead of in one year, and by further providing that any person desiring to make payment at an earlier date may do so.'

That was opposed by the members of the government and their supporters unanimously on a straight party vote.

On February 19, we had the following motion by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk):

That it is the duty of the government to enter into negotiations with the government of the province of Quebec, with a view to removing all obstacles to the abolition of toll gates upon the roads of the Island of Montreal.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved in amendment thereto:

That the words 'enter into negotiations with,' be struck out from the said motion, and the following substituted therefor: 'receive all the overtures that may be made by.'

The motion of the leader of the government was supported and Mr. Monk's motion opposed on a straight party vote.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. D. ROSS. I wish to rise to another point of order. As I understand, the hon. gentleman is attempting to answer an argument that was advanced on Thursday or Friday last to the effect that hon. gentlemen opposite were using obstruction.

Mr. LENNOX. No.

Mr. D. ROSS. My point of order is that that debate was disposed of last Thursday or Friday and the hon. member cannot now renew it, that the proper time for him to have made his speech was when the statement was made, not to-day.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not confining myself to the somewhat extravagant language used by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) the other day, but I am talking of the attitude assumed by the supporters of the government and their press outside the House and on the public platforms from one end of Canada to the other.

On March 10 we had a resolution by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) moved in amendment to Supply:

That all the words after the word 'that' be struck out, and the following substituted therefor: 'in the opinion of this House tenders received by any department of the government should be immediately placed in safe custody under seal so as to prevent any possibility or suspicion of tampering, and should be opened in public at the time and place mentioned in the advertisement and in the presence of at least three of the principal officers of the department; and the persons so tendering, or their duly authorized agents, should be at liberty to attend at the said time and place and see such tenders opened and recorded, if they so desire.'

That was voted down by a straight party vote.

On March 12, we had the resolution of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) on going into Supply, as follows:

That all the words after the word 'That' be struck out, and the following substituted therefor: 'the revenues of Canada belong to the people of this country and should be expended in the public interest;

And that this House condems the action of the present government in expending public moneys on works which are really for the benefit of favoured corporations and private individuals and not for the public benefit.'

The supporters of the government, one and all, saw their way to voting down that resolution.

On March 16, we had the resolution of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) in reference to cigarettes. Mr. Blain moved:

That the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes for the public good; and by an equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.

That the smoking of cigarettes has been proved by overwhelming testimony to be productive of serious physical and moral injury to young people; impairing health, arresting development, weakening intellectual power, and thus constituting a social and national evil.

That the legislation, licensing and restricting the sale of cigarettes has not proven sufficient to prevent these evils, which will continue while the public sale of the cause of the mischief is permitted to go on.

That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons heretofore set forth, that the right and most effectual remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes; and that it is expedient to bring in a Bill at this session to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

Mr. Clarke moved in amendment thereto:

That all the words after 'disadvantage' in the 4th line of the proposed motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

'That the smoking and use of tobacco in any form has been proved to be injurious to the physical and intellectual development of the youth of the country besides encouraging habits of idleness. That the legislation now in force restricting the sale of cigarettes, cigars or tobacco has been ineffectual to wholly prevent these evils. That this House is of the opinion that the most effective remedy for the existing evil is to amend the Criminel Code so as to make it an offence for persons under eighteen years of age to use tobacco in any form for smoking or chewing or to have possession of tobacco for either of such purposes, and also for the sale or gift of tobacco in any form to persons under eighteen years of age. That it is expedient to bring in a Bill at this session to give effect to this resolution.'

Although the hon. member for Peel on subsequent occasions endeavoured very strongly to get a vote upon that, he has not, by reason of private members' days being taken by the government, been able to get a vote. I am not able to characterize it under the ruling of the chair, I believe, any further than that. On March 30 we had the following resolution moved by the hon. member for North Toronto:

Mr. Foster moved, that all supplies purchased for the use of the various departments of the government should be procured on the basis of public tender and contract, under the direction of a competent purchasing commission, and with regard primarily to quality and price.

The government and their supporters voted down that resolution as being ridiculous and absurd. On April 23, we had a resolution in reference to immigration moved by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) on amendment to going into Supply:

That all the words after the word 'That' in the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted in lieu thereof: 'while recognizing the importance of legitimate well directed efforts to encourage desirable immigration, this House declares that it is time to cease paying a bounty at so much per head to agents for immigrants coming to Canada.'

This was voted down by a straight party vote. On April 30, we had the following resolution moved by the hon. leader of the opposition in amendment to Supply:

Mr. Borden moved in amendment thereto, that all the words after the word 'That' be left out and the following substituted therefor: 'the investigation conducted by the Civil Service Commission was confessedly partial and incomplete.

That the proposed inquiry before Mr. Justice Cassels is unsatisfactory and insufficient, inasmuch as it relates to only one paragraph of the report of that commission and touches but a portion of the administration of one department.

That this House regrets the deplorable extravagance, waste, inefficiency and maladministration revealed by that report and declares that immediate steps should be taken to reform and redress the same.

That the public interest imperatively demands the appointment of an independent commission with full powers to make a thorough and searching investigation into the several departments of the public service.'

This was voted down by a straight party vote. On May 19, on going into Supply, we had this resolution moved by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle:

Mr. Lake moved in amendment thereto, that all the words after the word 'That' be eliminated, and the following substituted therefor: 'this House regrets that the present government has permitted the improvident alienation of immense areas of valuable timber lands which are now held for speculative purposes to the detriment of the people, and records its opinion that such full and unrestricted investigation should be made and such available proceedings taken as may be necessary to revest in the Crown any timber lands in respect of which fraud or imposition has been practised.'

And the government voted down that resolution by a straight vote of themselves and their supporters.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me renew my point of order. With reference to rule 16 Bourinot says, on page 479:

No member, in speaking, can refer to anything said or done in a previous debate during the same session.

My point of order is that the hon. member is placing on 'Hansard' in concrete form all that has been done by the opposition this session. I do not think he is within the rules of the House in saying that such a resolution was defeated and such a resolution was passed. It surely comes within the category of things done in the House.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, I propose to proceed. I do not propose to argue that kind of interruption.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have to rule on the question.

Mr. LENNOX. I suppose so. I am quite willing to take your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is obliged to hear the ruling. Hon. members are in the habit of making remarks of that kind which are quite out of place. My ruling is this. I can hardly think that the matter under discussion has been the subject of past debate, and my rulings have been based on that view. In the next place, I think that practically everything the hon. member has been saying thus far is in illustration of the point he has been seeking, rightly or wrongly, accurately or inaccurately, to make, namely, that the opposition has not been obstructing the business of the House, and to that extent I think it is permissible. I do not know just how far the point which the hon. member has taken as to references to what has been done, has force in it; but at the present moment I cannot rule that the hon. member is out of order in what he has said.

Mr. LENNOX. In saying that I was quite willing to take the ruling Mr. Speak, er, I think you will bear me out that I am always willing to take the ruling of the chair. I was only proceeding on the supposition that it was not necessary to discuss the question. The next resolution I propose to refer to, in combating the statement which has been made from time to time, that the resolutions have not been important or worthy of full discussion, is a resolution moved by the hon. member for Sherbrooke on May 21, as follows:

Mr. Worthington moved in amendment thereto, that all the words after the word 'That' in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted instead thereof:

'the dealings of the Department of Militia and Defence in connection with the adoption and manufacture of the Ross rifle as an arm for the defence of Canada have displayed deplorable inefficiency, have been characterized by gross extravagance and improvidence and have impaired public confidence both in the alleged efficiency of the rifle and in the management of the department.'

That was voted down by a straight party vote, a very small vote, it is true, on both sides of the House, as it was during the current Ontario elections. On May 26, this resolution was moved by the hon. member for North Toronto on going into Supply:

Mr. Foster moved in amendment thereto, that all the words after the word 'That' be left out and the following substituted therefor: 'the civil service system of Canada should be based on merit and character alone, and the appointments thereto should be made from candidates whose competency has been established through open competitive examinations, conducted under a non-partisan civil service commission.'

Whatever the reason may have been, the members of the government and their supporters saw fit to vote down that resolution. On May 29, the last resolution to which I will refer was moved by myself on going into Supply, in reference to the debate affecting the Minister of Militia:

Mr. Lennox moved in amendment thereto, that all the words after the word 'That' be struck out, and the following substituted therefor: 'this House is of the opinion that ministers of the Crown should not be connected with associations or companies seeking contracts, aid or subsidies from the government of which they are members.

That resolution, after a most vigorous debate on the subject which had originated it, was accepted by the government.

Now, I had intended to refer to a number of matters which have occupied time during the session, introduced by members who are supporters of the government. Not that I complain at all of those resolutions. Some were very interesting, some were of practical importance, but many were merely academic. However as I am anxious that we should get into Supply as early as possible, I shall not take up time in referring to those, more than to say that an examination of the record will show that the government seems to have been actuated by a desire to get time. These motions were brought up from time to time by government supporters, just as we were in good position for proceeding with Supply, and take up a great deal of time, and some of them were mere theoretical motions which might very well be dispensed with.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I took the trouble to look over the month of April to see how the oratory was apportioned during that month, as between this side and that. I find that the government members took up 436 columns and the opposition 326½, showing a surplus of 109½ columns of Liberal oratory over Tory oratory. I find there were two main resolutions introduced—one relating to the Hudson Bay Railway, which was submitted by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles), and which took up some little time; the other, proposed by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), related to the cessation of immigration bounties. In addition to the discussion on these two main resolutions, there was a short debate on the postal mail service introduced by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), and then we had the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne), during one afternoon, moving the adjournment of the House. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Beauparlant) had quite a good deal to say with regard to the criminal code

amendments. Therefore, as regards the month of April at all events—the only month I have looked over—I find that the opposition cannot be accused of having taken up more time than the government side. As a matter of fact, they took up 109½ columns less. Then as regards the moving of resolutions, one was introduced by a member supporting the government and the other by a member on this side.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I wish merely to make one or two remarks. In the first place, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the tabulation of the resolutions submitted this session by members of the opposition. I am very glad that they were massed together so that the country may see practically the effective answers to the wild statements made in the newspaper press and sometimes in this House, namely, that the resolutions proposed by the opposition were merely theoretical and designed to waste time. I do not think you can say of any one of those resolutions that it was purely academic. I do not think you can come to any other conclusion than they had the practical object of drawing attention to abuses and proposing a remedy. I am willing to let those resolutions go to the public, and I think no parliament need be ashamed of the discussion we have had on them.

It has evidently become solely the duty of the opposition to criticise the acts and policies of the government. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if we had to depend on gentlemen who support the government to raise a single voice of criticism or dissent along any one of the lines traced in these resolutions, would we have had one of them presented to this House? It does not seem to be considered the function of supporters of the government to raise a single note of protest or criticism regarding either any measure of the government or the estimates. That has to be done by the opposition, and the opposition are here for that purpose. No opposition would be worth its salt if it did not carry out that purpose, and no country would long tolerate an opposition which failed to do its duty in that respect.

Take the estimates. The government have brought forward $100,000,000 or more. Will any one have the hardihood to deny that if it were not for the members on the opposition side, these estimates would all go through practically without a word of criticism? The supporters of the government do not consider that they have any duty in that respect. The Minister of Finance would soon set them in their proper place, according to his idea, if they attempted to criticise the estimates. They are here to do the bidding of the government and not to criticise its acts or policy. Just as in the Public Accounts Committee, there would be no criticism or examination of a single item if it were not for the opposition. I am not sure that it was not the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who made the astounding suggestion a week ago that he thought the opposition ought to pass the estimates without any criticism. I hope that the opposition will never be so relax in its duty as to fail to criticise the estimates. When millions of dollars are put before us in block sums, it becomes absolutely necessary to find out what this money is wanted for. A vote comes down for $5,000.000 for the post office. It is divided into three items only, millions in each. And this is only illustrative of many other resolutions brought down in Supply. You might just as well argue in favour of bringing in one resolution providing for the appropriation of $100,000,000 for the government, to be spent by their different departments, and pass it through without criticism as to take up this blind mass estimates of millions of dollars for a given department, nothing definitely shown, either by statement in the estimates or by the explanations of the minister as to what exact use is to be made of the money covered by this lump vote. This, I think, the country will quite understand—that, if we are to have an extravagant government, we must have an over-vigilant opposition, that if we are to have a government with so many bad places in its policy and so many worse places in its administration, then the opposition must take the time to thoroughly criticise—so far as it can against the obstructive tactics of the government in committee and in this House—and bring to the knowledge of the country the facts concerning each vote.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Before the motion is carried, I would like to say that I think it a matter of regret that the Bill to amend the Civil Service Act which is now on the Order Paper, has not been introduced in the House. It is a very important measure. It was first placed on the Order Paper on May 22. In respect of a portion of the delay, I have no complaint or criticism to offer, because the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was necessarily absent. But he returned some time ago, and it is to be borne in mind that this has stood on the Order Paper for eighteen days, during which time we might have been considering the Bill—for, undoubtedly, it will demand very serious and somewhat prolonged consideration by the House if its terms are along the line stated in the public press. Though the item has stood on the Order Paper for eighteen days, we know no more about the Bill than we did on the 22nd of May last. And there are other government measures not yet before us. We understand that a measure is to be introduced with respect to the Hudson Bay Railway. That has not even been placed upon the Order Paper. Nor have we any means of judging what its terms may be. We were advised in the speech

from the Throne that a measure is to be introduced with regard to the boundaries of Manitoba. But the House, up to the present time, is in complete ignorance what that measure may be. When hon. gentlemen on the other side suggest that the labours of the session should come to an end within five months, it would be well for them to bear in mind that if parliament had ended within that time, each of these three important measures could not have been brought before the House at all. And one, if not two of these measures, was mentioned in the speech from the Throne. It is hardly worth while to look at the matter from one standpoint alone, but we must bear in mind that the most important measures of the session are not yet before the House, nor does the House understand what their terms are to be.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is quite easy to see the effort made to-day, to cloud the issue which is now before the House and the country. The motive is quite transparent and the reasons also. We have been told on the floor of the House by members high and low on the opposition side that Supply would not be granted, the business of the House would be blocked, the aims of the government would be blocked, unless the government would drop clauses 1 and 17 of the Election Bill. It is easy to understand that this is the basis and motive of the opposition which we have had to carrying on the business of the country. Perhaps I may be permitted to say that, when we introduced the Election Bill, we received the criticisms made by gentlemen on the other side in no unfriendly spirit, not with any determination to force it down their throats willing or unwilling. We received their criticism, I believe, in a fair spirit, with an idea of improving the Bill, and meeting their criticism as far as we might. With regard to clause 1, the motives which have been attributed to us do not exist at all. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) stated that, as far as Quebec was concerned, the object was to have the votes of the aliens employed on the Transcontinental Railway on the lists. There is no such intention. We are willing to meet hon. gentlemen on the other side when this Bill is called up and discuss these questions on their merits and endeavour to meet their wishes as far as possible. We are told that section 17 is an attempt to interfere with the secrecy of the ballot. I have no desire to discuss the Bill, but I may be permitted to say that the effect of section 17 in the Bill as introduced is simply to provide that the honest elector who casts his vote shall not be disfranchised either by the accidental action of the deputy returning officer or, worse, by the wilful action of such officer.

The Bill does not provide more than that. But it may be that there are reasons why even this mild remedy should not be adopted in the public interest. We are willing to discuss that with our own friends to see whether the law should remain as it is, or whether it should be amended. We are willing to discuss whether it should be left in the power of the deputy returning officer to disfranchise any elector, or any ten or twenty electors, or whether the honest elector who casts his ballot should be responsible only for his own action and not made to suffer for the action of another man. But the question is not upon the Election Bill. The first duty of parliament is to vote Supply—and the question of the Election Bill and all other legislation is set aside. Generally, when parliament discusses legislation, the Supply is voted a year in advance, the machinery of government runs smoothly. But through the change that has taken place in the fiscal year, by which it ends on March 31, instead of June 30, the country has been left without Supply and the business of the government cannot be carried on. We did what is always done under such circumstances—for this has happened before—we applied to the opposition to give us one-quarter of the Supply covered by the resolutions before the House. We were not granted one-quarter, but we were granted one-eighth, which carried us up to about May 15. On May 15, a similar demand was made, but, up to the present time, it has not been granted. The first duty of the House, at the present time, therefore, is to see to it that the supplies are voted. If the Election Bill does not pass, if the Civil Service Bill does not pass, if the Hudson Bay Bill does not pass, the country still goes on—the public will be inconvenienced, some valuable improvements will be set aside, some valuable reforms will remain to be taken up another year, but the country will still go on. But the country cannot go on unless the creditors of the country are paid, unless the civil servants of the country get their salaries, unless the whole machinery of government is carried on—and this is what we are trying to effect at the present moment. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that we want the opposition to swallow these estimates holus bolus. No, we do not want anything of the kind. All legitimate criticism can be made, and ought to be made. But, for the last two or three weeks, what have we obtained from hon. gentlemen opposite? We have obtained the vote for the Post Office, the vote for the Customs and part of the vote for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. LAKE. And the Mounted Police.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And the Mounted Police, also—certainly, there could be

no criticism over that. These votes have taken two or three weeks' time. It is of no use to tell us that the opposition is facilitating the business. They may or they may not, just as they choose. But I have to point out to them that at the present time the duty of the government and the duty of the opposition is to see that the wheels of government are not clogged, that the King's government is carried on, that the public service is carried on, that the public servants and the creditors of the country are paid the money that is due them. If our friends opposite at the present time will give us what it is their duty to give us, there will be no difficulty whatever.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the right hon. gentlemen mean by that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I mean to give us enough Supply to carry on the business of the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let me direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that since the 20th of May the voting of Supply has gone on at the rate of about a million dollars a day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At the rate of a million dollars a day! And we were told on the floor of the House that if we would withdraw clauses 1 and 17 of the Election Bill the whole Supply would be voted in five minutes. I do not care whether you vote it at the rate of a million a day, or $500,000 a day; what I do care is that every day the government should have enough money at its disposal to carry on, not new projects, but the ordinary purposes which the government have to undertake as a matter of course every year. An hon. gentleman stated some time ago in this House that he was surprised that the government, with so large a majority, could not get Supply. That hon. gentleman surely must understand, and the whole country must understand, that under the rules governing parliamentary procedure. rules which we have adopted from Great Britain and of which we are all proud, every member of parliament has the right to speak and protect himself, the opposition have the right to protect themselves. At the same time, while the rules of parliament give the opposition power to protect themselves, and the right to speak, when the House is in Supply, once, twice, three time, four times, a hundred times, to take up the time of the House for a week, or a month or a year, the only limit which the opposition ought to recognize upon their privilege to speak is their own sense of what is reasonable and fair.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the right hon. gentleman suggest that during the time I have mentioned, the opposition have unduly criticised?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman's interruption. What else have they been doing?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I venture to say that during the ten days I have mentioned, more time has been taken up by the ministers than by the opposition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I daresay, because the minister had to answer the questions put to him, not once, but twice, three times, again and again, and again; and after the minister had given his answer and his explanation to one hon. gentleman, the same question was repeated by some other hon. gentleman, and the same answer had to be repeated, and the same explanation given many times over. Under such circumstances we have been forced to speak much more often than we should have been. But I leave it to the common sense of my hon. friends on the other side, What else have they been doing but giving us Supply in driblets, while the time has been going on? But we have now come to a point when, not only the government, but the opposition must recognize that it is their duty to see that the business of the country is fairly carried on.

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

Dominion Lands—chargeable to income—commissioner's salary, $3,200; salaries of the outside service, $321,800.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why does not the Minister of Railways and Canals go on with his estimates for the Intercolonial?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Railways and Canals will be prepared to go on with his estimates to-morrow, I hope.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The reason I asked that was because we have been told that the members on this side of the House should be in their places attending to public business. If that is a practical observation as applied to private members, it is much more practical as applied to ministers of the Crown.

Mr. FIELDING. The ministers are here to-day. But the Minister of the Interior has taken up his estimates which, in the judgment of the government, are important.

Mr. FOWLER. We would like to have an explanation of this item.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The sum of $300,000 was voted last session for the fiscal year 1907-8. It was estimated that the sum of $325,000 would be required for the next year, an increase of $25,000. There are 362 employees to be paid out of this appropriation, and to cover their salaries for the twelve months, the sum of $320,760 will be required, leaving a balance of $4,330 to be used for increases to these clerks who will become entitled to

the same during the twelve months ending March 31, 1909.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the commissioner?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. J. W. Greenway.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister mentioned that there were $4,000 required for increases in salaries, but that $325,000 was required. What does he propose to do with the other $20,000?

Mr. OLIVER. Since the last vote was submitted to parliament there have been a number of appointments to this service which will take up about $20,000 of the amount, leaving approximately $5,000 which will be available to pay the statutory increases or the increases which will be on all fours with the statutory increases of the inside service.

Mr. FOWLER. Were these appointments rendered necessary by increased work?

Mr. OLIVER. The work has increased and must necessarily increase from year to year. I had occasion to explain to the House, when the civil government estimates of the Department of the Interior were up, that although the number of homestead entries has not increased since last year, the increase in the number which took place three years ago is now bearing fruit in increased work in the department because of the work entailed by the inspection of homesteads, the recommendations for patents, and intermediate to these, the applications for cancellation. The taking of the homestead entry is the smallest part of the work connected with the land transaction. It is when we deal with the entry afterwards that the work accrues. Commencing five years ago, there was a very rapid increase of homestead entries from year to year, the number having risen from 10,000 to 20,000, to 30,000 and finally to 40,000 and it is due to this large increase that the work to-day is increasing in the department.

Mr. FOWLER. Are these additional officers principally homestead inspectors?

Mr. OLIVER. There are some additional homestead inspectors, but the requirements run through the whole list of the service. The inspection of a homestead is only one feature of the case. There are applications for extensions, for cancellations, for patents; there is an enormous amount of work that begins at the land office in the west and ends in the office here.

Mr. FOWLER. That means more clerical work then?

Mr. OLIVER. More clerical work as well as more outside work, such as the work of inspection.

Mr. FOWLER. Are the new clerks who have been taken on principally men or women?

Mr. OLIVER. The larger number are men, but there are a number of women.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As I understand it, the expansion of a few years ago is of such a character that it entails a considerable increase in the work?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is why you are asking for this increase so far as it is not devoted to increases in the salaries of officers?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I call the hon. gentlemen's attention to the curious itemizing of his estimates in this respect? You have the huge item of salaries; I do not object to that There could be no object in the itemizing of salaries. Then you have an item of $100,000 for contingencies, the information in regard to which is of a very general character. Then you have protection of timber $100,000; the information in regard to this is also of a very general character. Then you come down to the salary of one carpenter, $914.50. It seems to me to be in curious contrast—huge items of a very general character and then one item for the salary of one special carpenter, $914.50. I do not understand it, although there may be consideration that make these large items necessary in special cases. The minister explained matters in that regard to my satisfaction the other evening. Would it not be possible with respect to an item like this to divide it up a little more without inconvenience to the public service.

Mr. OLIVER. It would be possible to divide the salary item up but it would be difficult to divide contingencies so that the item would be intelligible and at the same time applicable to the case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You may desire to have it general in order to have the money available for a purpose that may not be foreseen.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, for things that may not be foreseen. We know that the services will be required but we cannot tell how much will be required for each. As to this unfortunate carpenter's salary, he is not in any of the classifications that are covered by the general vote, and, of course as we are ground between the upper and nether millstone of parliamentary criticism and the Auditor General's check, we have to put his salary into the estimates in this way.

Mr. FOWLER. Is he at Banff or at Ottawa?

Mr. OLIVER. Ottawa.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems clear that he cannot be regarded as a contingency or he would not be by himself.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice that the vote for the protection of timber comes under this heading. Have you added a number of fire rangers or taken additional precautions for the protection of timber ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have added two forest rangers.

Mr. FOWLER. In what districts

Mr. OLIVER. One at Edmonton and another stationed at Sapperton, in the New Westminister district.

Mr. FOWLER. I would call the minister's attention to this very important feature ; that is the protection of forests, not only in British Columbia but in the Northwest. I think that the money expended for the purpose of protecting our forests from fire is money well spent, indeed, and I do not think at the present time the precaution taken is sufficient. I do not believe there are enough fire rangers provided in the west and, particularly since this new Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is going through different wooded sections of the country every precaution should be taken as you have the danger from natural causes in addition to the danger from the recklessness of the class of men who are employed upon these railways, who are very largely foreigners, who care nothing whatever for the interests of this country and who would be rather delighted in doing mischief of that kind just for the sake of seeing the flames arise. I think it is most important that the minister should look into that matter very closely and appoint the necessary number of fire rangers.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to ask what the policy of the minister is in regard to the filling of vacancies in the different land offices of the Northwest and in the outside service generally. I asked him a question the other day with regard to filling a vacancy at Edmonton and, from the answer he gave, I understand he brought a man in entirely from the outside, a gentleman who could not possibly have any knowledge of the details of the work and who would have to rely upon the juniors, the men whom he was going to supersede in that event, to coach him and make him familiar with the work that he was going to do. I do not know whether the same policy is being carried on in other parts of the Northwest, but I would imagine that it is an extremely bad thing for the whole outside service to let men labour under the impression that no matter how good their work is, they have no chance of appointment to the best positions going. I would like the minister to give us a general idea of what his policy is in regard to promotion in the outside service.

Mr. OLIVER. It is very hard to lay down a general policy that would not be chiefly known, like the rules of English grammar, by its exceptions. In the case mentioned, the appointment was made of a gentleman who had hitherto been outside the service but we believed that by reason of his opportunities he was able to bring into the service ability and advantages that no person whom we then had in the service at that point was able to bring, and we had need of all the men who might be presumed to be of equal standing at other points where they were employed.

I may say generally that while it is very desirable that employees in the land offices shall have accurate knowledge of the routine of the office and of the department generally, in as much as they are from day to day in immediate touch with the people for whose convenience and benefit these offices exist, it is even more necessary that the man at the head of the land office should have such standing and qualification as will be to his advantage in coming in contact with the public at large. We may be able to get men who are perfectly competent to transact clerical work, who can keep in touch with the routine of the office and of the department, who are in themselves in every way creditable persons, but who lack the knowledge of matters and things in the world outside that would enable them to deal satisfactorily with the general public and with the questions between the department and the general public which arise from day to day in those offices and the settlement of which questions is really the main duty of the land agent. Under these circumstances, while we have given due consideration to the possibilities of promotion from within the service, it would not be fair to the House or to the service to let it be understood that the principle of promotion was our leading principle in providing for the outside service. It is absolutely necessary that we should have men in touch with outside conditions and we cannot always depend upon meeting that requirement by promotions from the service. When occasion arises we have to do the best we can and take them from the outside.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. LAKE. At one o'clock the minister had been giving the reasons for bringing in men from the outside and putting them in good positions in the outside service over the heads of officials who had qualified themselves for those positions. The reasons which he gave were, to my mind, a considerable reflection on all the officials of the outside service. To say that men who are dealing with the public every day with regard to the special questions which come

before their offices, who are thoroughly conversant with all the difficulties which arise in connection with those dealings, who understand how the ordinary run of questions are ordinarily dealt with, who know what questions can be decided locally and what questions have to be referred to headquarters—to say that these men are not as competent as anybody can be to deal with the usages of a land office is to my mind a reflection upon them. It is all the more of a reflection to say that they are not as competent as men brought in from the outside, with possibly no experience whatever of official life and having to learn all the duties after they come in. This must have an extremely bad effect on the members of the civil service. The Civil Service Commissioners in their report referred to the outside customs officers as men without hope. Unless the minister is careful, that will be the condition of members of the outside service of the Department of the Interior if this course is constantly pursued. Difficulties are inevitable in dealing with the many questions which come before these land officers if you bring in men without official training—men who are placed in those positions probably for services rendered to the party. However, much such men may wish to lay aside all partisan feelings in taking up a position of that sort, it would be impossible for them entirely to divest themselves of party feeling. Many cases have come to my notice in which I have been unable to avoid the feeling that local officials have allowed party bias to influence their judgment in dealing with the cases which came before them. I think that must inevitably be so if you bring in men without proper training for the positions which they are to occupy and who are being promoted for party services. The minister and his senior officials here may say honestly that they desire to administer the land laws without any bias or party favour, but if they are being served by men who are strong partisans I think they will find it impossible to prevent party bias from creeping into the service. When the minister was speaking of the Edmonton case, he spoke of there being no one on the spot as well qualified in his opinion as the man he brought in for the position of land agent there. It struck me that the first idea in his mind was that it was necessary to make a promotion of some one who happened to be in the land office at Edmonton. I think that would not be a good thing for the service. Where a man shows himself to have done his work well, it does not matter whether he happens to be in the particular suboffice where the vacancy occurs or not, and it should be possible for the minister to bring in the most efficient man he can find in the outside service to fill the position. Men should be encouraged to do their work well with the hope that if they do it properly they will be entitled to promotion at one time or another. I would like to ask the minister whether within the last couple of years he has brought in any others to take positions in the outside service who have not already been doing work in the service?

Mr. OLIVER. In establishing the new office at Moosejaw the gentleman who was appointed agent was from the outside. In the new office at Humboldt the agent appointed was from the outside. In the case of the Lethbridge office we promoted a man from the staff as agent. In the Regina office we also promoted a man from the staff. In each case we acted according to what we thought would give the best results in the public interest.

Mr. LAKE. In these other two cases I presume you had to bring in other officials to help the untrained officials put in as agents. What was the reason for the changes which took place in the Moosejaw office? I understood that another official had been appointed as agent and that after he had been doing his work for a short time the decision came that the office was to be closed, and then a further decision came that it was to be reopened again with the new officer in charge.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend must be misinformed. The gentleman now in the office is the gentleman who was first appointed, and there has been no break in the business such as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. HERRON. Has the minister any intention of opening the land office at Pincher Creek which was closed about a year ago? It is very desirable to have an office there. Our district is thirty miles away from the next subagency and there is a very large settlement extending in every direction. In my opinion there never was sufficient pay to induce a first-class man to keep the place. Would the minister not promise to reopen that office?

Mr. OLIVER. The reason of the resignation was that the salary paid was not sufficient. The agent was quite an efficient man and did very good work during a number of years. In fact he did so good work and so much of it that there did not remain sufficient to be done to warrant our paying him any increase of salary. A subagency is opened simply as a temporary convenience and does not at all replace the land agency. It is simply to enable people, who are not familiar with clerical work and have some difficulty in putting down upon paper their intentions, to get information from the subagent and deal with a person responsible to the agency. While it is our policy to open these agencies as the press of settlement renders them necessary, it is also our policy to close them when

the need has passed ; and although I would not say that the need has altogether passed at Pincher Creek, yet when the agent saw fit to resign because his salary was not sufficient and when, because of the general settlement of the country, the need for a subagency had decreased, we did not feel called upon to reopen the office.

Mr. HERRON. The minister is aware that the settlers have to travel from Crow's Nest Pass all the way to Fort Macleod at present, which is a great inconvenience. Would the minister be disposed to continue the office at a salary of $25 per month ? Even at that price a suitable man might be found.

Mr. OLIVER. If we could get an efficient and reliable man to act as subagent, I think we would be willing to pay him the sum suggested, but of course, as the business is not as large as it was some years ago, there is not the same necessity for a subagent. If however we could get one satisfactory to us to do the work at a fair compensation, there would be no objection to reopening the office.

Mr. FOWLER. Does this cover the cost of the National Park at Banff ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, there is another item dealing with the park.

Mr. LAKE. With regard to the Moosejaw case, the statement was made in the papers that Mr. Plaxton had been appointed at Moosejaw, that after having had the office open some little time, the office was closed and the papers were packed up and sent to Regina. But after a week or ten days the boxes were returned from Regina unopened and sent to Mr. Plaxton by mistake. In the meantime another land agent had been appointed. Why was Mr. Plaxton dismissed and a new agent appointed ?

Mr. OLIVER. There was a subagency at Moosejaw and the business of that subagency increased so very rapidly, because Moosejaw is at the western fringe of settlement, that it became necessary to establish an agency there. A large proportion of the business of the Regina agency was transacted through the Moosejaw office. Mr. Plaxton was subagent at Moosejaw, and, as in the case of other subagents, we were not presumed to be paying him a salary for the whole of his time. He had other occupations and only worked for us as a convenience and advantage to the settlement in that direction. When we established a land agency, we appointed an agent and did not appoint Mr. Plaxton. There was no connection between the two positions.

Mr. LAKE. Am I to understand that Mr. Plaxton was not suspended?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. LAKE. And that his services were entirely satisfactory ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am under the impression there was no complaint. The trouble was that the volume of business became so great that it did not appear right and proper that it should be handled through a subagency.

Mr. LAKE. It seems to me that the proper man to appoint would be the man who had been carrying on the work of the subagency in a satisfactory manner and who had got in touch with the people. Another complaint was that the office was removed from a very convenient situation to one much less convenient to the public.

Mr. OLIVER. That is an error because there is very little difference between the location of the two. One was down a flight of stairs and the other is up a flight of stairs, and both are within a few doors of each other on the same street.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). How many subagencies were closed in Manitoba during the past year ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say at the moment.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Why was the subagency at Ranchville closed ?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) asked the question in the House in the ordinary way, and, if I remember well, the answer was very much the same as I have given in the case of the question put by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) except that in that case the subagent had not resigned. We felt that the settlement of that part of the country had progressed to such an extent that it was not necessary to keep up the subagency. There is no doubt that the subagency is a very great convenience. But we have to draw the line somewhere ; the House would not justify us in establishing subagencies everywhere or in keeping them open everywhere they have been established. The subland agency is more particularly a convenience in the newly-settled sections. A great deal of the business to be transacted with the land office by old settlers can be transacted by letter, whereas entry must be made in person and the presence of the subagency enables the entry to be made by the settler in the vicinity of the land. So, there is a reason for the subagency in the new territory that does not exist in the case of an old-settled section.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). If the business had fallen off in this sub-agency, there would be force in what the minister has said. But I am informed that more business was done there last year than was done the year before. I know that the subagent has said—I have had no direct com-

munication with him—that, judging by the business of 1907, there was more reason for maintaining the subagency than ever before. It was hardly necessary on the ground of economy to close the subagency. as the saving would be only $25 a month, I have had complaints from a number of the residents of the district concerning the closing of this office. A statement has been furnished me of the business of the office in February last. There were six entries for homesteads—proceeds $60—and implements, $15 ; three inspections were made ; there was one abandoned homestead, and there were thirty-two applications for patents. I think that this volume of business would compare favourably with that of any other subagency in Manitoba. Information with reference to the closing of this office has reached me as follows: The subagent, who in years gone by, was a very active politician, during the last provincial contest remained inactive. This did not please the Liberal candidate—who was defeated and who attributed his defeat not so much to the efforts of his political opponents as to the inactivity of the subagent. And it is no secret in that part of the country that this defeated candidate takes credit for having had this agent discharged because of his inactivity in the elections. If the information I have is correct, the business has not fallen off, but increased.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the committee will agree that the volume of business stated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) is hardly sufficient to justify the maintenance of this office. And, if this was an increase over that of previous months, I think it is pretty good evidence that instead of being wrong in closing the office when we did, if we had closed it sooner it would have been better in the interests of economy. But I admit that, once an office is established, it is difficult to get it closed. There is a certain amount of convenience to the public in having the office there, and there are always people who are offended and complain if it is closed. I do not wonder that there are complaints about the closing of this office any more than about the closing of the office at Pincher Creek. I have no hope of ever closing a subagency office without complaints being made, and yet I feel that we must close these offices from time to time as settlement progresses.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The nearest agency is in the town of Dauphin, and the land agency in my own town of Minnedosa has been closed. The people in the section to which I have referred must go across the Riding mountains to Dauphin, or must go round by way of Neepawa a couple of hundred miles, or else by way of Roblin on the Canadian Northern. These people south of the Riding mountains are very inconveniently situated to reach the present land office ; and I think I have shown that there was no good ground for closing this subagency.

Mr. LAKE. Before the Moosejaw question passes, will the minister please tell us what special experience had Mr. Smith before his appointment as agent ? And also, I would ask him whether the minister does not consider that it would be more in the public interest, if, instead of closing subland offices and taking away the business for a week or more, it would have been better to make the transfer on the spot ?

Mr. OLIVER. As to the office being closed down for a week or more, I can only say that it was an error. I do not know how it can be explained, but certainly it should not have been closed down for a week, whatever the explanation. As to the first question, I may explain that the agent's name is not Smith but Rutherford. I am not aware what experience he may have had with reference to land matters before he was made agent, but our experience of the conduct of that office since Mr. Rutherford's appointment has been eminently satisfactory. We believe we did not make any mistake in selecting either Mr. Rutherford or his staff. It may be to the credit of the staff, or it may be to the credit of the agent, but the office has been exceptionally well handled.

Mr. HERRON. When will the minister arrive at a policy with regard to forest reserve parks ? I have had some requests from men who wish to build hotels—temperance hotels, I may say——

Mr. OLIVER. What ?

Mr. HERRON. I say, requests from parties wishing to build hotels at Waterton lake. I understand from the people of the department that the government has not arrived at a policy on that subject. When will the minister be able to state when and how these men can get permits or privileges to build ?

Mr. OLIVER. As has been stated, we have hardly arrived at a definite policy in regard to these various reserves, because the conditions differ in each reserve. The particular matter to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Herron) refers came before me some time ago, and if any gentleman desires to establish a resort within the limits of that park, I do not think there will be any serious difficulty in our coming to an arrangement if they make a proposition—we can come to an arrangement for a lease of the ground for a term of years. The Waterton reserve, while, in terms, a forest reserve, is rather of the nature of a park, as it is reserved for park purposes rather than as a forest preserve. It completely surrounds with the Waterton lakes in the

Rocky mountains and is eminently suited for a park.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What new reserves have been made on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains within the last year? I saw it stated in the newspapers in the west supporting the government that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) had said, at a meeting of the Forestry Association in Montreal, that all the east slope of the Rocky mountains from the national boundary to the northern limits of the country had been set aside as a forest reserve. Has the government made up its mind as to that?

Mr. OLIVER. There must be some error somewhere, there has been no such reservation. There is of course the Waterton reservation.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the size of that?

Mr. OLIVER. One or two townships. It is an old reservation set apart many years ago, and was never withdrawn from the departmental reservation. Then there is the Banff Park reservation, and there is also a large reservation at the Jasper House on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is about fifty miles in length from the southeast to the northwest, and extends from the foothills to the summit of the mountains. It will not be as large as the Banff park in area, because the Banff park, in its northeasterly portion, extends out far beyond the foothills of the Rockies. The railway will intersect it at about the centre. These are the only reservations that have been made on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains. But at some future time further reservations may be made.

Mr. HERRON. How many forest rangers are employed along the foothills from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway near Banff to the boundary line—and I would like their names.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. W. I. Margach, with headquarters at Calgary, has charge of the timber business between Calgary and the boundary line. He has the necessary authority to appoint fire rangers at $4 a day whenever, in his judgment, there is danger from fire. He authorizes them to take such measures as may be possible to guard against fire. I have not a list of those fire guardians who are employed in that part of the country. They are merely temporary.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What check, if any, has the government upon these forest rangers as to the work they do, and the number of days they are employed? I understand that those employed on the Riding Mountains timber reserve are paid $4 a day. Is there any particular time of the year in which they are supposed to do this work?

Mr. OLIVER. The timber inspector who authorizes their employment, that is to say, who calls them out for service, checks their diary and certifies to their accounts. They keep a diary for the time they are out. Whenever the timber inspector thinks it is desirable that, in certain parts of the country, there should be one or more fire guardians on duty, he warns them out. They are local men. Of course he has a note of the day when they are supposed to start out. They keep a diary of their operations until they return. He examines these, and certifies to their accounts.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Do they send in any reports?

Mr. OLIVER. We get our reports from the inspector who sends these men out. We do not get individual reports from the fire rangers in the head office. They come to the local land office and are dealt with there.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The minister speaks about their being local men. I could understand why it is necessary to have local men. But I am aware of at least one man who cannot be considered a local man. He lives in a town at least fifteen or twenty miles from the nearest part of the Riding mountains. I looked up his account, and I find that last year he put in an account for 112 days. I do not know when he could get in those 112 days, because for months at a time he is never outside of the town, and the impression is that there is very little work secured by the government for the $4 a day.

Mr. OLIVER. What is his name?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). His name is Armitage. You will find it on L—77.

Mr. OLIVER. It is in the nature of things that there may be abuses in the method by which we carry on this business, but I do not know how we can check it down any better than we are doing. It will be admitted that it is not desirable that men should be on pay all the year round for a work of this kind. In some years there is a great deal of necessity for their services, and in other years there is no necessity at all. I think the only thing we can do is to keep a watch for abuses, and to remedy them whenever we find any to exist.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the German system?

Mr. OLIVER. The German system would not be applicable to the conditions under which we employ these men of whom I am speaking. That is to say that the men simply go out into the Crown lands and do what they can to prevent the starting or suppress the spread of fire.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you have a statutory declaration made by the ranger ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think so.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you not think it would be an additional check if he were to make a statutory declaration as to the distance he travelled and what he did ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is a very reasonable proposition, I will take it into consideration.

Mr. STAPLES. How many acres of school lands were sold in Manitoba last summer and how much money was realized from the sale ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the information at hand but I will obtain it.

Mr. STAPLES. Is there any definite time mentioned during which these sales shall be advertised and how they shall be advertised ?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no time laid down in the law, as far as I am aware, but there is a custom which is followed with regard to the time and place of advertising and I do not think that custom has been deviated from.

Mr. STAPLES. Who was the auctioneer last summer in Manitoba ?

Mr. OLIVER. My memory is that most of the sales were conducted by Mr. Norris.

Mr. STAPLES. Is the minister not aware that Mr. Ingram sold probably as much as Mr. Norris ?

Mr. OLIVER. Where the sales were not on a large scale I believe Mr. Ingram did make them. In order to ensure, in so far as we can ensure it, the sale to the highest bidder and a fair opportunity to every one to bid, the auctioneer should be under the control of the department. Mr. Ingram is a salaried official of the department who is particularly concerned in the school lands and we have thought that where the sale is not on such a large scale as to require additional assistance Mr. Ingram can very well act as auctioneer. We think that his position is such that we can feel assured that the work will be done fairly. But where the sale is on a larger scale, where Mr. Ingram will be needed to keep track of the books and where we have to employ an auctioneer we think it is better to employ only one auctioneer, a gentleman whom we think we can depend on and who may look forward to further employment if his work is satisfactory. I think we have employed Mr. Norris in a very large majority of cases.

Mr. STAPLES. Are these lands put up at the request of any particular persons or under what circumstances are they advertised ?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, the province is always glad to have the lands sold provided they are likely to bring a fair price. The decision as to their being offered for sale is arrived at by the Department of the Interior, opportunity being taken of the construction of railways and the settlement of the country concerned when we think that the land has reached, if not its maximum value, at any rate a fair value.

Mr. STAPLES. How is the auctioneer paid ?

Mr. OLIVER. He is paid by commission except that the amount must not be more than $200 on any one sale.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Did the government sell any land at Fort Saskatchewan last November ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I am informed there was no sale. There was a sale advertised, but the upset price was higher than the people seemed inclined to pay so that the sale was abortive.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The reason I asked that question is that I remember reading a report in one of the western papers to the effect that there was a sale advertised to take place at Fort Saskatchewan and the objection was urged that it was a very inopportune time for such a sale to take place, in the midst of the financial stringency when people generally would not be in a position to bid and also there was a misconception as to where the lands were situated. They were believed to be in the town site of Fort Saskatchewan, when, as a matter of fact, the lands were, I am informed, two miles out. The sale would have had the effect of reducing the price of lands and there was very strong objection to the sale taking place at that time, the general belief being that the bidding would be confined to a few favoured individuals.

Mr. OLIVER. The sale did not take place. In answer to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) I may say that the area of school land sold in Manitoba year was 102,761.70 acres and the price realized was $1,063,157.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I find the statement to which I referred the hon. Minister of the Interior some time ago about the announcement of the hon. Minister of Agriculture at the meeting of the Dominion Forestry Association, held in Montreal on March 12. The 'Calgary Morning Albertan' says :

Montreal, March 12.—The important announcement was made by the Hon. Sydney

Fisher at the Dominion Forestry Convention here to-day that the Dominion government had decided to set aside the whole eastern slope of the Rocky mountains forest area as forest reserve extending clear from the boundary to the extreme northern limit of the country. This vast region, he stated, would be kept free from settlers and held for forest growth which would be cut from time to time under such strict regulations as would preserve it for all time as a forest reserve for the west. The announcement was received with hearty cheers by the delegates.

That statement received a great deal of prominence throughout the press of Canada and I can hardly understand how it is that the Minister of Agriculture would be so reported if he did not make it. The impression has gone broadcast through the west that this was going to be done. Has the matter been discussed or is the minister at liberty to tell the committee if it has been under consideration? I understand that some ten years ago there was a reservation along the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains and that it was subsequently thrown open, I am given to understand, on the advice or suggestion of the Minister of the Interior. Apparently the Minister of Agriculture must have had some authority for making that statement because we could hardly suspect that he would force himself upon the Department of the Interior and make any such statement as that when there was no foundation for it.

Mr. OLIVER. I think there must be some misunderstanding. For instance in one point the Minister of Agriculture is quoted as saying that it was the intention of the government to make a reservation along the whole eastern slope of the Rocky mountains from the boundary line to either the northern part of Alberta or of the Dominion. My hon. friend is aware that the slope of the Rocky mountains after a certain point is not under the jurisdiction of this government but of the government of British Columbia. As to the fact of their being a general reservation, such as my hon. friend has mentioned, I understand there was some suggestion of such a reservation but I did not understand that it was ever made.

Mr. FOWLER. It is another instance of the Minister of Agriculture butting into some one else's department. He has not fared as well in this case as in the Militia Department, because the Minister of the Interior does not propose to back up his statement in regard to this reservation.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a matter between the Minister of Agriculture and the newspapers, not between the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. FOWLER. It shows conclusively that the Minister of the Interior proposes to run his own department.

Mr. FOSTER. The matter is important in two ways. I remember distinctly the announcement having been made at a great meeting in Montreal by the Minister of Agriculture, and I remember that all the newspapers heartily approved of the idea of what they thought to be, from the minister's statement, an accomplished fact, namely the reservation of the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains. It is strange indeed that the Minister of Agriculture should go to Montreal and before a very representative gathering from every part of the Dominion make that authoritative statement on behalf of the Dominion government and then, three or four months afterwards, when we come to question the Minister of the Interior who has it in charge he says that no such thing has been done and if I understand him rightly that no such thing has been discussed with any practical idea of carrying it out at the present time. That is a very reprehensive proceeding on the part of one minister of the government and, as my friend has just said, it is not the first time that the Minister of Agriculture seems to have spoken very recklessly and entirely apart from the record. If it was not done, it certainly was in harmony with all the resolutions passed during the last ten years by the forestry meetings, and by what we may call in Canada the authorities on forestry. I remember that in this House not long ago a speech was made by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior in which he took up as one branch of this subject the question of forest reserves and showed the immense importance of having forest reserves made and made quickly so that there should not be any longer delay. He was good enough to refer at that time to some remarks made in the House some months before on the same subject, and I understood that the government and the Minister of the Interior very heartily subscribed to those ideas as they were brought out in the general discussion in the House. If the minister has done nothing it rather goes to support what was said in the debate in the House some four months ago that whilst information has been 'being gathered' and while the statements have been favourable to such a policy the Dominion government is letting year after year pass practically without doing anything. Of course it is of no use to have forest reserves unless the government at the same time go in for a system of preserving the water flow of the country as well, that is setting apart the reservoir sites so that the waters which would otherwise be wasted in overflows might be preserved and be made very useful in the later time when the water was more necessary. The minister knows very well that the United States government has spent millions of money and inaugurated a really wonderful policy in that direction

taking hold of the forest slopes and of the arid regions and by a system of water dams or reservoirs really turning millions of acres, formerly arid and of no use, into very eligible lands which they are selling at a large advance and out of which they will recoup themselves for all the expenses they have gone to and more. But what is of more importance is that at the same time they are keeping the forest reserves and turning arid lands into splendid agricultural lands and thus filling up the country with a very eligible population who go to these lands and do small farming in a tidy and intensive way, making themselves the best producing citizens in the agricultural line.

The minister to-day tells us that there are only three reserves, one of them the Banff, which we have had ever since we remember anything almost in our Northwest history, then this little picayune Waterton one, a township or a township and a half which really can hardly be called a reservation and the other one intersected by the National Transcontinental Railway. Those are the three at the present time and that is all we have. Does the minister not think that this is one of the most important questions that could engage the attention of his department and does he not think that most valuable time is passing while he is doing nothing? Is there not the possibility that the timber areas and water supplies will have passed into the hands of private parties before the government inaugurates a comprehensive policy of reserves? The minister comes from the west and knows that there is nothing which so agitates the people of that country and will agitate them as this very question. I read a most striking statement by Professor Robertson not more than three weeks ago in which he really called a halt to this self-glorification in which we have been indulging as to the mighty things we are doing in the west. He pointed out that we are in reality doing nothing in the west except shearing the fleece off and making no return or preparation for subsequent growth, that there is nothing like intensive farming and really no proper guarding of the reserves in water, forests and coal; but that we are simply taking all that comes in sight and laying up no reserve force for a rainy day. That process has taken place in the United States and the United States government has only recently, under President Roosevelt, taken up that large and broad system of reserves and of bringing in to the assistance of nature, nature's forces, which heretofore have been allowed to go to waste or to become destructive.

Now, we in Canada cannot commence too soon in that business. The fertility of our Northwest depends on our taking care of our forest reserves and looking after our resources of moisture. In the southern states and throughout the western states the immense losses from sudden overflows are year after year becoming more and more onerous, and men who give their attention to the subject point out that these losses arise very largely from the denudation of the forest areas. We cannot commence at this work too early; yet I am afraid that the minister is pottering around on non-essentials instead of giving full force to this very important consideration. Some one persuades him to build out here a sort of castle of Chillon in which to immure fifteen or sixteen astronomers who will try to discover a new ring around a planet or the tail of a comet in some far-off nebula. $150,000 has gone into that venture; but $150,000 put into this other matter would yield greater results to this country, and the stars might be allowed to cavort around a little longer without being subjected to the inspection of peering eyes. A man comes to a minister with a telegram, and we build a mint, and spend $600,000 on it; and now we have the mint, and we shall have the loss for ever and a day. In the meantime our western country is crying out for the preservation of those things which are essential to its growth and its continued prosperity. The minister is not doing much, though he is doing something. He takes particular trouble to secure a herd of three or four hundred buffalo at immense expense. It is nice to have the buffalo, but they will not form water reservoirs or keep the forest tracts of the country where they should be. All these things have their proper place, but it seems to me that if we neglect this matter of forest preservation, we neglect the greater thing while bestowing a great deal of pains and cost upon subsidiary things.

Mr. OLIVER. A mistake has possibly arisen from confusing the two words reservation and preservation. There is not much difference in the words themselves, but there is a vast difference in the meaning of the words.

Mr. FOSTER. One is necessary to the other, isn't it?

Mr. OLIVER. That is where my hon. friend and I do not altogether see alike. My hon. friend seems to think that reservation is preservation. I do not think that it is necessarily so. With regard to the preservation of the forest areas along the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains, I would not wish my hon. friend to suppose that the subject has not been considered; but it has been considered with this in view, that we have a Forest Reserve Act passed with a view to certain conditions, and we find that the conditions prevailing along the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains are such as hardly to make it advisable to apply the provisions of that Act along the

whole slope. We have there deposits of coal of stupendous amount and value; but they are of no value unless they are operated, and the purpose of the government is, so far as it has any connection with the matter, to secure their operation to the limit. We want as much of them as possible operated as soon as possible. I think I am safe in saying that that is the view taken by the government.

Mr. FOSTER. As much as is necessary for the country's need.

Mr. OLIVER. As much as is possible to be operated; because we believe that we have coal to spare to all the world, and that the operation of these coal measures for an outside market would add greatly to the wealth and prosperity of our country and not do ourselves any harm. If the little country of England, with its stupendous population and its stupendous industrial requirements, all dependent on the use of coal, as ours are not, owing to our waterpowers, can afford to ship coal to all the world that will buy it—and it is as a matter of fact shipped to all the world, even to its most remote corners—we in Canada, with a coal supply in comparison with which that of the British Isles is insignificant, can very well afford to take the same view and make what money we can out of our coal as opportunity offers. That is at any rate my personal view at the present time. The application of our Forest Reserves Act and its limitations to the area to which we look for the operation of our coal measures would be a clash of interests. It would interfere with the operation of our coal measures and the general industrial development along the base of the Rocky mountains. That, however, does not exclude a policy of forest preservation or of reforestation with a view to preserving both the water supply and the supply of timber. With this explanation my hon. friend will see that there is not so very much difference between the statement as it appears in the newspaper and the statement I presented to the House. As I said a few moments ago, the hon. gentleman seems to think that reservation is preservation. On that point I want to take very direct issue with him. We must give opportunity for the investment of capital and the application of energy, enterprise and intelligence in the turning to account of our natural resources, or our natural resources are worth nothing to anybody. They are not worth reserving or preserving unless there is capital and intelligence and energy and opportunity to a reasonable degree to turn them to account. In the United States at the present time and under present conditions, with the stupendous development of population, of wealth, of industry which has taken place in that country, after having shorn the fleece of 99-100 of its value, they may very well turn round and adopt a policy of preservation, or reservation if you like, in regard to the balance. The time has come when that may very well be a leading policy of the government of that country. Had that policy been adopted when the United States had only a population of 5,000,000 people, had it been then announced that there would be a policy of reservation for the sake of preserving the natural resources of that country throughout all its vast area, we would have had to wait several thousand years for the development that has taken place. There has been a waste, if you like to call it so, of the natural resources of the United States, but there has been there the most phenomenal development the world has ever seen; and I am under the impression that, for the present at any rate, while we should have due care for the preservation of our natural resources, we should also see that there is ample opportunity for the employment of capital and labour in the development of those resources and in turning them to account as contributions to the wealth and prosperity of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. At the risk of taking up a few moments more I want to put another view. I do not agree with my hon. friend in the main. I still hold that reservation is absolutely necessary for preservation. I do not mean that the government should stretch its hand over every bit of natural resources we have and lock them up from any private or corporate development. That would be the climax of absurdity. But if you are going to preserve a sufficient amount of our natural resources, you have to begin now. Suppose you give to every corporation and individual with capital to invest all our natural resources, suppose you hurry to put every bit into their hands, what will you have for the state? Now is the time for the government to decide what it ought to reserve and reserve that portion. My hon. friend says, speaking of coal, that the government cannot make these reservations because there are coal areas upon them. But it is quite possible to reserve your coal areas and administer them as they ought to be administered. I do not think it should be the policy of any government to get as many of those coal areas as possible into the hands of capitalists. These are the country's own resources and the country has a perfect right to their usufruct. As they belong to the people, the people have the right to parcel them out as they please with the object of letting the people have at least its fair share of the profits. It is not necessary to give capital all the profit from these areas in order to have them developed. Mr. Whitney did not take that view, and his policy has been of great advantage to the province of Ontario. Under the old policy, the mining areas were sold

at $3 an acre. Whoever applied for them and complied with the conditions got them at that rate. Mr. Whitney reserved, however, certain portions of the Cobalt area absolutely to the government and allowed no prospecting upon them. He had them prospected himself, through the government officers, and there is not the least doubt that there is a patrimony stored up in those reservations of millions and millions of dollars which will ultimately go into the treasury of Ontario. Is not that the proper policy? But if my hon. friend's contentions were carried out, Mr. Whitney would sell these areas at $3 an acre in order to bring in capital for the development. Take Cobalt Lake, for instance; there was supposed to be beneath the lake, which is 25 to 40 feet in depth, mineral leads of different qualities, because all along the sides these leads had been prospected. If the old government had been in office, under its policy the 40 acres would have been sold for $120. But Mr. Whitney did not do that. He put them up for sale and tender and he got $1,087,000. And there was no difficulty in getting capital to come in. My hon. friend asked what would the United States have been if they had adopted such a policy? Why, the wealth of the United States people would be to-day immeasurably greater than it is if thirty or fifty years ago they had reserved a proper portion of their natural resources in timber lands, coal lands and mineral lands and had kept them until the present to be operated by corporations or private parties or the state as they might think best. And the one thing which the best people in the United States deplore to-day in connection with this great question of capital and labour—the few rich and the many poor—is the improvidence of the state in having put too much its great natural resources into private hands instead of keeping them for the public good and giving the people their share of the profits. My hon. friend is anxious to get the coal areas in the Northwest opened up so that we may export our coal into every country in the world. I do not think that any well-wisher to the people is anxious for such consummation. He says that Great Britain has been exporting its coal a century and more. So it has, but to-day the British people are up against a coming failure of their fuel supply, and before many years you will find the people of England very chary of selling for export the only available fuel reserves they have. Canada is supposd to exist for more than a hundred years, for more than twenty-five centuries, and I am not at all anxious that we should too rapidly use up our coal reservations in the Northwest by sending out our coal to every country in the world in order to realize immediate profit. Our great natural resources are as much a national defence as the arms which we put into the hands of our soldiers. In this great competition between nation and nation, when coal is the only fuel we have left, the last thing in the world that Canada should do is to denude itself of its coal areas. If we should, future generations will curse the policy which disembowelled the earth of its fuel resources and distributed them to strangers for the sake of the little profit obtained at the time.

I believe that a country has just as good a right to defend itself by keeping its great coal area to itself, and its pulpwood and timber to itself—for the same remark applies to these—as it has to engage in any other defensive measure. Why should we hurry and rush to get our timber cut down and exported in exchange for a small sum of money, when, for centuries to come, our own people in increasing numbers will want timber? Rather we should regard this as a fund held in trust for the whole of Canada for the whole of the future, and we should make it a policy that not one stick of timber shall be taken off without making sure that another is growing to replace it. Reforestation rather than a spendthrift destruction for export of these natural resources should be the policy of the country. I invite my hon. friend to think over these things in the night watches, to consider what I have said and see if he cannot revise his opinion, and, by all means, get a hustle on and reserve these water resources, timber resources and mineral resources as far as proper. One thing more I would like to ask him: Is he taking any steps in regard to the large forest areas that have already gone into private hands, so as to have regulations made by which these forests shall be perpetually kept up? They have been granted, and for a song, and it will add, of course, to the value of the grant if the government makes regulations which make the supply perpetual; but the country has so great an interest in the matter that I would rather see this than see it left in the hands of these speculators to denude these areas of their timber. I think the minister ought, with all the wisdom there is in his department, to give his attention to how it is possible to preserve every acre of timber and prevent it being denuded, keeping it as a perpetual producer for the benefit of the people of this country, even though the benefit inures directly to the individuals who, at the present time, are the fortunate possessors.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has placed a proposition before the House, as it appeals to my mind, of having you cake and eating it. I do not think he has been able to make clear how that end is to be arrived at. He said that, if the United States fifty years ago, had adopted a policy of reservation in regard to its natural resources, that country

would have been vastly richer to-day. We cannot tell what would have been the case had a certain policy been adopted fifty years ago. But I submit that the most valuable asset of the United States—admitted in all the rest of the world and admitted in the United States as well—is the individuality, the energy, the enterprise, the industry of the people of the United States. And, had it been the policy of the government of the United States at any stage of the history of that country—a policy which, of course, would have been impossible in the temper of the people—to put up the bars against the exercise of the energy, enterprise and inventive spirit of the people there could not have been the development, the prosperity, the success that there has been. It is because the forests have been cut down, it is because the earth has been 'disembowelled of its coal' and of its iron, it is because these natural resources have been turned to the uses of man that the United States is as it is to-day. Take the case of Ontario, this very country. Given conditions as they are on the continent of America to-day outside of the province of Ontario, and the province of Ontario would be more valuable if it were covered with the trees with which it was covered a hundred years ago than denuded of its trees as it is to-day. But had the province of Ontario and the rest of the continent remained covered with trees during all these years, there would have been no value in the province of Ontario to-day. You must give opportunity to the application of energy, intelligence, enterprise and industry, or you have no value. What I am trying to impress upon the minds of hon. members is that the natural resource has not, of itself, any value, it is made of value by the application of the energy, intelligence and industry of man in supplying the needs of man—in that way and in no other. There is a time coming—it has no doubt come in the history of the United States, and it is coming in the history of Canada—when there will be a sufficient aggregation of accumulated wealth and of population and of surplus energy, for a policy of reservation and preservation and special care of the natural resources that remain to be entered upon. But I submit that the fact that this time has arrived in the history of the United States is no evidence that it has arrived in the history of Canada. It is, however, a fact that we should be unworthy of our position if we did not learn by the experience of others. Recognizing what has taken place there, we may recognize also what has been done to couple preservation with enterprise, and that is the object of our policy at the present time. We hope to achieve a reasonable measure of preservation of our natural resources so that they may be turned to useful account, but it is not to the degree suggested at any rate by my hon. friend a policy of reservation that would prevent them being turned to account by the energy, enterprise and industry of our people. To get away from generalities, and to deal now with matters of more detail, speaking of our policy in regard to coal, under the regulations by which the coal lands of the west are administered at the present time, we do not contemplate the alienation of these areas except on condition that they shall be operated.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the present policy ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Within what time must they be operated ?

Mr. OLIVER. Within a year from notice given by the government.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. On lease.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and the lease is conditioned upon their being operated within a year from notice given by the government. That is the point I want to show—the difference between reservation and preservation, between reservation and development. We are not handing out—as I think my hon. friend suggested—the coal areas of the country to private hands; we are holding them in the hands of the government until the time arrives when they can be worked at a profit. And then our policy is that the opportunity shall be there to the firstcomer, the first man who is prepared to take them over upon the terms upon which we offer them, which terms involve their operation.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you increased the size of the area that may be given to one individual under the new system of leasing instead of selling ?

Mr. OLIVER. Our regulations do not provide for granting more than four sections to one individual, but they do provide that several individuals may combine their interests. When we sold, we only sold half-sections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the form of lease you adopt, is there a certain ground rental and a royalty ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The ground rent is $1 an acre a year ; the royalty is five cents a ton.

Mr. FOSTER. Can that be raised by the government ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think not during the terms of the lease.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any system of computation as to acreage payment and royalty payment ?

Mr. OLIVER. A coal lease is available to the first comer who will accept it on the conditions. We place a ground rent upon the land so that there will be no inducement to any one to hold it unless he

operates it, and the condition of operation is a condition of the lease, upon notice being given. In regard to timber, the condition is somewhat different from that imposed in regard to coal. It is possible that for one reason or another the supply of timber within a section of country may at some future period become exhausted. It is also to be remembered that the timber supply may be renewed while the coal supply cannot. Therefore it is proper that any policy dealing with the disposition of the timber should have as a part of that policy the reproduction of the forest. That is, I may say, a part of the policy of this government, although not yet developed as highly as we hope it will be at some later time. But there are many things to learn in regard to this matter. We have not yet been able to form a scientific system with regard to the widely varying conditions prevailing over our vast territory. We may be going too slowly, but we have to consider the public purse, and we do not like to ask for large sums until we feel that we can assure parliament that we are going to get value for the expenditure. The timber which is under the control of the Dominion government, I may say, is but a comparatively small part of the total timbered area of Canada. Under the previous regulations the principle was the same as that which prevails in regard to coal, that is to say, that the first comer got it on application, subject of course to sale by tender. But now we hold practically the whole of our timber under reservation, and we only offer it for sale when we are satisfied that the public interest requires it. That is an important difference between the former system and the present one. Formerly our timber was open to the first applicant. We did not have to put it up, it is true, but our practice was that the timber was offered to the first applicant. Now we advertise it to the world when we think that the public interest will best be served by putting up any part of it. This system actually places the timber under reservation.

In regard to the reproduction of the forests, or the reforesting of the present forest area, let me say that while the forest is valuable and while the reproduction of the forest is valuable, the land is also valuable for agriculture. Where there is an area of country that to-day is covered by mercantable timber that is required for the use of the people and when that timber is cleared off the land is valuable for farming purposes, it is a question whether we would be warranted in all cases in insisting upon the reforesting of the area cut off. It is no secret that the Dominion of Canada, in its stupendous area, is not all fertile. We have, it is true, vast areas that are fertile; but I do not think I can be charged with decrying the country when I say that there are also vast areas that are not suitable for agriculture, but which, in many cases, are covered by timber and in some cases by timber of great value. Now under these circumstances if there are immense areas of country covered by timber the land of which is of agricultural value when the timber is cleared off, it would be a fair proposition to say that we should limit our efforts at reforestration to some extent at least, to those areas that are not valuable, or less valuable for agricultural purposes. That is the policy of the government. There is in the railway belt of British Columbia where the greater part of the timber supply is situated which is under the control of this government, very limited areas of most valuable agricultural land which is to-day covered by timber of great value. There is, however, in that same area a very large proportion of the land covered by timber, which land is of much less agricultural value. My view is that when the timber is cleared off land that is of especial agricultural value, we should not undertake to reforest it. At the same time we should have a well defined and aggressive policy of reforestation, and I will be glad to bring before the House such a policy as soon as we have information at hand, and are able to present to the government a system that we would be warranted in asking the House to support. I wish to confine our efforts at reforestation to the vast area in the railway belt which is of lesser value for agricultural purposes. The same policy will be applied to the three prairie provinces. Where the land is not suited for agricultural purposes it may be very well adapted to reforestation, but where it is suited for agriculture it seems to me that the greater value is achieved by employing it for purely agricultural purposes because, after all, there is plenty of land capable of producing timber and good timber that is not of great value for agricultural purposes.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a distinction between the different classes of natural resources which illustrates the difference between reservation and preservation. Timber is a natural resource that reproduces itself while mineral is a natural resource that does not reproduce itself. Therefore, where we have a natural resource which reproduces itself preservation will meet the full requirements of the case without any general system of reservation. If proper regulations are enacted governing the cutting of timber there is no question whatever, that, if you provide a proper fire guarding system, the present supply of timber in the country will be maintained throughout the years that are to come. But, it is important that there should not only be proper regulations with regard to the cutting of timber, but that these regulations should be stringently enforced. Having had some experience with regard to timber, I see no

objection whatever to the leasing of the timber limits of the country under proper conditions. The difficulty has been in the United States that the men who have been engaged in the lumber business have thought only of the present and have, in taking out the larger timber, destroyed the smaller growth which eventually would make the larger timber and the fact that in the United States there is not a very great timber supply has made it necessary for them to adopt a general reforestation system. I think that at the present time in this country it is not necessary and it will not be necessary if we adopt and carry out proper regulations for the preservation of timber. Therefore, I am to a considerable extent of the same view as that which the minister has expressed with regard to the timber supply of the country. I think, that the minister should apply himself to the working out of a proper system of regulations. The regulations we have, in fact, at the present time, are not so bad if they are properly carried out and I think that this question of the timber supply and of the water supply, consequent upon the forest being maintained, will not be a serious question for at least many years to come in this country.

In so far as the coal in the west is concerned, I do not think we need, for many years to come, have a great deal of fear about exhausting the supply. I would be glad to see every ton of coal that is produced in this country used for the production of manufactures so that we would not be shipping out one ton of coal and so that it would not be shipping out a natural product but a product in its manufactured state. But, under the conditions as they are at present, that is not possible and therefore I do not think it would be advisable for us to enact legislation which would prevent coal owners from shipping to foreign countries. We hope the time will come when we can employ all our coal at home because it is a great advantage to us if we can use all our iron, coal, and limestone in the manufacture of steel and iron, but at the present time, I think it would be a suicidal policy for us to say that no coal shall be exported. On the coast of British Columbia the tremendous amount of labour which is employed to-day in the mining of coal, because the coal owners are allowed to ship south when they have no coal, would be turned out of employment if legislation of that sort were enacted. I think that the present policy is an excellent one, that the coal areas should no longer be absolutely alienated but that they should be leased, the Crown retaining control. I think that policy is all right. Perhaps it is not well that there should be an absolute figure fixed for the royalty which cannot be increased. I think that the government should have the power to make a general increase in the royalty. Again, on that question of royalty it does seem to me that the ease or difficulty with which the mine can be operated ought to have some effect upon the amount of royalty which a man should pay because it has a great effect upon the profit that would be produced from a mine and there should be a sliding scale. I can understand how difficulties might creep in and how favouritism might be used in this case but it seems to me that a distinction should be made, that a sliding scale should be adopted.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I would like to ask the minister if he has received many applications for the leasing of coal lands under the new regulations?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the number. We have not had nearly as great a demand for leases as we have had for purchases, but still we have had a very considerable demand. I will give the figures later.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. With regard to the regulations governing the leasing of coal lands, my opinion is that it would be utterly impossible to get coal lands in the Northwest leased under these regulations because of their stringency. Every one knows that in coal mining, a large amount of capital is required and if you say to a man: You can have these coal lands, but you must agree to operate them, to pay a royalty and to give up your lease at the expiration of twenty-one years, you lay down conditions that will make it utterly impossible to get these coal lands taken up and operated. Twenty-one years in the life of a coal mine is nothing at all.

Mr. FOWLER. The leases are renewable?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The regulations do not say so. It is entirely at the option of the Governor in Council.

Mr. GALLIHER. It is the usual way.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It is the usual way, but we have to take what they say. A man will not make a large investment if he can only have a lease of coal lands for twenty-one years. The business is one which requires hundreds and thousands of dollars and in my opinion it will be utterly impossible to get the coal lands operated.

Mr. FOSTER. The timber leases are only from year to year; yet they are considered to be perpetual.

Mr. OLIVER. One of the objections that our hon. friends opposite take to the present leases is that there is a provision made that on the fulfilment of certain conditions which are set out the lease will continue so long as there is timber on the limit.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I do not think there is any such provision with regard to coal mining leases.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I have consulted men who have been operating mines on Vancouver Island with reference to extending their business to the Northwest and they have refused to take any interest in these coal areas under the present regulations. As to the contention of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with reference to the reservation of coal lands, if that were carried out we would not have any coal mined in British Columbia to-day. The principle laid down by the hon. gentleman was that we should simply hand over coal areas in proportion to the demand of the home market. The British Columbia coal mines have developed simply on account of the foreign market which they supplied. Seventy-five per cent of the production of coal in British Columbia to-day is depending on a foreign market. Not a dollar would have been invested in coal mining in British Columbia had it not been that the capitalists who went into these ventures knew that they had a market in the United States. The development of the Crow's Nest Pass mines proceeded upon the assumption that their principal market was in the United States. Of the coal of Vancouver Island for many years 98 per cent found a market in the United States. If the principle advocated by my hon. friend were carried out it would be impossible to operate mines. By operating mines you increase your home market. As a matter of fact within six or eight years in Vancover Island the home market for coal has increased from 10 per cent to 50 per cent; half of the coal of the island is going into the home market by reason of the development of British Columbia, especially the Pacific coast. According to the principle of my hon. friend the coal will have to remain there until you have a home market when, as a matter of fact, it is the operation of coal mines with the increased population and development of manufactures that creates the home market.

I would like the minister to consider the possibility of making extensive changes in the coal regulations. Under the existing regulations they have to operate, they have to pay a royalty and they have a lease for twenty-one years which may or may not be renewed according to the good will of the Governor in Council, which I am informed will prevent the development and operation of coal mines.

Mr. FOWLER. I did not know that the leases were for 21 years only. The royalty, I consider, is all right; perhaps an acreage royalty might be collected. I think you should have the leases renewable because as my hon. friend has pointed out the operation of coal mines calls for enormous capital. You cannot equip a mine to produce 700 or 800 tons a day without the expenditure of $300,000 or $400,000. If a man has to invest $300,000 and after 21 years he might be at the mercy of Tiberius, he will be in a serious condition and will not put his money in. You will remove the worst objection if you make the lease renewable.

Mr. R. SMITH. If all conditions are fulfilled.

Mr. FOWLER. If all conditions are fulfilled of course, and if the conditions are not fulfilled, you should have the right to enter at any time and take possession of the property. As to the area I do not believe that four sections are enough.

Mr. R. SMITH. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. The person going into the business has to get the names of fictitious persons to apply for leases.

Mr. GALLIHER. They may be genuine names but the leases may be assigned.

Mr. FOWLER. But they may not have any interest in the matter. We know that is the case. It is done all around. When we used to sell coal lands, the area was only 320 acres and of course you had to get people to assign them. I think it better to make the limit double that amount, eight sections. When you are going to invest $300,000 or $400,000, four sections is a small area to work. Coal mining is not all profit, I have had some experience and know that it requires a very large amount of money.

Mr. R. SMITH. I understand that according to these regulations the price at which coal is to be supplied to settlers in the district is fixed.

Mr. OLIVER. To settlers in the vicinity.

Mr. R. SMITH. Did the coal leases granted by the Crown contain such a provision ?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes. It was because the previous regulation contained that provision that it was continued in the present regulation, not because I had any personal belief in its merits.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That period of 21 years does seem a very short term on which to invite the investment of a large amount of money in the development and operation of coal mines. The system under the Nova Scotia lease is for a term of 20 years with provision for three renewals, so that the total term reaches 80 years, after which the government is not obliged to renew, although, I suppose, under ordinary conditions they would certainly do so. There are also two important provisions in the Nova Scotia statute, section 46, chapter 18 of the revised statutes of Nova Scotia, 1900:

> Every lease shall contain a provision that the royalties may be increased, diminished or otherwise changed by the legislature.

And in respect to the renewals to which I referred, it contains this provision :

In any such renewal the rent payable by such lessee may be increased under the authority of this chapter or of any such statute, subject to the provsions of the next following section.

Under this provision the royalty might be increased at the end of each 20 year period. It seems to me that some such system as that would be a good one to adopt in regard to coal lands in the west.

Mr. OLIVER. When the present regulations were adopted I had in view the operation of coal lands in the prairie rather than in the mountains. The operation of coal mines where the seams are horizontal and regular and the distance below the surface is not great does not require such a large investment. I will confess that I had not in mind, to the degree that I should have had, the application of these regulations to the mountains where the seams are irregular and where the expense of installation of a mining plant is stupendously greater. However, as these are regulations and not statutes it is a matter that can be very easily adjusted, and I may say that the very great demand that was being made for coal lands under the recent regulations seemed to me to have outrun the probability of development to such an extent that I did not think the interest of the country were going to suffer seriously under the new regulations until we had at any rate plenty of time to see them experimentally in operation and to see where the faults and failings lie. I do not presume to be able to foresee every condition and I am very grateful for the suggestions that have been made to me. They have struck me also in this way. The Canadian Pacific Railway have a very valuable coal mine in operation in the Banff park under conditions as to lease and they have a lease for a term of 20 or 21 years. Everybody knows that they have made a large expenditure and are operating a very useful mine. They are intending to enlarge their operations and require the investment of a still larger capital, but in looking for further capital to increase their operations they bump into the restriction of a 21 year lease. They say to us : We would like to get the privilege of a renewal of this lease and unless we can get that privilege we cannot secure the larger investment that we desire to make, and that is desirable in order that the country should get the full benefit of the coal measures there. Thus the matter has been brought very pointedly to my attention and I think in time we will be able to remedy the difficulty.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any distinction between the anthracite and the ordinary bituminous coal under the regulations ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have not under our present regulations. The former regulations made a difference, the anthracite was sold at $20 an acre while the ordinary coal was sold at $10 an acre. I do not think it would be advisable to provide for changes in the royalty, at any rate during the term of the lease. I think it would be very proper to arrange that there should be a renewal of the lease, and that at that time the royalty might be changed, but I do not think it would be a proper inducement to capital to hold out the possibility of the royalty being changed during the term of the lease. It would be very much better, if you ask people to invest their money in the enterprise, that you should let them know exactly what the ground rent and the royalty are, during a reasonable period, at any rate. If I were willing to concede any change, it would be in regard to the ground rent rather than the royalty. I may assume that the regulations, as far as they have come under criticism as yet, are reasonably satisfactory and I shall certainly take account of the representations that have been made in regard to the extension of the term.

Mr. GALLIHER. Will the royalty be applied to all companies which are now operating mines?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. GALLIHER. The government propose, however, to levy a royalty on all new mines?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think the principle is a good one from the beginning, but it rather places the late developer at a disadvantage, because he will be called on to pay a royalty while some of those operating large mines obtained some time ago will not be, and so their coal will cost so much less. I have been written to in regard to this matter of discriminating against the men who now invest their capital, but I presume that the policy has been adopted by the department as being in the best interests of the country and of coal development. With regard to the leasing regulations that have been adopted, I have heard very much the same sentiment as that expressed by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), that the term of twenty-one years is somewhat short. I can understand the desire of the minister to check some of the applications that were made at large in years gone by in regard to coal lands. At the same time, I would point out that under the leasing system he is practically placing all the coal lands in the hands of men with capital and beyond the reach of the prospector. Under the old system, which I admit had its abuses, the man who went into the hills and searched out these minerals and who could get to-

gether some of his friends and form a syndicate to purchase a tract of land for coal mining purposes, had some advantage. I do not like the idea of cutting out the prospector. With regard to the twenty-one year lease, I understand that the lease price is a dollar an acre. That means that for the term you are paying $21 an acre for your coal lands, or, if the lease is renewed for another term, $42, and by the time it is renewed for 99 years you are paying a pretty high figure for your coal. If it is decided to be the best policy to continue the leasing principle, I quite concur in the propriety of including in the lease a provision by which the lessee would know that at the end of the period, if he had conformed with the regulations, his lease would be renewed for a further period. I would also favour some reduction in the charge per acre.

Mr. OLIVER. The point which my hon. friend has mentioned in regard to the prospector is certainly a very important point, and it is one on which I feel quite as keenly as he does, and I am not sure that we might not be able to make some change in the regulations to avoid cutting out the prospector. But at the time the regulations were passed, I think everybody will agree, the prospector was rather overdoing a very good thing—he was getting in his deadly work at a rate which the country could not stand, and it was necessary to cut him off short. However, I appreciate the prospector and the value of his work, and I can assure the House that he shall get every possible consideration at my hands.

Mr. FOWLER. I think after all that the prospector will not be very much the worse. Previously he had to buy the land, now he can lease his four sections.

Mr. GALLIHER. He cannot dispose of it in the same way.

Mr. FOWLER. But still we must look at what is going to be in the general interest of the country. Perhaps the government will employ prospectors. I think they ought to do that, to find out where these coal lands are, because they are going to get a larger income from them.

Mr. FOSTER. I see the Minister of Agriculture has come in, and I think I will renew the matter that we could not decide during his absence. For his information I may say that in the course of the information that has been given us, it was stated by the Minister of the Interior that no reservation had been made or was contemplated of the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains. The hon. member for Calgary informed the Minister of the Interior that the Minister of Agriculture had some months ago in the city of Montreal announced to the Forestry Association that the government had reserved or was on the eve of reserving the whole of the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains, and great applause was given to the minister and to the government for undertaking that policy.

Mr. HERRON. I have the honour of representing a district where I think the largest coal areas are to be found and the greatest quantity of coal mines of any portion of the Dominion. I shall not take up time by repeating what has been well said by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) and Kings (Mr. Fowler) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). But I wish to emphasize the fact that the development of new mining has practically been brought to a standstill by the system of leasing. The minister may have had many applications for leases of new coal lands but they are nearly all in connection with some coal lands already in operation. Were it not for that, I think I am safe in saying that he would not have had any applications whatever for the leasing of coal areas. I wish to point out the disadvantage a man is under who has only a lease. It is impossible for him to get capital to any extent to open up his coal mine, under the lease system, when the government practically only grant a lease for twenty-one years. The prospector has therefore quit looking over coal. Dozens of men know where there are large coal fields, who do not think it worth while to apply for them under the present system. It is quite true that there were great abuses under the old system but the new system has gone to the opposite extreme. Where a man complies with the conditions of the lease, it would be very easy to continue it. It would be very easy to give him a guarantee that if he complies with the conditions made from time to time by the government, he would be assured of a continuance of the lease for a longer period. It takes a very large amount of capital to develop a coal mine. One company in my riding whose mine has been in operation only four years, has put in two sets of machinery, their last set cost them over $400,000. Another company has spent in developing work mostly, in the way of machinery and a railway, over $4,000,000. It is impossible to develop a mine without from $250,000 up to several millions, and no one will risk that money under the present lease system. I would recommend the minister to make some provision by which, if a man is going to open up a mine, he will have a lease for a longer period than twenty-one years.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it will be found that the lease system is not so much against operation as against speculations. One of the most highly developed coal properties in the west has been developed under the lease system in the Banff park. This is the Anthracite coal property, now oper-

ated by the Canadian Pacific Railway. True they would be better off if they had a longer lease or if I could arrange so that they would have a longer lease ; but the fact nevertheless remains that out of the five or six mountain mines now in operation, this one is under lease and has the most thoroughly equipped plant of them all.

Mr. GALLIHER. That was long before the present regulation.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, under regulations which applied to Banff park alone. Those regulations are to a great extent the basis of the regulations now applicable to the whole country.

Mr. GALLIHER. Is the lease the same as at present ?

Mr. OLIVER. Practically the same.

Mr. GALLIHER. As to time ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, it does not provide for a renewal, but I think the difficulty can be overcome in the case by legislation. If I should come down with a Bill asking for an amendment, my hon. friends will understand that the question has been already before the House. There have been leases issued to the number of sixty-four since the 15th June, 1907, under the present regulations. Quite true, a good many were in order to add to property already held under purchase; but, on the other hand, there are also a number of applications for leases, for operation as separate mines. True it is that the inducements which formerly existed to prospect for coal—that is to say the speculative inducement—does not exist to-day; and I am free to admit that that speculative inducement was a right and proper, and up to a certain time, necessary feature of our coal development. We could not, in all human probability, have reached the development we have attained to-day under the existing regulations. There had to be in the beginning the element of speculation, but it seems to me that we have now reached a reasonable measure of development, and the spirit of speculation having absolutely run wild, it was thought the proper time to put the industry on a basis of development rather than of speculation.

I submit that, with the provision for an extension of the lease on the conditions being fulfilled, the present regulations are more favourable for actual operation than the former ones. The fact that a number of operating mines have taken out leaseholds under the regulations is fair evidence on that point. But to clinch the matter absolutely, the former regulations provided for the sale of the lands and coal area at $10 per acre, subject to a royalty of ten cents per ton. The present regulations provide for the sale of the land—if you like to call it so—at $21 per acre and a payment of royalty of 5 cents per ton. Now, if you calculate the amount of coal contained in an acre of ground and figure it at 5 cents a ton, you will find, in operation, the land that was purchased at $10 an acre has, in many cases, cost vastly more than that which is leased.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. But in one case they own it and in the other they do not.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely—in one case they do not have to operate it and in the other case they do. Consequently, the element of speculation was very pronounced under the former regulations—though, as I have said, those regulations were prefectly proper up to a certain point. That element of speculation was too strong to be allowed to continue in the present condition of the country and especially in view of the fact instanced by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) that there had been already alienated some of the best areas of coal-bearing lands in the grants to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, and the homestead lands given to settlers before the imposition of the royalty. And the fact that we were selling coal lands on a royalty of 10 cents per ton alongside lands that carried no royalty kept out of operation the land that we were selling. We have reduced the royalty by half so that there is only 5 cents a ton between the coal mined under our regulations and coal mined free of royalty. Therefore, there is not the same bar to the operation of coal lands held under our present law as there was under the system of purchase which prevailed before.

Mr. HERRON. Has the minister come to a settlement with the companies in the Crow's Nest Pass that have applied for a rebate ?

Mr. OLIVER. The companies operating in the Crow's Nest Pass have applied for a rebate or remission of royalty, but so far, we have not been able to give either, and they are required to pay the royalty according to the terms of their purchases.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. First, I would like to ask one or two questions in connection with section 10, 17, 17 west of the 4th meridian, concerning which I have been trying to get information for a client of mine in Winnipeg. On June 1, I asked the following question :

1. When and to whom was patent granted for section 10, 17, 17 west of the fourth meridian?

To this the hon. minister replied:

1. Homestead entry has been granted for the four quarters of this section, but no patent has yet been given for the surface rights to any of the four homesteaders.

As I understand it—I am not well acquainted with these mineral districts—the

surface rights of a given area may be granted to one party and the mineral rights to another. In that case, what protection has the man owning the homestead right against the man who has the mineral rights?

Mr. OLIVER. The homesteader owns the surface, but the man who acquires the mineral right, if he is operating his coal lands, has rights, practically, of expropriation against the surface holder.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understand that these parties made application to homestead. It is the second part of the question and its answer that I particularly cannot understand. The question was:

2. How many applicants were there, what were the names of the applicants, and what was the date of each application?

And the answer of the hon. minister was:

2. No patent has yet been granted for the mineral rights under the section in question, but there have been five applicants for these mineral rights.

Then follow the names of the five applicants. Now, does the minister mean by this answer that the mineral rights have not been disposed of?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no intimate knowledge of the instance to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) refers, but judging from what he has read I should say that the mineral rights had not been disposed of.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is what I took from the answer, and sent off that information to my client in Winnipeg. But he was not satisfied; and, on going to the department, I found that these rights had been disposed of.

Mr. OLIVER. Let me revise the answer. I understood the hon. member to read a direct question asking if the rights had been patented. The question was how many people had applied. The answer did not convey the information that none of these applications had been granted.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. However, I find that the mineral rights have been disposed of. Perhaps, I misunderstood it, but I gathered that these rights had not been disposed of at the time I asked the question. But, from information I get, I understand that they were disposed of on March 20, 1907.

Mr. OLIVER. Disposed of to one of the applicants named?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. To two of the applicants named. But my client seems not satisfied that these were disposed of at the time his application came in. However, the point is the patent had not been granted, but two applicants had rights on two half-sections, though apparently the patents had not been granted.

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

Mr. OLIVER. They have not completely paid for it, and therefore they have not got the patent yet.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I asked a question the other night with reference to this Turtle mountain timber reserve, and the minister was not in a position to answer at the time, but said he would refer to it on the next occasion the matter came up. Has he now the information in regard to the resurvey of the land there?

Mr. OLIVER. The townships in two ranges, 20 and 21, were subdivided in 1879. The lines were marked with wooden posts, and the marks are now obliterated. A resurvey of these townships has been asked for several times. As most of the lands have been patented and have passed out of the control of the Crown, it was not considered to be the duty of the government to take care of the boundaries. But a resurvey can be undertaken when all the owners or persons having interest in that land shall agree to accept the new survey and abide by it. Should such an agreement be obtained, the request for a resurvey will receive careful consideration. The land having passed out of our hands we claim that we are relieved from the duty of making a resurvey. A survey made by us now would not affect the rights of the patentees unless they gave their consent. Therefore, while we are willing to go on and make a resurvey, it is absolutely necessary, in order that it may be of any value, that we first get an agreement by the patentees to accept that survey.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think that is satisfactory as far as it goes. But I think I asked, about two years ago, if a part of this had not been resurveyed. I am told by the settlers that about two years ago a part was resurveyed and iron stakes were put down, but the work was not completed.

Mr. OLIVER. My information is that the question was asked of the Surveyor General, and he says the request had been made, but that no resurvey had been given.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In regard to the timber reserves in these two townships to which we have been referring, I understood the minister to say that the forest rangers made no report directly to the government, but they made a report to the inspector, and he reported to the government.

Mr. OLIVER. That is as regards the fire rangers, men who are in the transient employment of the government, in the wooded country. But I think that the men who are employed regularly within the forest reserves do report to the head office.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In the Turtle mountain reserve, for instance, there is one forest ranger who is permanently employed.

Mr. OLIVER. He would report direct to Ottawa ; but the men whom he employs, would not.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Has he any other duties outside those of forest ranger? I refer to Mr. Charles Wakinshaw, forest ranger of the Turtle mountain reserve.

Mr. OLIVER. My impression is that he is assigned to the duty of looking after the timber and the general interest of the forest reserve.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What the minister said a few moments ago in reference to reforestation bears out the principle I have been contending for in this House for two or three sessions. I fully recognize the necessity of reserving these forests, if we can do anything with them in view of our climatic conditions. The minister said that after the timber was cut on these so-called reserves it was not always advisable to replant them. I agree with that. I have brought this matter up several times, and more particularly in connection with this very reserve, that part of it which is in township 1, range 21, west of the 1st meridian. That is an illustration of what the minister has been saying. We have a forest there in township 1, range 21, over which the fire swept some years ago, and the timber on it has been practically all destroyed. I stated the other day that all the new timber, trees two, or three, or four years old, in this whole township, could be put into two sections, that would be only two sections out of thirty-six. I took pains to drive over that township last fall, and I say that it has all grown up with grass ; and as I stated the other day, no one knows better than the present Minister of the Interior that trees and grass cannot be grown together. Quite a lot of that land has been cultivated by so-called squatters, though I believe they are now practically all off. But I am confident we can never make a success of growing trees in that particular township. Now the township east of that, which would be township 1 in range 20, I think can be made a success as a forest reserve, but I am confident that township 1 in range 21 cannot be made a success. I agree with the minister that this is a township which comes under his definition, it is a township that will be useful as farming land. The best of wheat can be grown in the greater part of that township. I have asked before that some inspection be made of that township, because I think it is useless for us to plant trees upon it. Some men have planted trees this year, but they have sown seed on only a limited area of that land which has been cultivated. But undoubtedly seed that was sown on that land which was cultivated last year would grow, because we have had heavy rains. I am talking of the general principle of planting and I would like if the minister would look into the conditions prevailing in that township. If I am wrong I am willing to take back anything I have said. If we can get timber to grow there that is what we want. However, these settlers are confident that the efforts to establish a timber reserve in that particular township will be a failure and if it will not make a timber reserve they think that these squatters should have their rights recognized. If in two or three years my opinion with regard to the township prevails and this land is open to homesteading, and I have no doubt in my mind that it will be, then, I say, that a moral if not a legal injustice will be done to those who have been there for quite a number of years. These men have met with great hardship during the last winter and I do not think it is out of place to make a short statement in connection with that matter. They were promised land away up in the north some place, a great many of them went away last fall and I understand they had a very hard winter. I had a letter with regard to the matter this week. Certain privileges were offered them. they were to get hay and other provision was to be made for them and I understand that some of them have not been very well treated. Although these men had no right to squat on that land they did so and were there for a number of years. They erected buildings and cultivated the land. They were ordered off last fall and perhaps rightly, but if that land is thrown open these men should know it as early as possible and they should receive due consideration. I would like very much that the matter should be looked into by the Minister of the Interior this summer. I do not see why we should not have a proper inspection made. Who is the inspector over Mr. Wakinshaw—Mr. Stevens ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, Mr. Knechtel, a Canadian by birth who has had experience in scientific forestry in the United States, is the superior officer in the west of the forest rangers who are employed directly on the timber reserves and we depend upon his report from actual examination for final action in regard to these reserves.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does he live in Winnipeg ?

Mr. OLIVER. His headquarters are in Winnipeg.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How long has he been in the employ of the government ?

Mr. OLIVER. He came into the employ of the government on the 1st March, 1908, and went west immediately.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Can he have authority to inspect this township ?

Mr. OLIVER. I propose that he shall make a very careful inspection of the Tur-

tle Mountain reserve. His first orders were to deal with these squatters who had been removed and see that the promises made to them were carried out. I have had some communication which would lead me to believe that he has done so and that the conditions are much more satisfactory than they were formerly.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not say that is not possible. Will he make an inspection this summer to determine whether it is suitable for a forest reserve or not

Mr. OLIVER. I will certainly assure my hon. friend that it will be inspected by Mr. Knechtel. I could not say definitely that a determination will be reached because such a question might depend upon more than the present appearance of the locality. It might require some little time to reach a conclusion.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If that township is inspected and it is determined that it shall be opened to homesteading will these people be reinstated or will they receive any consideration ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is looking pretty far ahead. These gentlemen had no legal right upon the land, they squatted on that land which was under departmental occupation, they were, under the authority of parliament, required to be removed and we gave them as much consideration as we could in their removal. They have taken land under ordinary homestead right elsewhere and I do not see that they would have any prior right should the township be reopened for settlement at a later date.

Mr. SCHAFFFNER. They have not all taken up homesteads in another place. Some have gone up there but the land did not suit them as well as in the Turtle mountains and they have not taken up homesteads. I think it would be only fair that these men who spent several years on these lands and made improvements there should be reinstated.

Mr. LAKE. I wish to make a few remarks with regard to the granting of the townsite of Buchanan on the Canadian Northern Railway. The papers in connection with this matter were brought before the Public Accounts Committee and after several attempts I managed to see them while they were in charge of an official of the department. But, I was only able to glance through them very quickly as the official was anxious to get away. I would like to give to the committee the result of the few notes I was able to make and to ask the minister if he will give an explanation of some of the points which stand forth in regard to this question. The townsite is in one of the odd numbered sections which was included in the Doukhobor reserve. It is the northwest quarter of section 35-31-6 west 2nd meridian. At the time that the correspondence opened the land was in the possession of Dimitry Soochochen, a Doukhobor, who was the owner of the quarter-section in the early part of 1905. The first matter of interest in the file is a communication from the agent at Yorkton on the 29th June, 1905, forwarding Dimitry Soochochen's abandonment of the north west quarter. I made inquiry in this House as to whether Soochochen had received any consideration for the abandonment and I was given the answer by the minister that he had not. Now, the information comes to me that he did receive a very considerable consideration, that is to say that he got the title to another quarter-section, or rather the title to another quarter-section was vested in Peter Veregin, head of the Doukhobor community, but of this I cannot speak with certainty. On receipt of this communication from the agent at Yorkton, dated 29th June, a telegram was sent by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands to the agent at Yorkton dated 5th July, 1905, as follows :

Dimitry Soochochen has abandoned northwest quarter of section 35; allow O. Ramsland to apply scrip forty acres and homestead balance.

No correspondence appears on the file to show how Ramsland came to be an applicant for this quarter-section, but apparently a week or so after the abandonment had been made a telegram is sent to the agent at Yorkton to allow a certain specified individual to make an entry for a quarter section, partly as a homestead and partly as scrip. This is an odd-numbered quarter-section. I understood the minister the other day to say that when the Doukhobor reservations were thrown open the odd-numbered quarter-sections included were considered in the light of homestead land and were thrown open to homestead entry. Apparently that was done in this case, but it seems to me that one principle at any rate was violated, that after an abandonment had been made of the land, instructions should be sent to allow a particular individual to make an entry on that land. I understood that the rule of the department was that the first applicant should have the first right of entry.

On July 27, the agent at Yorkton wrote asking what portion Ramsland should be allowed to scrip. He went on to explain that he understood that the Canadian Northern Railway had located the townsite of Buchanan on the section and he asked to be advised if the area of the townsite and the right of way was to be reserved and if so he wanted the area defined.

The next letter appeared to be after some considrable delay from the secretary of the Department of the Interior to the agent at Yorkton, dated October 13. He said :

It appears A. J. Sinclair (half-breed) allows to scrip south half. Please report all facts.

Have you ascertained where townsite is located?

It seems to me that throughout this whole question a good deal must have been done by personal communication, because there are several gaps and no letters appear to take up the continuity of the negotiations.

Next comes an acknowledgment of the abandonment by this Doukhobor, which is returned to the department undelivered, and the right to make a second entry which was sent to D. Soochochen. Apparently neither of them reached him, at any rate the papers were returned uncalled for and appear still on the file. If my information is correct, however, the Doukhobor had not much cause for complaint in this case; he got other land and apparently handed on the title to the head of the community.

On November 2, 1905, the agent at Yorkton informs the secretary of the Department of the Interior that Mr. O. Ramsland made homestead entry for the north half of the northwest quarter, on the 5th of August. He goes on to state that his information with reference to the townsite of Buchanan is that the township is not yet surveyed and when surveyed the entire site becomes the property of Mr. Ramsland according to arrangement with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.

The secretary of the Department of the Interior apparently wrote Ramsland on December 22, with reference to a letter which he had sent to the Minister of the Interior, referred to specifically, and which is not on the file :

It is assumed since the scrip was located thereon that the townsite of Buchanan forms part of the south half of the northwest quarter of 35, which has been assigned to you. There could not have been any objection on the part of the department to half-breed scrip being located on 80 acres instead of the legal subdivision only.

So it appears that the half-breed scrip finally is located on the whole quarter-section. The patent apparently had issued to Ramsland for the whole section, less right of way and station ground. That is in February, 1906. Ramsland abandons some months later the entry to the north half of this quarter-section in order that he may apply scrip to it and take up another homestead of 160 acres.

The secretary of the Interior on May 11, acknowledges Mr. Ransland's last letter and says :

It has been decided to permit you to scrip this land. This will exhaust your homestead right.

Now apparently he is told that he may take this choice between the two courses, either to scrip the whole of the land and exhaust his homestead right or to continue to homestead the portion for which he had obtained homestead entry. Then apparently some one else steps in and protests against this arranged infringment of Ramsland's right to make another homestead entry.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LAKE. Mr. Chairman, when you left the chair I was discussing the question of the town site of Buchanan, and I was referring to the fact that after Mr. Ramsland had been granted the right to place scrip upon the quarter-section upon which the town site was situated, he made a complaint that he was not to be allowed to exercise his right of homestead entry subsequently. I see by the correspondence that apparently Dr. Cash, M.P., the member for that district, complained of the action of the department in informing Mr. Ramsland that in placing scrip upon the quarter-section he had exhausted his right to homestead entry, and that instructions were sent to the land agent at Yorkton by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands that it had been decided that Mr. Ramsland's right of homesteading again had not been exhausted. It appears that a little previous to this many of the Doukhobor entries had been cancelled, and that the department had decided that the other three-quarters of this section should be put up for sale at public auction. Instructions were sent to the agent at Yorkton to this effect, with a poster advertising these other three quarter-sections for sale at public auction, and the agent was instructed to give notice that these quarter-sections adjoined the townsite of Buchanan. The instructions went up on May 13. 1907; the sale was to take place on July 8, 1907; but we find that on July 6, there was an application from Mr. Robert Buchanan, a very leading Liberal, I believe, in that district, to purchase one of the quarter-sections. This was granted to Mr. Buchanan, subject to the right of the Doukhobors in the property, and there is a memorandum by the chief clerk, dated November 14, 1907, stating that the land was sold to Mr. Buchanan subject to homestead duties. It does not appear in the return what Mr. Buchanan gave for the land. The return does not state that both of the other quarter-sections were put up for sale at public auction; but one of them apparently was sold at public auction for $19 an acre; and the gentleman who purchased it, Mr. Edward Pinkerton, had in addition to give free right to the Doukhobors to take off their crop and to pay for their improvements. There were eighty acres broken. and he had to pay $2 an acre for this. So that this very desirable quarter-section cost him $20 an acre. The papers are very incomplete. A good deal of the correspondence must have been done privately or the communications may have been personal. At any rate,

this is the way the matter stands: That the government, in possession of the fact that the northwest quarter of section 35, township 37, range 6, west of the 2nd meridian, was destined to be the townsite of the town of Buchanan on the Canadian Northern Railway, agreed, on the Doukhobor who at that time had the homestead right abandoning his homestead, to allow Mr. M. O. Ramsland to place scrip on the quarter-section and in that way become its possessor; that subsequently, after the cancellation of the homestead entries for the other three-quarters of that section, the government decided to have them put up for sale at public auction; that one of those quarters at any rate was sold privately prior to the public auction to a supporter of theirs, the price not being stated, but carrying with it the homestead duty, so that it may be taken for granted that the price was not very large. A return has been brought down showing the sales of land during the last year and up to the early part of the present year, and in that return the sale at auction to Pinkerton at $19 per acre does appear, but the sale to Mr. Buchanan of the other quarter-section, with homestead duties attached, does not appear, so that I do not know at what price it was sold to him. At any rate, the whole transaction appears to me to be a very unusual one, and I think the Minister of the Interior should give us an explanation of it—in the first place, why he allowed an odd-numbered section to be taken from the Doukhobor reserve and scripped, and why afterwards he allowed a private sale of a quarter-section to take place just in advance of the sale by public auction, and at a very much smaller figure than it was afterwards found could have been got.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the townsite of Buchanan, as the transactions occurred some time ago, they are not very fresh in my memory. But, as I gather from what my hon. friend has said and after hurriedly looking through the papers——

Mr. LAKE. I informed the Commissioner of Dominion Lands this morning that I was going to bring up the matter, and I was in hopes that he would have the papers here.

Mr. OLIVER. I have the papers here. As I said, in speaking the other day in regard to the Doukhobor reserves, the Canadian Northern Railway line runs through what was originally the Doukhobor reserve, and in this case runs through a quarter-section that was entered as a homestead of a Doukhobor. At the time the transaction spoken of took place, in the summer of 1905, we had not arrived at any conclusion as to how we were going to deal with the Doukhobor lands. Those who were in this House at the time will remember that when the estimates of that year were under discussion, some questions were raised, and I think it was made abundantly clear that the department had very little knowledge of the situation with regard to the Doukhobors. While the information of the department was in that condition and before we had arrived at any conclusion as to how we should deal with the question, it was brought to our attention that the Canadian Northern Railway desired very much to place a station upon this particular quarter-section.

And, if the station were to be placed there, it is altogether desirable, in the interest of the surrounding country, that the land, or a portion of the land, should be available for townsite purposes. My hon. friend will understand that a station of itself is not of the full value that a station is when accompanied with the advantages of civilization and settlement which naturally arise in the vicinity of a station. Therefore, it seemed to us that it was in the public interest that the wishes of the railway company and of the settlement should be met by arranging that this land should become a townsite. Now, it was impossible, as I understand it, to make any arrangement with the Doukhobor who had entered in regard to this townsite. His entry stood in the books, and it might have been possible to cancel it under the law as it stood. But I did not feel that we were justified in taking action in regard to these Doukhobor entries by piecemeal. I wanted to decide on some policy before I took action in regard to it, and I was not then in a position to decide upon a policy. Therefore, it seemed to me, when the proposition was made that this Doukhobor should be induced to abandon his entry and another man be allowed to take entry of the land—the other man one who would make arrangements in regard to the townsite—that the country stood to lose nothing, because the land was already entered by the Doukhobor, and he was in a position to exercise his rights of proprietorship, for it seemed to me it would not be well, as a matter of sound public policy, to abrogate these rights at the time. It was a case in which it was better for all parties that a quiet solution should be arrived at. Therefore, the Doukhobor was allowed to abandon his entry and Ramsland, as the first applicant, was allowed to place scrip on part of it and enter as a homestead for the balance. Now, the reason for the permission being given to place scrip on one part and homestead entry on the other was that Ramsland entering upon the whole of the land as a homestead would be in no better position than the Doukhobor to have the land dealt with as a town site, but if he entered three-quarters as a homestead and placed scrip on one-quarter, if he sacrificed his homestead right for 120 acres and placed scrip on the other 40, he would be

in a position to demand a patent for the 40 acres and to place land on the market for townsite purposes. It was with that in view that Ramsland, being the first applicant after the Doukhobor had abandoned the homestead entry, was given the privilege of putting scrip on a part of it in order that it might be used as a townsite, to the advantage as we believe of the railway company and of the surrounding settlement. As is known, the scrip is issued in 240-acre lots—that is, 160 acres and 80 acres. Therefore, we allowed Ramsland to put scrip on 80 acres instead of 40 as originally intended and to homestead the other 80 acres, and a patent was given him, I presume, for the 80 acres placed under scrip. Ramsland was then in the position that he had 80 acres of land under patent and 80 acres under homestead entry. It is true we could have held Ramsland to the position, but I do not know that it would be any particular advantage to the country or any one else to retain him in that position, and, as my hon. friend has said, he was given an opportunity to place scrip on the remaining part and was told, as my hon. friend said, he would thereby exhaust his homestead entry. However, up to that time, we had not arrived at a general policy in dealing with the question of placing scrip upon lands that had been homesteaded. There were cases when it had been permitted and the homestead right had not been exhausted, and there were cases where it had been permitted and the homestead right had been exhausted. It was represented—I assume, as I have not had time to study the matter—that, for one reason or another, Ramsland was entitled to the best treatment, that is to the right of placing scrip upon the land and not exhausting his homestead right. At any rate, that is the treatment that was accorded him. He was given notice, some time in May, I think, that if he placed scrip on the remaining 80 acres he would thereby exhaust his right. But, on June 1 he was notified that he would be permitted to take homestead elsewhere and that the exhaustion of his homestead right would not be insisted upon.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was that ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer that question. I have already explained that decision as to exhaustion of the homestead right had depended upon the circumstances of each case. But, shortly after this, we got out our general regulations for the guidance of the department—something that had never been done before, and, under these regulations, we provided that whenever scrip was permitted to be placed upon a homestead, the homesteader's right was thereby exhausted. We have held to that principle, but, up to that time, we had not established that as a principle. I am assuming that there were circumstances—or there were, in our estimation circumstances—in this transaction of Ramsland's to entitle him to consideration to that extent.

Mr. LAKE. The minister has not made any explanation of the sale in advance of the public auction.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg pardon. I am not able to give any explanation to that instance. In the return placed before the House, I think last session, a statement is given of the sales that were made, and this return states specifically that the three quarter-sections in question were sold at auction and the prices are given. I am bound to assume that my hon. friend's statement is correct and that the return is incorrect.

Mr. LAKE. Does the minister's file show that ?

Mr. OLIVER. The file does not show that it was sold at private sale but that it was applied for by Buchanan and that he finally purchased it. The return given to me shows that the three-quarters were sold at public auction.

Mr. CASH. I was present at the sale and the three-quarters were sold at public auction to the highest bidder. One was bid by Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Ramsland was bidding against him.

Mr. LAKE. What price ?

Mr. CASH. One-quarter sold at $17 the other at $5, and the other, at a price between the two, about $10 or $12.

Mr. OLIVER. The figures I have here are $19, $17 and $5 respectively, sold at public auction.

Mr. LAKE. How can the minister account for the fact that in the return brought down, Buchanan's name does not appear.

Mr. OLIVER. Which return ?

Mr. LAKE. Return No. 88—R brought down the 21st April last.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that. The file does not show that the land was sold to Buchanan at private sale. It shows that he applied for certain lands and got them but does not say that he got them at private sale.

Mr. LAKE. In the papers there is a memo. by the chief clerk 'land sold to Buchanan subject to homestead duties.'

Mr. OLIVER. These three sales were all sold subject to homestead duties.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister does not seem to have made an explanation which satisfies himself, on account of his not being familiar with the file. He should take

the first opportunity of making a thorough explanation to the House.

Mr. OLIVER. Of which part ?

Mr. FOSTER. That townsite sale.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose it will be agreed that the question of the distribution of the three quarter sections has been settled.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see a complete explanation as to why you told Ramsland that if he scripped eighty acres he would exhaust his homestead rights, and afterwards on June 1, you notified him he would have his homestead rights. The minister said there must be circumstances but did not know what they were. We should have that explained. As to the sale to Buchanan two days before the auction, that ought to be explained.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) has settled that point. He says he was present and saw these three quarter sections sold at auction to the highest bidder, subject to the performance of the settlement duties, and that is in accord with the printed report I have laid on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. But the real explanation should come from the papers themselves. The file ought to give a complete explanation, should it not ?

Mr. OLIVER. The printed report, which has been before the House ever since the latter part of the last session, says that these sections were sold at auction on the 8th August and that they brought $19, $17, and $5 per acre respectively, realizing a total of $6,453.70.

Mr. LAKE. The application of Mr. Buchanan two days before the sale and the statement in the papers show that my hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) may have been mistaken. The papers left me under the impression that the entry had been granted Buchanan at that time.

Mr. OLIVER. In order that we could compel the performance of the homestead duties, the homestead had to be granted.

Mr. HERRON. How is the situation of the Blairmore townsite at present? I have heard it reported that the people residing there are not able to obtain patents for their land. Is the owner able to issue a patent at present or how does it stand ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer at the moment, but I am under the impression that the patent has not yet been issued. There may be some question of adjustment with regard to the grant of land that was to be sub-patented to Pelletier and Lyon.

Mr. LAKE. Another question I want to bring up is the matter of the homestead entries to section 16 of township 24, range 28 west of the second meridian. This is a whole section entered for by a certain Mr. Tanguay and his three sons on the 29th March, 1902. I asked some questions with regard to this particular matter, and the minister will find all that I know about it on pages 3432 and 3433 of 'Hansard.' I asked the minister how many applications there had been for cancellation of two of these homesteads—the two which were held by the sons, namely : the northwest quarter-section and the southeast quarter-section. With regard to the northwest quarter section, the minister said that there had been an application for cancellation on the 19th September, 1903, by W. R. Kane, and that another application had been made on the 4th August, 1906, which the agent had not officially reported. That is to say that the whole number of applications for cancellation with regard to that quarter-section had been two, but that there had been three inspections made by the homestead inspectors of this quarter-section, and that, seven times in succession, extension of time had been given to the holder of the quarter-section.

The date of his entry was the 20th of May, 1902, and extensions were given to him up to the 1st of July, 1907 ; therefore, for considerably more than five years the land was held for him, although he was not performing the homestead duties. Now, in regard to the other quarter-section, another son of Mr. Tanguay, Adolphe, made a homestead entry on the 29th of May, 1902. The minister stated that one application for cancellation had been made by W. R. Kane, on the 19th of September, 1903, and that on the 13th May, 1905, Mr. Robert Brown said that he had applied for an inspection, but this was not officially reportetd. Yet in connection with this same homestead we find that there were three different inspections carried out by officials of the department, that seven distinct extensions of time were given to the applicant to make good his entry ; that he did not put in his residence at all until the 15th of September, 1907, and that after that time permission was given to him to purchase the land. Now the point I wish to make is that there were certain gentlemen applying for cancellation, and that if the persons who had made the entries were not doing their duty, and continued to refuse doing their duty, the persons who had put in the cancellation had the right to get the entry for homestead. I understand that Mr. Brown made an application for the cancellation of both of these homesteads, and he was hoping, up to quite a recent date, to get at any rate the second homestead to which I have referred, that of the southeast quarter-section. I sent to Mr. Brown the answers which the minister had given to my questions in the House, and Mr. Brown stated that they were abso-

lutely incorrect, that his application was still on file, and that he believed that the Mr. Tanguay who held the entry for the southeast quarter had never been a resident. And yet the minister had given permission to have this homestead purchased at $3 an acre, thus depriving Mr. Brown of the right which he undoubtedly had to have that homestead cancelled in his favour. I noticed in some of the correspondence which was sent to me that on the 15th of July, 1907, the Hon. Walter Scott, premier of Saskatchewan, wrote to Mr. Brown in regard to this matter, acknowledging that Mr. Brown and other parties had written to him about the cancellation of these quarter-sections; that he was informed that while permission to purchase was cancelled, further extension had been granted the homesteader until the 1st of November following on condition of cultivation and other improvements for the present season. That letter was sent to Mr. Brown. Mr. Scott further informed him that he did not think any good purpose would be served by communicating further about these cases at that time. So Mr. Brown understood that leave of absence had been granted until the 1st of November, and on the 2nd Mr. Brown put in an application for the homestead again. He was met, however, with the statement that the land had already been sold to Mr. Tanguay. I find in the return which was brought down in regard to the sale of the land that this land was sold to Mr. Adolphe Tanguay on the 21st of October, ten days previously, for $3 an acre, the reason given being that it was his cancelled homestead. Now I would like the Minister of the Interior to give us an explanation of this matter. It seems to me that Mr. Brown had certain rights in regard to this land; it also seems to me that he was done out of these rights, and further, that it is a new departure, according to my idea, that the Minister of the Interior should undertake to sell cancelled homesteads to the persons against whom they were cancelled, especially in cases where, apparently, no residence duty at all had been performed. I would like to ask the minister whether he is prepared to continue these sales of cancelled homesteads in such cases as that, and whether he would make these sales applicable to anybody who chooses to apply for them. It seems to me that the minister must have had very strong reasons to act as he did in this case, and no doubt he will be able to give them to us. I may say further that the following extensions of time were granted to Adolphe Tanguay. It will be remembered that he made his homestead entry on the 29th of May, 1902:

Seventeenth November, 1903, until May 1, 1904. On father's representation and promises. April 8, 1904, until May 1, 1905. August 23, 1905, until May 1, 1906; crop destroyed by hail. May 17, 1906, until July 1, 1906; considerable area under cultivation claimed. June 28, 1906, until August 1, 1906. November 12, 1906, until April 1, 1907. May 2, 1907, until November 1, 1907.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not in a position to give the committee full information in this case and I am sure I will be excused from going into the actual details. I have some indistinct remembrance of it, and I am sure my hon. friend will see that in the stupendous number of cases passing through the Interior Department, some proportion of which come to me for final adjustment, I can hardly be expected to keep in mind many of them, at least, so as to be accurate in regard to details. I have a remembrance of the Tanguay case, but I cannot explain it in detail. However, as it comes to my mind, it is something like this: The father and several members of the family went west some time in 1902. The idea was to settle the members of the family together—the father, two or three sons, and, I think, some sons-in-law. It is frequently the case that a father desires to have his sons and sons in-law settled near him. It may have been that, as the practice of accepting proxy entries prevailed at that time, some of the young men did not enter in person and did not go into immediate residence upon their land. I cannot speak upon that point, but, as I remember the case, Tanguay senior and one or two of his sons and sons-in-law did actually settle on land in this neighbourhood, are settled there yet, are settlers who have made substantial improvements were entitled to their patents and have secured their patents. With regard to these two particular quarter-sections, apparently, for one reason or another, the settlement duties were not properly fulfilled, but, on the other hand, I think the evidence is that a substantial amount of work was done upon these homesteads by the father on behalf of these sons, or by the sons themselves. In so far as I can remember, it was represented to me that when these young men had put in some part of their residence duties and very fully complied with the requirements of the law with regard to cultivation, it had become impossible, in the transaction of their business, to actually settle upon that land, and it was a question as to whether they should lose what they had done, that is lose the value and the advantage of their improvements and residence, or whether they should adopt some means of permitting them to acquire title. There have been many cases in which we have done this: When a settler had, to a measurable degree earned his patent, that is to say, when he had completed practically the duties but had not entirely completed the duties, we were not entitled to give him the patent of a free homestead, and yet it would not be fair, in our estimation to deprive him of the time labour and money which he had expended upon the homestead; we have,

in order to clear the account, in fairness both to the government and to the settler, sold him the land. When a settler had resided upon his land to the full requirements of the law, except, it may be, a few days, a week or two, sickness had intervened, he had made a miscalculation, something had occurred, he had fulfilled the duties, except a small portion of the residence duties, we have, in order that we may be able to give that man his patent, in order that he may not lose the time and labour that he has placed upon the land, sold it to him at a dollar an acre. Then again, if he has been short of his residence duties but has performed his cultivation duties to the satisfaction of the department we have sometimes sold to him, in order to square the account, at $3 per acre.

Mr. LAKE. Suppose he has done no residence duties at all?

Mr. OLIVER. In that case our practice is not to do anything but to cancel the entry. Our information is that these Tanguays did perform their residence duties, not to a sufficient extent to entitle them to their land, but that they did their other duties either themselves or through their father in the way of cultivation and improvements to such a degree as would, apart from residence, fully entitle them to their patent. It is on that principle that we have made the sale that my hon. friend mentions and of which Mr. Brown complained. It may be that in this case we have erred by being too liberal in our construction of the practice, but, in administering the lands of the country, in order to secure settlement and development, it has been the practice to give every reasonable consideration to the actual settler who is on the land and especially to the families of settlers. My hon. friend knows that it is a definite provision of the Land Act that if a man has ten sons all may acquire patents for their homesteads without ever living a day upon the land ; but by residing with their father they can complete all the duties upon their homestead. While we refuse proxy entries generally one member of a family may make a proxy entry for the other members of the family. It is considered to be sound public policy to give consideration to the desire of families to settle together and it was in pursuance of that idea that the consideration which we have given to the Tanguays was given to them. Perhaps we erred a little, but we believe we erred on the right side in giving consideration to these people and allowing them to protect the expenditures which had been made on their behalf and retain the land in the neighbourhood in which the other members of their family are located.

Mr. LAKE. I sympathize with the minister in the position which he takes that facilities should be afforded to families to settle together. But, in this particular case, apparently one son, to whom permission was given to purchase his homestead, never performed any residence duties at all until a month before the purchase was permitted. The gentleman who brought this matter to my notice apparently is under the impression that the son has never set foot upon the land at all even up to the present time, although the government state that he had gone into residence just a month before permission was given to him to purchase the land. I think it ought to be understood that if proof can be adduced that no residence duties at all have been done in a case of this sort cancellation ought to take place. The minister agrees to that.

Another point is that Mr. Brown says he made application for cancellation of both these quarter-sections at different times. In one case the minister apparently has no record of his application. In the other case he simply states that Mr. Brown says he put in an application but does not know whether that is the case or not. These applications for cancellation are important particularly in regard to priority, because if a man knows that the duties are not being performed on a desirable homestead, and believes there is no intention to perform them he has a right to expect that the law will be carried out and unless there is a valid reason that cancellation will take place. In these cases, from the government's own showing, cancellation apparently never took place and the gentleman had to go elsewhere. I have known of other cases where there has been strong feeling in regard to this question of cancellation. I have had correspondence with the department in reference to more than one of them. I wish to impress on the minister the absolute necessity of having a complete record of these applications for cancellation because the man who applied for cancellation has rights under the law which should be respected.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite appreciate the view of my hon. friend in regard to cancellation. I hope that he and the House will understand that cancellation is one of the most difficult questions with which we have to deal in the administration of the lands. We have to be guided on one hand by considerations of the rights of the worthy but poor settler, and on the other hand we have to give due consideration to the rights of the man who wants to fulfil the duty which the other man is failing to fulfil. It would be impossible to fulfil the law so as to satisfy both parties when a conflict necessarily exists between the homesteader and the applicant for cancellation. From time to time since June last we have defined our position in regard to cancellation as fully, as completely and we believe, as fairly as has been possible under the very difficult circumstances. I do not know whether my hon. friend is ac-

quainted with the regulations in regard to cancellation, but we find that from time to time the healing of one difficulty is followed by the opening of a new difficulty. It is impossible to foresee the ingenuity of man in protecting his entry when it ought not to be protected or in attacking another man's entry when it ought not to be attacked. We can only try to strike a fair average in dealing with these hundreds of cases and we hope to get fair consideration for trying to do what is right and fair between man and man according to the best interests of the settlement of the country. We do not pretend that we are able to please both sides to a dispute in which only one can win.

Mr. HERRON. I have seen a good deal of this question, particularly in my own locality. I can say from experience that I commend the minister for a great many acts of his in the way of being lenient, while still within the law, to settlers in allowing men to purchase in some cases at a dollar an acre, and in some at $3 an acre, if they have not fulfilled all the requirements of the law. But at the same time I know many cases in my locality where the government has been either very seriously imposed upon by people getting places or else a great deal of partiality has been shown. I know one place near my own town where a man had an entry for a quarter-section. He was not able to go on it for the first six months, but I do not know that he did not get an extension of time for six months. However, before the second term was up he was notified his entry would be cancelled, if he could not show reason why he had not done certain improvements. He was not able to comply with the law and another man got his entry. This man held it about two years. He never resided on it or made any attempt to reside on it, and he was allowed to purchase it at, I think, $3. As soon as he got the patent he sold the land for $20 an acre, but he had never made any attempt to live on the land or improve it. There are a great many other cases of the same kind I have seen. The minister has been lenient and I would recommend him to be lenient with men who have made a conscientious attempt to comply with the conditions.

Mr. LAKE. I wish to ask the minister as to the disposal of the quarantine lands near Estevan. They were disposed of apparently by public auction. What where the conditions of sale, where were they advertised, what time was given to carry them out and what bids were received ?

Mr. OLIVER. This relates to a certain area of land, about two sections, on the boundary line near Estevan, about where the Soo line crosses the boundary. They were reserved for the use of the Agricultural Department for holding stock in quarantine upon them. After a time the Agricultural Department decided that they did not require them any longer and they were released from reservation. In the meantime the land around had settled up and they had become, as we thought, of some little increased value. We felt that if they were open to ordinary homestead entry there was likely to be a good deal of hard feeling about priority of entry. Therefore in July, 1907, they were put up for sale at an upset price of $3 per acre subject to settlement conditions, that is to say subject to cultivation of twenty acres and 12 months residence. No tender for more than one-quarter section was to be accepted from the same applicant. Tenders were received in the department, but the sale was not carried out in view of an irregularity in regard to the highest tender. The cheque accompanying it was not certified or marked by the bank, in accordance with the conditions of the advertisement. The cheque accompanying the next tender had been marked by the bank, but we did not feel justified in accepting it, although it was really the highest that complied with the terms of the advertisement, as the lack of the mark on the cheque accompanying the highest tender might have been only an inadvertence. Therefore we decided that for the time being we would call the sale off and again advertise the lands for sale by public auction, when no mistake would be likely to occur in regard to the cheque. The date of this sale has not yet been fixed, but it will take place some time during this summer.

Mr. LAKE. What are the sections ?

Mr. OLIVER. Half of section 6, half of section 16, three-quarters of section 18, and one-quarter of section 23.

Mr. LAKE. The return brought down says that the northeast quarter of section 16 was sold by tender on the 15th of October to James Rutherford at $3 per acre. How did that tender come to be received ? I understood from the minister that the tenders were called for in July.

Mr. OLIVER. The information I have is that the lands were to be put up in July to be sold on the 16th of December. It may have been that the date was postponed from October to December.

Mr. LAKE. A sale took place on the 21st of October to J. C. Flynn at $3 per acre. The local press stated as much as $7.50 per acre had been offered for the land which had been sold to the lower tenderer. I hope the minister will have an inquiry into the whole matter.

Mr. OLIVER. The House will see that these lands are for sale, not at the highest price, but under settlement conditions,

which of course detracts considerably from the price that would otherwise be got for them. The statement that $7.50 per acre was offered must be a mistake. It is quite possible that the land would be worth that figure as a speculative proposition, but I do not think we would receive any such figure with settlement conditions attached. However, the sale did not go through, and the land will be offered at public auction some time this summer.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it an absolute rule that unless a homesteader literally fulfils the settlement conditions, he cannot get his patent, and that all the government can do in such a case is to allow him to purchase at a certain reasonable price? Suppose a man did his settlement duties for three years, doing everything that was necessary in the way of building a shack, breaking his land and putting it under crop, but something occurred to make a break in the performance of his residence duties, would he not be able to get his homestead entry? Is that absolute?

Mr. OLIVER. That is as we understand it. We have no authority to issue a patent unless the requirements of the statute are fulfilled. There is, however, an instance in which we have stepped outside the statute, and in the proposed amended Land Bill I am asking for provision for that; that is, where a settler suffers from some physical disability that absolutely incapacitates him from fulfilling his duty. In one or two instances of this kind we have taken an order in council as authority for issuing the patent.

Mr. FOSTER. After a man has gone on and done his duty faithfully as a bona fide homesteader, something might happen, like the fall from a load, to prevent him fulfilling all the conditions; and it scarcely seems fair justice to say to him, you can buy your homestead for $3 an acre, when other land can be bought at the same price. There ought to be a remedy somewhere, whether by report to parliament or otherwise. It seems very harsh that the result of three years work should be entirely voided because of some unforeseen and unavoidable accident.

Mr. OLIVER. The best we can do in such a case is to sell the land at $1 an acre, unless in a case where the man is absolutely incapacitated and then we get an order in council.

Mr. FOSTER. I think you would have to come to parliament.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly, but once the patent is issued, I do not think the government is subject to political attack or the patent to a legal attack. I wish to remedy that position by an amendment to the Act, so that there will be no question about the

authority. The best we can do is to sell at $1 an acre, and we only sell at $1 an acre when there is merely a trifling difference between the performance and the duty.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that ministerial administration or by order in council?

Mr. OLIVER. It is ministerial. There is a provision in the Act that the minister may sell at $1 an acre, and he exercises that power in that case. In such a case as that mentioned by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), where we sell at $3 an acre, there has been a substantial failure in the residence, but a liberal fulfilment in the cultivation. We simply say that the man has failed in the essential particular required by the statute, but in order that he may save the money that he has put into the land we make the sale to him.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice by the return that in the aggregate there are a large number of those sales at from $1 to $3 an acre and sometimes more than $3. Is that done on ministerial responsibility or is an order in council required?

Mr. OLIVER. These are dealt with by ministerial authority. In the few instances where the price is over $3 the sales are in British Columbia.

Mr. HERRON. Are there any sales at $2 an acre?

Mr. OLIVER. There may have been, but since I have been minister we have either made it the one way or the other. They are made at $1 an acre in order to save the man who has substantially fulfilled his residence duties, but we sell at $3 an acre to the man who has failed in what we consider an essential part of his duties, the residence. We do not sell to any one who has altogether failed in his residence duties. There must be some residence or there is no sale. There is another instance where we sell, namely, where there are fractional pieces of land adjoining lakes or large rivers—a piece less than eighty acres, the corner frequently of an adjoining homestead. Our practice is to sell that to the owner of the adjoining land, believing that the area is too small to warrant any one taking it as a homestead and believing that, if the adjoining owner wants it it is reasonable he should have it, and we sell it at that price.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister must be, to a large extent, at the mercy of his officials who report to him from all through the country. Does he think that these officials are influenced by political or party considerations? Some of these difficulties may arise from that fact.

Mr. OLIVER. By the time the case comes from the inspector to the agent and from the agent to the head office and runs the gauntlet in the head office, it is pretty

well trimmed of anything but its merits, and there is not much chance to hang anything else to it.

Mr. FOSTER. What is Mr. Obed Smith's position now?

Mr. OLIVER. He is assistant immigration commissioner in London, England.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he there permanently?

Mr. OLIVER. As permanent as anything in the outside service. An exchange was made early this spring between Mr. J. Bruce Walker, who was assistant immigration commissioner in London, and Mr. Smith, who was assistant commissioner in Winnipeg. The salary was the same in both cases.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister issue instructions to his land officers throughout the west, by circular or otherwise, forbidding them to engage in the business of buying and selling land or changing or otherwise the homesteads?

Mr. OLIVER. I think there is a provision in the Land Act itself which forbids an employee of the Lands Department from taking part in any transactions having relation to government land. It does not forbid their engaging in transactions with regard to other lands. I do not know that we have issued any instructions, but the Land Act is very definite.

Mr. LAKE. I notice that a number of pieces of land have been sold to the Grand Trunk Pacific for townsite purposes at $1 an acre. Does the minister consider that a proper price?

Mr. OLIVER. The land was sold to the homesteader at $1 an acre and he sells to the company for whatever he can get. The Grand Trunk Pacific of course runs through lands owned by private individuals and other corporations as well as through government lands, and it is necessary that they should not only have stations but conveniences for the handling of grain and other business in order that they may give full benefit and advantage to the surrounding country. In placing their stations where they will be most suitable the company frequently has to select quarter-sections occupied by homesteaders. The homesteaders could not sell that land to the Grand Trunk Pacific and could not make it into a townsite, and it amounted to a hold up of the development of the town at that particular place until he got his patent.

Where the settler got his patent he would do as he pleased with it. Under these circumstances, the railway company, being desirous of getting action for the development of this town as soon as possible, for the sake of the business, and for the sake of knowing definitely where they were, desired to acquire these lands. Now, so far as the government was concerned, the right to the land had already passed, and there was no way by which the government could recover its ownership in that quarer-section. The homesteader had the right to earn the title, and, so far as we knew, he would earn it and would become the owner. Therefore, it was a mere question of allowing the railway company to get beneficial action upon the property or delaying that action until the homesteader earned his patent. In order that action might be had as soon as possible, we sold the land that the railway company wanted to purchase for a townsite to the homesteader and he sold to the railway company for what he could get. I hope he made a good sale. We allowed him to take land elsewhere. It was a fortunate thing for the homesteader, and, I say frankly, I do not regret giving him the advantage, for the government lost nothing and it was not a matter of taking advantage on the part of the homesteader. He was there as a settler, the railway came and made his land valuable in spite of him, and I know no reason why he should not get the benefit. Where the railway saw fit to place its station upon land still remaining in the Crown, the arrangement is different. There we think it quite fair and reasonable that there should be facilities for the establishment of a town, and we sell the land to the company at $3 an acre, retaining one-quarter interest in the proceeds of the sales that may be made. The reason why we prefer to retain an undivided one-quarter interest is that if we were to retain a divided interest the question of municipal taxation would necessarily arise, and we have found that a very difficult and vexing question. It is a generally established principle that the government pays no taxes. We do not feel that we should be warranted in breaking through that rule and paying taxes on the land when it became part of the municipality. Therefore we conclude that probably the best way to deal with the matter was to sell the land to the railway company at a price and simply retain an interest in whatever result might come from the future sales. I think the transaction is one that will commend itself to the House and the country.

Mr. FOSTER. But if you had braved the dangers of municipal taxation, your relation with the railway company would be that you would have one-half the townsite still.

Mr. OLIVER. That would be the usual system of dealing with a railway company.

Mr. FOSTER. Instead of that, you keep one-quarter upon which you pay no taxation. That is, you keep the municipality out of the taxation——

Mr. OLIVER. That is——

Mr. FOSTER. Well, you cut them out of it.

Mr. OLIVER. No, the railway company owns the land and has to pay taxes.

Mr. FOSTER. On the whole of it?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. If it were divided, part of it would not pay taxes.

Mr. LAKE. The minister says that the government charge $3 an acre, but the return shows that the amount paid is $1 per acre. That is why I asked the question, thinking $1 too low a price.

Mr. OLIVER. The mistake must arise in the case of townsites where the purchase is made by the homesteader.

Mr. LAKE. It does not show that in the return.

Mr. OLIVER. I am satisfied that that is how it arises. When we sell to the homesteader we sell at $1 an acre. but when we sell to the company we sell at $3.

Mr. LAKE. In this return, wherever the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Grand Trunk Pacific Townsite and Development Company is mentioned, the price is $1 an acre, and I see no sale at $3 an acre. Sales should appear in the return as they were made? Another question I would like to ask the minister is in reference to one sale by G. H. McKague, 160 acres at $2.50 per acre 'in lieu of cancelled pre-emption.' What is the explanation of that?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot recall the particular point mentioned. But I may say that the question of pre-emptions is one that arises occasionally. The right of pre-emption expired some time about 1889. But, though it is so long ago since this right expired, there are isolated cases where the pre-emption patent has not yet been issued because of the failure of the homsteader to complete his payment for pre-emption or for some other reason. It may be that there is some part of the payment due, or it may be that there is a seed-grain lien, or a lien of some other kind against the land. In any case, every now and again, we come across a pre-emption entry of which the homesteader is not entitled to a patent and the question arises what we are to do with it. In some cases, they have paid part of the price, and it seems hard that the man should lose what he has paid, even though he has not entirely completed the payment. I do not recall the instance my hon. friend has mentioned, but I can imagine that it was of this character. We find in our books an instance of pre-emption the payment upon which had not been completed, and not being able to get into communication with the homesteader or the man who had the pre-emption we have cancelled it. After a time, the owner has waked up and found that he has lost some property. He comes to us with his tale of woe; he tells us that he paid part of the money and could have paid the balance if he had known, that he ought to have it, that we ought not to rob him, and so on. And it may be that we have felt there was merit in the man's case and have met his grievance in the way my hon. friend suggests. I do not know that this is such a case, but I say it is quite possible it may arise in that way. The other day a case came before me where a pre-emption owner had notice that his pre-emption was cancelled. Though he had got it in 1889, and had paid $240 out of $480, he had never been able to raise the balance, and it was only when he got notice that his land was cancelled that he woke up and came back to us, and wanted reinstatement and the privilege of paying up the balance of the price.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to mention another matter that has created a good deal of feeling in the neighbourhood where I have been living. There have been complaints that certain parties are able to get cancellations in the land office at Regina when other parties cannot do so. It is also complained that the government officials are in the habit of taking money from settlers, and giving cancellations which other parties were not able to procure. This was brought to my notice some time last year, and I think I called the attention to it of the Commissioner of Dominion Lands. Later on when I got home, it was again called to my attention. Several different individuals came to see me about it, and told me of case after case. I was not able to go into these cases and verify them. But something did happen which enables me to bring the matter before the minister. I will not give the names, because I do not know if the complaints are well founded ; but the minister will easily be able to identify the case which I propose to lay before him. A certain individual stated that he had been approached by one of these parties who professed to be able to control the cancellations, and had offered to get the cancellation of a certain very desirable quarter-section on payment of the sum of $400. I may say that he was a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. This individual went to the land office and found that he could not get a cancellation. But he there and then made an affidavit, which was taken in the land office, and I will read the affidavit, leaving out the names. I think the minister will agree that it is just as well the names should not be mentioned :

I ..... do solemnly declare that the homesteader is not in residence, and has made no improvements. The only improvement on the place is thirty acres broken in 1905 by a party at who told me last year that he could let me have this land for $200. The land was entered for on October 17 last, and the entrant has not started to live on it, but states that he can let me have it for $400. I understand that he has written to have it protected.

The matter was reported to the head office here, and the homestead inspector was told to report. His report states:

I have not discovered any evidence of manipulation in connection with the evidence.

I cannot believe that the homestead inspector could have made the inquiry he ought to have made under the circumstances, because I know from the amount of talk all through the neighbourhood, that he must have been able to get something more than is contained in that report. I would like the minister to make inquiry and see whether there is any ground for this complaint. It is in connection with this same office that I mentioned, as furnishing complaints about cancellations not having been properly recorded.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to follow the incidents my hon. friend has mentioned. Certainly, the idea that there is favouritism in cancellations is very injurious to the standing of the department in the minds of the public, and is therefore an injury to the settlement of the country, because confidence in the administration of the land office must lie at the foundation of successful settlement. It has been my object to establish that confidence. Our departmental regulations in regard to cancellation read as follows:

Application for the cancellation of the entry of a homesteader in default, must be made in person at the land agency for the district within which the land is situated.

Mr. LAKE. How long has that been in force?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say how long it has been in force, but it has been printed and in the hands of all parties concerned ever since the 1st of October last.

Mr. LAKE. That is subsequent to a good many of the cases.

Mr. OLIVER. Then it goes on, a page and a half of provisions intended to guard against fraudulent applications for cancellation. There was, as we found some years ago, a great abuse in the matter of cancellations. There was no restriction, anybody could go into a land office and apply for a cancellation of a whole township for homestead entry. Among some of the other provisions of these regulations, are the following:

An application for cancellation will not be accepted or considered if made within six months of the date on which the homestead entry was granted, unless the application should be made on the ground of ineligibility of fraud. In such case the application may be accepted at any time after the date of entry, and must be accompanied by a statement on oath giving full particulars.

Only one application for cancellation will be accepted against an entry until such application has been finally disposed of.

The applicant for cancellation must be eligible to make homesteading, except in the case of a minor, and eligible to have land reserved for him.

I am aware that circulation of reports such as those my hon. friend has mentioned are injurious, and I will be glad to follow them out to a finish, if he will furnish me with information. I am afraid there may have been matters that were not absolutely correct in the Regina land office some time ago. As my hon. friend is aware, there was a change of agency there over a year ago, and I was under the impression that matters were more satisfactory since. I am not a respecter of persons, I want to have the confidence of the people with regard to the fair administration of the land laws, and if, on investigation, I find that a wrong has been done, wherever the lightning strikes somebody will be hurt.

Mr. LAKE. I am very glad to be able to bring these matters to the attention of the minister. I have been in communication with respect to two or three of them with the Commissioner of Dominion Lands who, no doubt, will bring them to the attention of the minister. I expect that the commissioner knows about this particular matter to which I have just referred. A return was brought down in connection with it. There is just one other matter to which I desire to call the attention of the minister. I have had several resolutions sent to me by boards of trade in the southern part of my constituency, one of which is as follows:

Resolved, that this board heartily endorses the resolution recently passed by the Saskatchewan Game Protective Association in respect to the establishment of a national park and game preserve in the Moose mountains and the placing therein of a herd of buffalo and other wild game.

Has the minister been able to give any consideration to the question of forming a park in the Moose Mountains? I see that a good deal has been said about it lately. It is an ideal spot for a timber and game preserve. I would like to hear from him in regard to the matter.

Mr. OLIVER. When the project of purchasing a herd of buffalo in Montana was first brought up the Moose Mountain timber reserve was the place I had in mind for the location of the herd. But, afterwards, when I heard of the resentment that was felt locally against the removal of the herd from Montana, I thought it would be rather doubtful policy to place such a large herd of buffalo within what you might term easy reach of the boundary line.

Mr. FOSTER. What would the distance be?

Mr. OLIVER. About forty miles which is not a very long run for a band of buffalo. I thought it would be better to place them

temporarily where they were placed and afterwards make arrangements for an area of grazing land where they would be practically out of reach of anything of that kind. At the same time I am aware of the advantages of the Moose Mountain country and I quite sympathize with the desire of the people to have some specimens of game there. When we get our buffalo settled down, when we get our principal grazing ground entirely inclosed and our herd installed there I will be very glad to take up the question of pleasure parks, as they may be called, in different parts of the country. As my hon. friend is aware, there is an Indian reserve adjoining the forest reserve at Moose Mountain. We have been able to secure from the Indians the surrender of a piece of land adjoining a very pretty lake there with the view of it being used as a summer resort and I think that in due course we may be able to do something in the way that the resolution suggests, but at the present time we do not feel that we are in a position to deal comprehensively and intelligently with the question of the location or the buffalo beyond what we have already decided. It is an old saying that you must first catch your hare before you can cook him, and I would like to have all the buffalo that we are going to get well in hand before I decide upon the policy of distribution.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are there in the herd now ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are about 400.

Mr. FOSTER. How are they distributed as to sex ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry to say that the majority is against us, but still there is a fair proportion—well, not a fair proportion as breeding cattle are understood—but we have a very considerable number of females and there was some measure of increase this spring although owing to the rough handling last summer there has not been as great an increase as we otherwise might have expected.

Mr. HERRON. As I had some experience of buffaloes in the early days, I have great sympathy with the government in procuring that herd. I think they did well to secure the buffalo which are natives of our land, but I rather think it was unfortunate that they were placed in the northern country where they are at present. Does the government not anticipate a great deal of trouble in securing and removing them from the present place to the new park laid out for them or the place where it is intended to locate them permanently ? I understand that they are in a wooded or partially wooded country. I doubt very much if the government will ever be able to secure the buffalo from that timbered country, get them loaded on the cars and move them to another part of the country. You cannot do that with ordinary domestic cattle in a timbered country. It is impossible to get them out of the timber until they are ready to come. I do not know what is to be done with the buffalo. I feel certain that there will be great disappointment in getting them out. Has the government taken that into consideration ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, the government has taken it into consideration but it is one of those things which is really not for consideration. It is something that has to be done. I quite appreciate the difficulties of it but I do not see any other recourse and I have no doubt that, when we were able to secure so many of the herd as we did under the unfavourable circumstances which surrounded our getting them, we will be able to make the transfer from the park where they are to the park where we want to keep them permanently.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they inclosed at present ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, they are in an inclosure four miles square. As my hon. friend (Mr. Herron) says, part of the area is wooded and part is prairie. It is a very nice location in itself but it is not an ideal buffalo range, but the park which we have now reserved and for the fencing of which we are asking an appropriation, is in a part of the country which is considered to be an ideal buffalo range. We hope to get the park fenced in time to receive the remainder of the herd that we hope to get from Montana this summer and later will make the transfer.

Mr. FOSTER. You have 400 already and you expect to get more ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is believed that there are about 200 more. When we entered into the bargain first we thought that the whole herd amounted to 350, but as they were on a wide range and had not been rounded up it was impossible to ascertain the exact number. But we feel that we are getting them at a price at which we can afford to take the whole herd and if we are able to corner the market by getting the whole herd that fact will appreciate the value of what we have.

Mr. FOSTER. You did not buy them by the number ?

Mr. OLIVER. We got them at so much per head.

Mr. STAPLES. How much per head ?

Mr. OLIVER. $200 per head landed at Edmonton, plus the actual cost of transportation, which amounts to $45 per head. The seller stood the loss until arrival at Edmonton. We paid only for what arrived at Edmonton.

Mr. STAPLES. Who negotiated the purchase?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. H. Douglas, superintendent of the park at Banff.

Mr. STAPLES. Had he any assistance?

Mr. OLIVER. I think so, Mr. Ayotte, the immigration agent at Grand Forks, may have assisted in Mr. Douglas' absence.

Mr. STAPLES. That gentleman was a deputy returning officer in the last Dominion election in Manitoba.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware.

Mr. STAPLES. I saw in a western paper that he had assisted in the purchase and had made a clean up of $25,000.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no hesitation in saying that as far as the clean up is concerned, the statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. LAKE. In reference to the purchase of lands by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, have all these lands been paid for and the patents made out and have the lands become liable to taxation?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that definitely. If the payments have been made the patents will issue without delay.

Mr. LAKE. Are not the patents completed ?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand so.

Mr. LAKE. And all conditions fulfilled?

Mr. OLIVER. That is our understanding.

Mr. STAPLES. How many acres of swamp land were transferred to the Manitoba government this year?

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid I cannot give that. I think we have transferred in all about 2,000,000 acres ; about three-quarters of a million acres were transferred this year.

Mr. STAPLES. How many acres of Dominion lands are there still in Manitoba?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say until tomorrow.

Mr. STAPLES. Who are the inspectors inspecting the swamp lands in Manitoba?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Dukes and Mr. Ducker are and have been for some years.

Mr. STAPLES. What conditions are required to qualify lands as swamp lands?

Mr. OLIVER. The requirement is set out in an order in council. Roughly it is that some portion, one-quarter or one-half of a quarter-section, must have been at some time under water. Then it can be reported as swamp land and we can transfer it.

Mr. STAPLES. The minister knows that it has been a grievance in the province for many years that according to the Act of 1885 about 7,000,000 acres should have been turned over to the province long before now, and not more than two and a half million or three million acres have been transferred. That land is drying up and what would have qualified as swamp ten years ago would not qualify now. The province is losing a good asset owing to the delay in inspecting and turning over the lands. Before and after the change of government here, Mr. Greenway, then the leader of the provincial government, said that upon the Liberals coming into power in Ottawa these lands would be quickly turned over to the provincial government, but they have not been.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know my hon. friend's authority for the statement that there are 7,000,000 acres which should be transferred to the province.

Mr. STAPLES. That was the estimate in 1885.

Mr. OLIVER. It may be that in all Manitoba there are 10,000,000 acres that would qualify, but the agreement is that the lands are only to be handed over on their being surveyed. As the survey has progressed the inspection has been made and the lands handed over. We have now handed over 2,000,000 acres and there remains very little that has been inspected and surveyed to be handed over. There is, however, an account to be adjusted between the two governments in respect of lands which have been handed over to the province as swamp lands and which have been squatted upon by settlers before being handed over. In the protection of the rights of these settlers it has been necessary to make some adjustment with the province of Manitoba. This account is still open, but as far as the lands are concerned they are inspected and handed over. The grievance that the province of Manitoba is suffering because lands which were not handed over as swamp lands some years ago have become dry and are now not eligible to be handed over as swamp lands, may be a good argument on behalf of Manitoba, but I am afraid that my hon. friend will not receive sympathy from other sections of the Dominion in his complaint, because if it was a loss to Manitoba it was a corresponding gain to the Dominion. But I think my hon. friend's contention is imaginary rather than real. Taking one year with another, the average has been about even, and the province does not stand either to lose or gain by delay.

Mr. STAPLES. I think the province of Manitoba should have its rights; and should not lose this valuable asset by lapse of time. There has been nothing to prevent this government in the last ten years putting on the necessary surveyors and inspectors to survey these lands, so that they

could have been handed over to the province; and I am sure that the sister provinces of this Dominion would not consider that Manitoba was getting the best of them. It is generally conceded throughout this Dominion that the province of Manitoba has not been treated as it should have been by this government. I do not think the other provinces want to take an unfair advantage of the province of Manitoba, or make a gain from the fact that these lands, by the lapse of time, are continually drying up and will not qualify as swamp lands. If they had been inspected ten years ago and had been turned over to the province at that time as swamp lands, the province would have got the benefit. I am not making this complaint against this government only, but against the late Conservative government as well. What the people of Manitoba expect is fair treatment, and therefore I would ask the minister to take immediate action to put on the necessary surveyors and inspectors, and turn over to the province what lands will qualify as provincial swamp lands.

Mr. FOSTER. In connection with this item I have a matter placed in my hands which I do not understand very well, and I am going to ask the minister to allow us to take it up on some other of his items, so that we may get the information required.

Mr. OLIVER. What is it in connection with?

Mr. FOSTER. It is in connection with a request of the Robbins Irrigation Company for a re-arrangement of their lands.

Government of the Yukon Territory, $365,000.

Mr. OLIVER. For salaries and expenses connected with the administration of the territory $165,000 was voted for the fiscal year 1907-8, and the same amount is asked for the current fiscal year. The principal items are: salaries, $70,720; living allowances, $40,800; insane patients' expenses connected with transportation to asylum at New Westminster and for maintenance at Dawson and Whitehorse, $15,000; travelling expenses to and from Dawson and the territory, $5,000, printing and stationery, $7,000; advertising mining regulations, proclamations, &c., $5,000; telegrams, telephones and postage, $2,500; expenses connected with collection of export tax, $3,500; to pay commission of 10 per cent to the Royal Northwest Mounted Police on sums collected by them as mining recorders and inspectors, $6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister making any change with reference to living allowances?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no change proposed in these estimates. The living-allowances are the same this year as last, and they were the same last year as the year before.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that Mr. Girouard is no longer registrar, and that some re-arrangement has been made. Will the minister explain what that is?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Girouard has retired, and Mr. Laliberté, who was librarian to the Justice Department, has been made registrar at $3,800 salary and $1,200 living allowance instead of $4,000 salary and $1,500 living allowance which Mr. Girouard received. His salary as librarian of the Jusice Department I understand will drop.

Mr. FOSTER. What was that salary?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer that, as it is in another department; but the idea is to combine the duties of the two offices under the one salary, which shall be that of the registrar.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been charged that there are too many officers there at present for the work there is to do. Has the minister looked into that?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will remember that some time ago there was considerable reduction in the number of officials. I am not able at present, beyond this change with regard to Laliberté, to offer any proposal for reduction. The commissioner of the Yukon was here a little while ago in connection with the reduction that we proposed to make in connection with the government of the Yukon, and I discussed the matter with him, and he informed me that he was not able at the moment to make any suggestion as to reduction. I urged on him the desirability of reductions being made if they could be made, but I regret to say that in one or two instances he seemed to think that more assistance would be needed rather than less. For instance, he says that the surveys are very much behind, and that we should have more assistance in that work.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the duties of F. T. Congdon, who is receiving a very large salary and a large living allowance?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Congdon is not in the employ now. He retired about a year ago. He was legal adviser. When Mr. Congdon retired, Mr. Senkler, who before that was gold commissioner, was made legal adviser at the same salary and with the same living allowance. Mr. Gosselin, who had been assistant gold commissioner, was made commissioner, and the office of assistant was dropped, it being believed that, with The Placer Mining Act, there was not the necessity that formerly existed for a gold commissioner and an assistant.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any reduction been made in the number of clerks in the Gold Commissioner's office? There seems to be

altogether too many of them. For instance you have appointed a clerk, L. G. Bennett, gold commissioner's office, getting a salary and allowance of $1,690 for the nine months; Bolduc, a clerk, gold commissioner's office, with a salary and allowance of $1,600 for the nine months ; a stenographer, gold commissioner's office, with a salary and allowance of $1,837 for the nine months ; Aime Dugas, a clerk in the gold commissioner's office at $1,900 salary and allowance for the nine months ; Finnie, chief clerk. gold commissioner's office, $2,625, salary and allowance for the nine months ; another mining inspector, and then you have Fysh, clerk, gold commissioner's office, $2,025, salary and allowance for the nine months ; Gosselin, assistant gold commissioner, with a salary and allowance of $3,900 for the nine months ; Grant, clerk, gold commissioner's office, salary and allowance, $1,800 for the nine months. Then more mining inspectors. Then L'Hereux, clerk, gold commissioner's office, $1,100, salary and allowance for the nine months ; Little, stenographer, gold commissioner's office, $2,025, salary and allowance for the nine months ; Macfarlane, clerk, gold commissioner's office, $1,760, salary and allowance for nine months. Then you have an accountant in the gold commissioner's office at $1,500, salary and allowance for the nine months. Another stenographer and gold clerk, at $2,475, salary and allowance for the nine months. An assistant gold commissioner at White Horse, over $3,000, salary and allowance for the nine months; G. D. Munroe, clerk, gold commissioner's office, salary and allowance, $1,440 for the nine months ; W. C. Noble, clerk, gold commissioner's office, $1,650, salary and allowance for the nine months ; G. Pepin—that is the ministrel, I suppose—clerk, gold commissioner's office, $1,575, salary and living allowance for the nine months ; G. Petre, clerk, gold commissioner's office, salary and living allowance, $1,500 for the nine months ; A. H. Povah, gold commissioner's office, $1,370, salary and living allowance nine months ; E. C. Sinkler, gold commissioner, salary and living allowance for the nine months, $4,875. Another stenographer in the gold commissioner's court, $1,586, salary and living allowance for the nine months ; another stenographer, gold commissioner's office, $1,575, salary and living allowance, nine months ; a correspondence clerk, salary and living allowance, $1,800 for the nine months ; an assistant correspondence clerk, salary and allowance, $1,200. That is a tremendous staff. Does the minister really think all that array is necessary for the work in the gold commissioner's office there ? He himself was there and looked into it. What I am told is that there is an aggregation of men there absolutely unnecessary. Any business man could do the work with a very much less number of men and expense.

Mr. OLIVER. Of the names mentioned, Munroe, Macfarlane and Pepin are not in the employ there at all, and their places have not been filled. Macfarlane is employed as mining inspector on one of the creeks at Granville in the place of another man who has left the service. These are some of the decreases I mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister not think that the pruning knife could still be applied ?

Mr. OLIVER. It looks to me as if it could. I did succeed in getting some pruning done. I have discussed the matter very fully with the present commissioner, and although he may not be as anxious to apply the pruning knife as my hon. friend, still I think he will do what is right, and I hope the staff will not be allowed to remain over the requirements, if it is too large. It does look bulky for the amount of business.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister must take into consideration the fact that the commissioner lives night and day with these people, and the last thing in the world he wants to do is to recommend that any of them be cut down. If the minister waits until that is done, he will wait a long time. I think he ought to exercise his own judgment about that. If it was a large place, where the people were distributed a good deal, the commissioner would have all the more liberty that way, but they form a circle of their own, and it would be like cutting out one of his own family for the commissioner to make recommendations in that way. I hope he will do what is right, but I do not think there is much hope that he will face the live flesh with the idea that he is going to cut down their salaries and living allowance, because I do not think he is courageous enough to do it. As regards Mr. Congdon, the local adviser, he was for a long time the representative of the government as controller or administrator of estates ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it true that, although the law required he should give bonds, he never did give security, all the time he was administrator of public estates ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware that he acted twice in that capacity, that is before he was commissioner and after he was commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, he was in and out all the time.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware that he gave bonds on either occasion. I am satisfied that on one occasion he did not.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the papers will show that he never gave either an individual bond or a guarantee bond or anything of the kind. Who is administrator now ?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Senkler, the present legal adviser, and administrator during the absence of Mr. Henderson.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he give bond ?

Mr. OLIVER. He is under a bond of $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it also correct that Mr. Congdon, all the time he administered the estates as public administrator, never really made any statement with reference to any estate he administered, and that the department has not a single statement made by him of a complete estate—of the transactions from start to finish.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer definitely. I am under the impression however, that, so far as our department is concerned, my hon. friend is probably correct. However, I understand that the case is that the administrator of estates—as the practice was there—was under the direction of the local government, the Yukon council. We appointed him and paid his salary, but, as I understand it, his administration was in accordance with the laws and ordinances of the Yukon council, and it was understood that his responsibilities were to them and not to us. For that reason. the statement that he would make would naturally be to the Yukon council, not to us.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not true that the public administrator represented the Minister of the Interior ? If so, surely the minister here ought to have statements of his administration. It does not seem to me that the Bill is not filled when he is simply left to the tender mercies of the council which he himself dominates. Mr. Congdon is a rather dominatingly-inclined man, as shown by his whole history. He went out and went in a good many times, and never went back without having an increase in his salary, a very material increase. He was a kind of character who really controlled and had a dominating influence. He was commissioner some time, and member of the council generally. It would be an odd thing to have the public administrator accountable to himself as a member of the council. Is the minister aware whether he ever made a statement of an estate he managed as public administrator—finished statements and duly audited, before the local government ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I am not aware how the business was transacted between himself and the local government in that connection. I may say that I have found the position as it was, and I stated it to my hon. friend, entirely unsatisfactory, for practically the reasons which he has placed before the House and because of the divided responsibility, so to speak. The responsibility was not definitely fixed, either with the Yukon council or with the government. We, I assume, took it for granted, that the Yukon Council, having passed laws and ordinances under which the administration was to be carried on, would see to it that the laws and ordinances were properly administered. They, on the other hand, possibly thought that, as we appointed the administrator and paid him we were looking after the matter. I am afraid that, as a result of the examination made last summer by Mr. Beddoe—I think the report has been brought down—the matter was not in a condition that was satisfactory, or, I will go so far as to say, creditable to any of the parties concerned. I propose to cure that difficulty for the future. We did cure it in a measure when Mr. Senkler was appointed, by our requiring him to deposit securities to the amount of $10,000. There was a question raised as to our right to do that, the supposition being that it was the right or duty of the Yukon council to do it. However, we required the deposit of the security. And, in the Bill now before the House in regard to the Yukon, we propose to take the responsibility in regard to the administration of estates, to appoint the administrator, to require him to give security, and, while he administers the estates subject to the laws and ordinances of the Yukon council, he will make an accounting to the representative of the Auditor General. That will be more satisfactory. It is not that we wish to take from the rights or responsibilities of the local government, but we feel the condition in the past was such that we are warranted in future, in such an important and delicate matter, in absolutely fixing the responsibility. We will be quite prepared to fix the responsibility and place it entirely on the local government, but, if we are to assume any part of it, we want to assume it all.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to hear the statement made by the minister. I assume that, under the new arrangement, we shall not have what appears to me to be such a scandal as has been there for so many years. There is one other question we ought to have satisfactorily at rest ; Is it not the intention of the government to demand from Mr. Congdon an account of his stewardship ? He has been there, he has administered estates, he has acted as guardian for infants and had had charge of trust mattters dealing with the most intimate relations that the government has with its wards; and all the time he has been there, as we have seen, he has not really finished up an estate so far as putting in a statement that anybody could get hold of, properly audited and shown to be absolutely correct. Does not the minister think that Mr. Congdon should be called upon to make a full report of every estate he has had in his charge, thoroughly

audited, and that the past negligence should be atoned for, at least by having it as far as can be effected, put in regular shape? I think that is the only thing that can be done to secure the government from the imputation of allowing its representative there to carry on matters of that kind in a very lax way. And I do not think it would be at all improper that Mr. Congdon should be asked to give a thorough and complete statement of every estate that he has managed and to have that statement thoroughly audited if it has not already been audited, and made as plain as it can be made at this late date.

Mr. OLIVER. I feel not at all in a pleasant position in this matter of administration of estates so far as we have been able to reach a statement in regard to them. There is, no doubt, something to be said in favour of the view taken by my hon. friend. The difficulty that might, or may, arise if we decide to take such action is that we may not have the right to call for the statement. The position may be taken that I have suggested—I believe may very well be taken—that the accounting is not to us but to the local government. It does not appear that there is any legislation or any definite delegation of authority that would put us in a position to absolutely demand this accounting.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the minister, is it not the fact that either the government here is in a position to demand that accounting or the government there is in that position?

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, as the government here practically controls the government there by its appointed members, there is no difficulty in the government getting at the matter. I am not stating this to make a point against any one or anything of that kind; but I think it will be quite too bad—to say nothing stronger—that the matter should be left in the position in which it is. For instance, I have the right, I believe, to move for a return, showing the estates administered by the public administrator in the Yukon, and I suppose the House would pass a motion for a return of that kind and that we ought to have it. But that will not be necessary if the minister himself will see that, through their own legislation or through their control of the government of the Yukon, that statement shall be made. I do not know that I ought to press the minister, because I suppose he has gone as far as he can under the circumstances. But as regards the present legal adviser, who is receiving the people's money as an employee of the government, is it proper for him to put himself at the head of a political organization, and fight out political campaigns, strike down opponents, boost up his friends, with all the arts that he can use? The present incumbent of that office, Mr. Senkler, is he disposed to take that line of conduct? If he does and I were in the Yukon, I would never let him rest. Mr. Congdon was legal adviser, he was commissioner, and almost everything by turns, always well paid for it, and all the time he was an ardent partisan, continually menacing, threatening and cajoling in order to work up a party interest. It does not seem to me that men who are paid by the people's money and put in official positions, should be allowed to do that out there any more than they would be here. I cannot conceive that Mr. Senkler would be a man of that stamp.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman suggests that Mr. Senkler is taking that course, I think it would be very far from his character. As for Mr. Congdon, I think it is fair to say that in my judgment the hon. gentleman has presented the case in a very extreme light. Mr. Congdon was legal adviser of the government in the Yukon, and on the retirement of the Hon. Mr. Ross from the commissionership, Mr. Congdon was promoted to the commissionership. There may have been an interval during which he was not legal adviser or commissioner, but it was practically a promotion from the position of legal adviser to that of commissioner. I cannot agree that any slur is to be cast upon Mr. Congdon for partisan or political action while he was commissioner. It is true, he retired from the commissionership, and became a candidate as a supporter of the government. In the contest he was unsuccessful. There have been grave statements made as to the methods in which the political contest was conducted which resulted in his defeat. I am not prepared to say whether those assertions are correct or not. But I have heard no such assertions in regard to his conduct when he was reappointed as legal adviser. When Mr. McInnes was commissioner I had no knowledge of any political activity on his part. He was acting as legal adviser amongst the people who had supported him for the position of member of parliament. True, he did not quarrel with those people. But I am bound to say that so far as my observation went while I was in the Yukon, he was not in any sense using his position as legal adviser to advance any one's political interest. He seemed to be attending strictly to the business he was appointed to do. I am bound to say that I know of no person whose qualifications are better than those of Mr. Congdon. Any one who knows him will agree that he is a very brilliant man, with a very good knowledge of law, and a most excellent method of expression. Besides, he is a man of absolutely blameless private life.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason for all these timber men?

Mr. OLIVER. We pay members of the mounted police who are stationed on the creeks, ten per cent on the collection of timber dues. We have one timber inspector, Charles Sylvester.

Mr. FOSTER. I find here that you have Mr. Martin, crown timber and land agent, $2.250 for nine months; you have W. H. Povah, clerk of timber and land office, $2,000 for nine months; you have Mr. Sugrue, timber inspector, $1,400 for nine months, and Mr. Sylvester, timber inspector, $1,800 for nine months. Those are in the timber branch. I do not think that the timber business is very heavy in the Yukon.

Mr. OLIVER. Martin and Sugrue are not now in the employ of the government. Povah is employed in the gold commissioner's office as stenographer. We have only one officer in the timber business; that is Mr. Sylvester.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that makes it better. It would seem that the gold commissioner's office, the mining engineers and the inspectors might all work together. It is a cognate business. What does Mr. A. J. Beaudette, mining engineer, do?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Beaudette is, in my estimation, the most valuable man we have in the Yukon. His duty is to satisfy the recorders or the gold commissioner, as the case may be, as to the facts upon the ground with regard to any matter of dispute that may arise.

Mr. FOSTER. And is necessary in that regard, I dare say.

Mr. OLIVER. Whereas the other mining recorders and inspectors are local officials who accept entries for mining claims and collect royalties and do other office duties, Mr. Beaudette is the man out on the creek who actually inspects the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Could the collections be made by the gold commissioner's clerks?

Mr. OLIVER. These are the collections made on the creeks.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that the Povahs seem to be quite a family up there. There are three of them.

Mr. OLIVER. There is only one of that family, Mr. W. F. Povah, who is now in the employ of the government. He is a stenographer and he was formerly in the timber office. The others are not in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. Have all the expenses of the Treadgold Commission been paid. I notice $1,000 paid to Judge Britton. Does that finish up the expenses of that commission?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that the Yukon 'World and Official Gazette' got $3,520, a large part of which was for printing and a part for advertising. Does the minister himself supervise that? The Whitehorse 'Star,' for advertising the mining regulations for twelve months, got $600 and also something for advertising. These payments seem to be large. Then a lot of smaller papers, some of them in eastern Canada, received various sums. What are the reasons for running down here and publishing these advertisements?

Mr. OLIVER. We publish the mining regulations in the Dawson and Whitehorse papers and in some of the British Columbia papers pretty fully. We also publish in some of the leading eastern papers in centres like Montreal and Toronto a synopsis of our homestead and mining regulations and we charge the part of the advertisement relating to mining regulations to this Yukon vote. But that is only a small part of the expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the insane taken charge of?

Mr. OLIVER. In the New Westminster insane asylum.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the grant for the local council of $125,000 given them in a lump sum?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How is it audited?

Mr. OLIVER. There is a quarterly audit by the Auditor General. The accounts do not go to the Department of the Interior; they go direct to the Auditor General and are audited by him. Of course, there is a local accountant. The Auditor General is sending one of his officials to the Yukon now to make an audit on the ground. Under the Bill which is now before the House we propose that the accounts of the Yukon, both local and federal, shall be audited in the Yukon by a representative of the Auditor General; that is to say, that the Auditor General shall officially be there for a part of the year to audit the accounts. Without waiting for this legislation the Auditor General has sent one of his men to make such an audit under the authority that he now possesses or believes himself to possess.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, according to Mr. Beddoe's report, it is not a bad thing to have it done.

Government of the Northwest Territories, $9,800.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the services that Mr. Fred White gives apart from the work which he carries on in connection with the Northwest Mounted Police?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. White's duties as commissioner of the Northwest are fairly set out in the items which I have before me.

Mr. FOSTER. There is clerical assistance in his own office?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And schools. Would the minister explain what these are?

Mr. OLIVER. There are a number of mission schools scattered throughout the Northwest Territories and one which is not a mission school, and Mr. White oversees the distribution of assistants to these schools, simply assisting the efforts which are being made on behalf of education.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister give us the particulars with respect to these schools?

Mr. OLIVER. The list is as follows:

List of Schools in the Northwest Territories receiving Grants from the Dominion Government through the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories.

Place.	School.	To whom Grant paid.	Name of Teacher.	Yearly Grant.
				$ cts.
Roman Catholic— Fort Providence.....	Sacred Heart School ..	Rev. Father Husson.....	Sister Beaudin.....	400 00
Roman Catholic— Fort Resolution.....	St. Joseph School.....	" "	Sister Genereux	300 00
Episcopal— Great Slave Lake....	Hay River School....	Rt. Rev. W. D. Reeve ..	Florence A. Potts ..	400 00
Episcopal— Fort McPherson.....	St. Matthew's Mission...	" "	Wm. Thompson... / Geo Fraser.....	200 00
Episcopal— Herschel Island.....	Herschel Island School..	" " ..	C. E. Whittaker...	200 00
Episcopal— McKenzie River....	Fort Simpson School....	" " ..	Jas. R. Lucas	200 00
Episcopal— Lake St. Joseph ..	Fort Hope School.....	Rt. Rev. Geo. Holmes...	Clara C. Richards...	200 00
Public School— Keewatin District. .	Barrows Public School ..	S. W. Hanchett, secretary treasurer.	Jean Wier.....	585 00
				2,485 00

Mr. FOSTER. How many children attend that Barrows school?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the numbers here. The school is at a village north of the Canadian Northern which is just beyond the line of the province of Manitoba. The school is in a saw milling village which is outside the jurisdiction of Manitoba and is reached by a short piece of railway. It is not a mission school?

Mr. FOSTER. Do these schools report?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, they report as to their work.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that report printed.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not imagine that that report has been printed. There will be some mention of it in the published reports.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Is that the only school is Keewatin?

Mr. OLIVER. It is the only one to which we give any assistance and the only public school we have any knowledge of at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the attendance and such information in reference to these schools should be given in return for the help we give.

Mr. OLIVER. They make a return every three months to the commissioner. It may be printed in the report of the commissioner, but I do not think he has yet published a separate report.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What disposition is made of insane patients from the Northwest Territories?

Mr. OLIVER. There are only two insane patients at the present time from the Northwest Territories and I believe they are being treated at the Brandon asylum.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). There is no change since the formation of the new provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. No, they have not made arrangements for the care of the insane.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the prisoners taken care of?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that depends on the locality. The Northwest Territories

extend along the north of five provinces and I fancy prisoners will be taken to whichever province is most convenient.

Mr. FOSTER. What is included in miscellaneous expenses?

Mr. OLIVER. It is necessary always to have a small amount to meet contingencies that may arise, but here we are asking an increase of $600. My note says that we now have accounts amounting to about $1,200 in connection with what is known as the Fiddler murder in the Keewatin district.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If you take Supply to-morrow, in what department?

Mr. FIELDING. We will take Railways first, and, if there is time, Militia.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 9, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. MONK. The House will remember that a motion was put off till to-day regarding the adoption of a report made on the 20th May last, by the committee appointed to supervise the official debates of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I had hoped that the chairman of the committee would be in his seat to-day, but he is not. Cannot the hon. gentleman wait until to-morrow ?

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 183) to amend the Canadian Shipping Act—Mr. Brodeur.

SALARIES OF PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to renew my request of yesterday to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) with reference to the salaries of employees in the Public Works Department.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works.) I have made inquiries, and I find that the caretakers and the heating engineers in the public buildings at Hamilton have not received their pay. So the hon. gentleman's information was correct on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. When the one-eighth was granted, the minister said that would be sufficient to pay these men for April and May. Is there any special reason why this has been withheld?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I also made inquiry as to the reason, and I found that with respect to the caretakers and heating engineers the vote of last year was not sufficient to pay them for the entire year, and a portion of the one-eighth was used in paying wages for the month of March. Then with the remainder the accountant began in the eastern provinces and went as far west as he could. So the caretakers and heating engineers, not only in Hamilton but in other parts of Ontario and the west, have not yet been paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister taken the course of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and issued a circular to the public works employees throughout the country as to their working in anticipation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because I have great hope, and the accountant felt, that in the course of a few days a vote for these poor men, who must of course get their pay, as every hon. gentleman will admit, would be available. I did not think it was necessary to issue a circular just at present.

Mr. LENNOX. We are in very good humour now.

ANGLO-AMERICAN TREATIES.

Mr. SPROULE. When may we expect that the Anglo-American treaties and the correspondence in connection with them, will be laid on the table? We were promised them before now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will inquire.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the First Minister to say last week that they would be all ready in a few days.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that. I said I would lay them on the table as soon as they were printed. They were ordered to be printed at once, and they are in the hands of the printers now.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the government a question in regard to Bill (No. 157) which has been introduced by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), an Act to amend the Railway Act. Is it the intention of the government to promote the

passage of that legislation during the present session ? The Bill is a very short one. it has only one paragraph, which is in the following terms :

No operator, train despatcher, or other employee who, by the use of the telegraph, telephone, or other electrical device, despatches, reports, transmits, receives, or delivers orders or messages pertaining to or affecting train movements shall be required or permitted to be on duty for a longer period than eight hours in any twenty-four hour period, except in case of emergency, in which case any such employee may remain on duty for a period not exceeding twelve hours in a twenty-four hour period, and such excess duty shall not be permitted on more than two days in any seven.

In view of the frequency of accidents on our railways during the past few years, I would like to ask the government if it is their intention to have that legislation passed during the present session?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a public Bill, and must take its rank along with all other legislation of a similar nature. Whether this Bill and other public Bills should be treated exceptionally, is a matter as to which I could not give an opinion at this moment.

THE GOVERNMENT STEAMER 'MONTCALM.'

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) if he has received the report and evidence taken in the investigation into the sinking of the 'Montcalm.'

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, on Friday I moved :

That an order of the House do issue to the proper officer for a copy of the evidence taken in the 'Milwaukee-Montcalm' collision case.

And I presented the return immediately. I take it that that is the return to which my hon. friend has alluded.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I would ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). whether or not there would be any objection to laying on the table a statement respecting the seed grain supplied in the west, setting forth the amount purchased by the government, the sum paid for it, the amount that has been sold to farmers under the terms of the arrangement either by this government or the provincial government and the selling price. I have forgotten the exact details of the arrangement, but the minister will understand what information should be given.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Of course, the distribution is only just completed. The report is being prepared as quickly as possible to place before the House. It cannot be a complete statement, as the accounts will not be closed by that time. It will be of the nature of an interim report dealing with the subject of purchase and distribution. I hope to place it before the House within a short time but I cannot fix a date for bringing it down.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Would the proposed statement show what disposition the persons to whom the grain was distributed had made of it ? The object of the government in distributing the grain, of course, was to have it sown, and so a complete statement would show how many acres the party had sown. I have heard it said that considerable amounts of this grain had been sold by the parties receiving it.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid the statement I have in process of preparation would not cover that point, but the point will be covered by a subsequent and complete statement. However, I think there is very little danger that any of the grain has been sold, as the price at which we have been compelled to supply it would not be attractive as a basis of transactions.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Would it cover the point how much of it had been paid for ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, it will show that—absolutely.

FEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (South Cape Breton). With the leave of the House, I move :

That Bill (No. 185) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company be placed on the Order Paper for second reading this day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I observe that a great many of the private Bills are going to the Senate in the first instance. I quite approve of that idea. There is no reason in the world why many of the private Bills —and, indeed, public Bills as well—could not be introduced in the Senate. But I would like to call the attention of the government to the circumstance that there is, if I remember the rules correctly, a great discrepancy in the fees required on the introduction of a private Bill in the Senate and those required on the introduction of a private Bill in this House. Besides that, the rules of this House make special provision for additional fees, where Bills are introduced after a certain time in the session. The object of that, as the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will remember, is to have Bills brought forward, and the work on them done, in the early part of the session when the business of the House is not conjested. This particu-

lar Bill, and other Bills as well, come to us pretty late in the session. I would suggest that, as the government have entire control of the framing of the rules of the Senate in this regard, it might be advisable to consult with the leader of the Senate with the view to having the rules of the two Houses made uniform on this point. It seems to me an unnecessary incongruity that a private Bill introduced in this House should pay a particular amount, while the same Bill if introduced in the Senate, would pay a smaller amount, or that there should be any such discrepancy in these fees.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). As my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) knows, the Senate is the master of its own rules. The rules prevailing there are of the Senate's own framing. Two years ago, when we amended the rules of this House, we provided new fees for private Bills and I think that, on the whole, the new rule is an improvement on the old. The attention of the Senate may not have been called to this matter. But my hon. friend knows that the Senate desires to do more of the work of the session. I shall deem it my duty to call the attention of the leader of the Senate to this matter.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I desire to ask the Minister of Railways about a certain return, ordered by the House some time ago, with regard to the running of two trains a day on the Murray Harbour Railway in my province. I have made some inquiry about it and it has not been brought down. I would also remind the Minister of Marine and Fisheries about a return of licenses for fishing and canning lobster in my province which have not yet been brought down.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I thought the return had been brought down. I will make inquiries about it.

SUPPLY—THE PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). I am pleased to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) in his place this morning, but am sorry to see that he has 'busted' his voice——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. What I say is quite correct, for, as the hon. gentleman has attempted to answer a few questions across the floor to-day we have been unable to understand him. He has been out in the country preaching provincial politics, and I would like to inquire why a minister occupying the high and honourable position which the minister occupies would descend so low as to——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I withdraw that. But I intended to read from the paper what the minister said, and then I will leave it to the House——

Mr. SPEAKER. That statement, I suppose, is withdrawn.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I withdrew it. I wonder why the minister cannot go into his own province and talk provincial politics without making use of the following language :

> Starting on another tack, the Minister of Marine asked : 'How is it that a man so ferocious for French Canadians and Catholics as Mr. Bourassa is, has allied himself with an Orangeman of Ontario like Geo. Taylor to get Mr. Cousineau elected in Hull?'

And further :

> Do you mean to say that an alliance between Mr. Bourassa and an Orangeman like Geo. Taylor is not provincial politics? asked the speaker.

That is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I admit that the charge made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is correct, that George Taylor does belong to the Orange institution. He is proud of the honour of belonging to it and he is also pleased to ally himself with the first to make use of this language in the province of Quebec ; Mr. Bourassa said :

> He did not, however, want to raise religious questions, but wanted the two races to remain in peace under the British flag.

Any man who makes use of these sentiments can depend on George Taylor coming to his assistance, because the Orangemen of this country have a duty to perform and they have performed it from time immemorial up to the present. That is to grant free religious institutions all over this country, to maintain and uphold them. We have no objection to our French Canadians because they belong to the Roman Catholic Church and it is our duty to uphold them in their rights. I did go over to Hull to help Mr. Cousineau and I am very glad to say that the French Canadian people of Ottawa county elected Mr. Cousineau to support Mr. Bourassa, to the great discomfort of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But, I do think it beneath the dignity of a minister of the Crown to go into his own province and among his own people and try to raise religious and race

cries. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman descending to such tactics in order to try to defeat a gentleman who, I am glad to know, is elected in the two constituencies he ran for and who will carry Quebec when he appeals again, as he did appeal yesterday to his friends there not to pay any attention to what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries might say and who made use of this language :

He did not, however, want to raise religious questions, but wanted the two races to remain in peace under the British flag.

Further :

Hon. Mr. Brodeur——

Mr. Bourassa said :

—talking about George Taylor and Orangemen, had forgotten to say that he had voted ten or twelve times with Mr. Geo. Taylor for the abolition of the French language in the Northwest.

The minister did not tell them that. But, when he refers to 'an Orangeman like Geo. Taylor' I would like to know what his meaning is ; I would like to know what he means by it ? Why did he not refer to the Orangemen sitting behind him ? For instance, why did he not talk about the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Finlay) ? Does he think that there are no Orangemen amongst the hon. gentlemen who are supporting the government ?

Mr. FOSTER. They were not worth mentioning.

Mr. TAYLOR. No. But, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, going down into his own province, trying to raise religious feeling and indulging in the language which I have quoted could have mentioned some hon. gentlemen who are supporters of the government at the same time that he picked out 'an Orangeman like Geo. Taylor.'

Mr. LENNOX. Are there any more of them there ?

Mr. TAYLOR. There is quite a number, the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Finlay), the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Jackson), the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) is astray.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, while he occupies the position of a minister, ought to rise above race and religious cries in a local election instead of dragging in the names of men who are just as honest as himself and making references to Orangemen like so-and-so. The Orangemen occupy a high and honourable position in this country, the institution is just as high and honourable as any in this country either in the province of Ontario or of Quebec and we do not like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to go on the platform and condemn and censure people as if they were not fit to be citizens of this country. They are citizens, they hold high places in this country and they will continue to do so.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is my hon. friend reading from ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am reading from the Montreal 'Gazette.'

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister cannot deny it. I would like to ask the minister if he did not make use of this language.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not in the way it is reported there.

Mr. TAYLOR. A good deal worse probably in French. Does the government blame the opposition for obstructing when ministers go out and throw out such insults as this ? I ask the minister to say whether he said that Mr. Bourassa had formed an alliance with Orangemen like Geo. Taylor.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Speak now.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) does not deign to reply, I would like to say that such language does not come with very good grace from a minister of the Crown and especially from one who has so frequently referred to the fact that he desires to avoid race and religious cries in this country and that he always aimed at putting them down and keeping them under. It is not a very good evidence of that desire and, if the hon. gentleman is correctly reported, I frankly confess that I do not think it is to his credit or to the credit of any minister of the Crown to make use of such language.

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

Railways and Canals—collection of revenue —Intercolonial, $9,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) goes on with his explanation I would like to read him a telegram which was sent to me, and if the minister could give us any information as to when the orders were given and what they were meant to signify I would be very glad. This telegram was sent from Moncton on June 5, 1908 :

Hon. Geo. E. Foster,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Following circular No. 490 has been posted in government offices here:

Division Superintendent's Office, June 3.

I have letter from general manager dated 2nd instant which reads as follows: 'I am instructed by department to advise you that the interior partial appropriation votes by parliament for works and staff under control of Department of Railways and Canals will shortly be exhausted, if not already so, and that no further appropriation has been obtained from parliament at the present date, and to instruct you to notify the general members of your staff of the position leaving it to them to decide whether they will continue to work on understanding that no salaries or wages will be paid them until further Supplies have been voted. Please be governed accordingly.' Similar notices have been sent to employees individually. Is there any warrant for this circular?

I think the minister owes it to the House to make a statement as to what he really intended to do by that letter. Did he intend to dismantle the Intercolonial Railway force or was this tantamount to a notice of a discontinuance of service? If it was not meant for that what was the particular purpose the minister had in mind?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The particular purpose the minister had in mind is I think quite clear on the face of the document itself. I do not see how any minister in charge of a department like mine could protect the department and himself under the conditions without doing something of that kind in view of what I will read now. On May 15 the Deputy Minister of the Department of Railways and Canals received the following from the Auditor General which I think will explain the whole situation:

Sir,—Let me call your attention to the fact that of a great portion of the estimates for 1909 only one-eighth has been voted by parliament. Please note that we have no authority to exceed this until further supplies have been granted. In view of discussions which have taken place in reference to the overdrawing of appropriations it would be advisable to notify all your officials charged with the expenditure of public money that they must not under any circumstances exceed the appropriation.

In view of that, the department did what it always does with contracts when the money has not been voted—it notified those interested that their salaries would be subject to supply being voted by the House. Suppose this had happened: Suppose parliament had dissolved and gone to the country it was well to have it understood that the money not having been voted the men could not be paid and until the money was obtained that they were working under that understanding. It was simply that and nothing more.

Mr. HAGGART. Could not the hon. gentleman do as he did before and pay them when there was no appropriation by Governor General's warrant?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend forgets that a Governor General's warrant can only issue when parliament is not in session.

Mr. HAGGART. I know that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Parliament would not be in session under the supposition put by the Minister of Railways, namely, that there would be a dissolution.

Mr. FIELDING. I was speaking of the present conditions under which the circular was issued.

Mr. HAGGART. Are not all the receipts of the Intercolonial at the disposal of the department?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. HAGGART. When was a change made?

Mr. FOSTER. The money goes to the Receiver General now.

Mr. HAGGART. By what Act of parliament was that done? When I was Postmaster General and when I was Minister of Railways the receipts were at the disposal of the departments if they choose to use them. Has the Minister of Railways any information from the Justice Department to the contrary?

Mr. FIELDING. That has never been the case under the present administration, and I think my hon. friend is mistaken as to his own practice. I have not looked into the law, but I presume the practice has been in conformity with the law and the practice is that all the receipts from the public works of Canada go into the consolidated fund and can only be paid out of the Dominion treasury when voted by parliament. I think my hon. friend is mistaken when he says it was otherwise in his day.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not mistaken at all. When I was Postmaster General and Minister of Railways I got an opinion from the Justice Department that all the receipts were at the disposition of the department of Railways and Canals and of the Post Office Department. Unless that has been changed there is no necessity at all for all this complaint about not paying the Intercolonial Railway employees and the Post Office employees. The Postmaster General has no doubt consulted the law officers of the Crown and he knows whether I am correct or not.

Mr. FIELDING. I still think my hon. friend is mistaken, but if there is a law which would allow any department to make use of the public money without the authority of parliament I think it is an unfortunate law. I am speaking of what has been the practice and I rather think it is in accordance with the law.

Mr. LENNOX. The suggestion made by the Minister of Railways was that there would be a dissolution of parliament and if that were so my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) was correct in saying that a Governor General's warrant might issue. That is what the Minister of Railways put forward as an excuse for having issued his circular.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not as an excuse.

Mr. LENNOX. I see fit to call it an excuse. The government might be driven to a dissolution of course, but I don't think they are likely to have any dissolution at the present time. The Minister of Railways has put forward a very poor excuse for the issuing of this circular. He gives the letter of the Auditor General as a reason, but the minister must have known the condition of things without the Auditor General pointing it out to him. Is the government driven to such a position that they must issue circulars to the employees of the government advising them to go on strike, because that is the effect of the circular. It seems like a political dodge and nothing else, and an attempt to relieve the government from the odium in which they stand before the people for their conduct of public affairs. No existing circumstance could have justified the minister in issuing such a circular. I thought it had been issued in some way without his knowledge, but now that he takes the responsibility for it I am amazed that he should have done such a thing. That circular was simply a bid to the men employed on the Intercolonial to creat a political situation which is not in the interests of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to be uncharitable but I incline to the opinion of my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) that it smacks very strongly of being a political move in order to make capital against the opposition. If the minister had been perfectly frank he would have added to that circular that the reason the employees have not been paid is because of the minister's own neglect. The House met in November last and it was not until about twelve o'clock on Friday night, the 5th of June, that the minister deigned to ask the House for one dollar of this vote. If a gentleman who has charge of the Railway Department will sit in his seat for nearly seven months and not ask the House to grant him a vote of what is necesary in order to pay his employees, I think he is estopped from issuing a circular of that kind at this time. He should have explained to them that by some strange mischance or lapse of memory or something of that kind he had actually forgotten that there was some $8,000,000 or $9,000,000 to be voted for them and that he had not during these six months asked the House for a dollar of that money. Does not the minister think he should have added that as a codicil ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Railways being known to be a truthful person could not have made that statement in the circular because it would not be the truth. I am sorry to have again to point out that the Minister of Railways and Canals, through the Minister of Finance, months ago approached hon. gentlemen opposite in the customary way and asked that the various public services of the country, including these particular persons in the Railway Department, might be provided for by a vote on account. We asked that a one-fourth vote might be taken, leaving three fourths to be the subject of debate in later days. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when approached in the usual way, did not concur in that suggestion; they accepted it only in a qualified way and agreed to assist us in obtaining a one-eighth vote. That one-eighth was duly obtained. When it was exhausted the Minister of Railways and Canals again, through the Minister of Finance, following the usual course, proposed a further vote on account, and we were informed we could not obtain the assistance of the opposition in passing that further vote through the House.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance wishes to be given a reputation for extraordinary truthfulness.

Mr. FIELDING. Ordinary.

Mr. FOSTER. For never allowing, even by inference, the least idea to get abroad that he is doing a thing not exactly as it ought to be, vide an example not long ago, where the Minister of Finance, when fairly cornered by the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) as to the fact that he had already had voted to him some $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 by this committee stated in effect that he could not be expected to come down for a Supply Bill for every $10 that was voted. That is an extraordinarily truthful way of representing the matter. A Minister of Finance who was cool and truthful and wanted to lay all the facts before the House, who was not unduly excited at the time of speaking, would say : I am very anxious to get the money so that these men can be paid. I have totalled up the items and find I have been voted some $7,000,000 or $8,000,000; here are these poor people waiting for their pay which is in arrears; I think as Minister of Finance I might take my dignity off my shoulders and ask a Supply Bill for $10,000,000 or $12,000,-

000 and so get the money for these public servants. Did he do that? No. He is the minister who says: You people in the opposition have no rights except what we chose to give you. He is the minister who has grown very autocratical—three-fourths of the difficulty in this House is due to his autocratical or aristocratical disposition. Time was, I dare say, when he was a democrat, a democrat down to the hilt, like the right hon. gentleman beside him. Time was when he belonged to the common people and stood for the virtues of the common people. To-day he has gone on in an interrupted course of events politically which he does not seem to have ascribed to anything but his great ability and foresight, whereas, in reality, Providence and favouring gales have been behind him and certainly he would not be in the position he is if Providence and favouring gales had not assisted him. Now he has grown autocratical. He says to these employees: Starve if you like, I have $12,000,000 of your money and I will be hanged if I will ask to have it paid to you until the whole batch of estimates are put through. The minister must take the responsibility for his position in not asking a Supply Bill for nearly $12,000,000. He is not suffering, he draws his salary each month as it is statutory. but these men cannot do that and he holds them up. The minister would have done well if on having $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 voted he had asked for a Supply Bill. He would then have done well for the people who are in need of the salaries which they have earned and which are due to them.

The minister has made the statement, not once but twice to-day, that the Minister of Railways and Canals has through him asked for a vote on two occasions. Of course the other ministers do not amount to much. The Minister of Customs is a small man and the Minister of Railways and Canals is a young man and they are modest and do not like to ask parliament for their votes and so the Minister of Finance says: Through me, the Finance Minister of this great and growing country, a vote is asked for. So when you tax the Minister of Railways and Canals with being too neglectful or having his memory not serve him well in this matter the Minister of Finance hopes to get him out of it by saying: Oh, that does not matter, I as Minister of Finance have asked for a vote on account on two occasions; on one occasion you gave us one-eighth and on the other you refused it. The Minister of Finance would be more truthful, according to his own statement of what he wants to get, if he had given the attendant circumstances of that second asking. The Finance Minister knows and the Prime Minister knows that negotiations have been going on, that there are questions in dispute between the opposition and the

government and that every request which has been made for Supplies in that way has been made on the basis of negotiations which at the time were going on, and that there was a reply which might have been made by the Prime Minister himself which would have lightened the situation but that reply was not given.

The Prime Minister is fond of saying that the King's government must go on. Yes, but it is an altogether different assumption that it must go on under the present flag. It is quite possible it might go on just as well under another party. The King's government must go on but that is not the statement that it must go on under the party which at the moment holds the reins of power. There are some things which are public measures and some things are not. This measure which is in dispute between the opposition and the government to-day is a measure which affects the status of members of this House. It is something in which every member is interested. In Great Britain these arrangements of the franchise of the country are matters of consultation and agreement between both sides of the House. You cannot find an instance in the British parliament of a minister undertaking to revise the basis of the franchise and putting it on this ground; I have a right to bring this in. I am going to put it through and you have no right to treat this in any other way than to discuss it and vote upon it and see which side is the stronger of the two. They do not do things in that way in the British parliament, and never have done them in that way. This measure, therefore, fairly regarded, is not in the same category as a public Bill, the Civil Service Bill, for instance, the Hudson Bay Railway Bill, or any other measure of that kind. This is a matter for negotiation and compromise, and in the negotiations that have gone on, the granting of Supplies has been a make-weight. The Minister of Finance should have stated that, and should have stated, if he had wanted to be frank about it, that the negotiations are still pending and that the Prime Minister is the man who has been in charge and has not concluded the matter.

Now, I have been frank in this matter, because there is no use in trying to make out before the country that there is not an issue between us, nor is there any use in trying to make out that the issue is different from what it is. Here you have the franchises of the Dominion; here you have a party in power which, during eighteen years of its history in opposition, maintained a certain view with regard to the franchise. They declared for a Franchise Bill on the lines of the provincial franchises. They canvassed the country on that; they asked votes on that; they got into power on it. So they had a mandate from the people on this subject. They came into power and they revised the law accord-

ing to the mandate of the people. Now, the Prime Minister has no mandate from the people to make ducks and drakes of the franchise arrangements of this country. Yet, without any mandate at all, they come before this parliament with a scheme which makes fish of one and flesh of another, which looks upon one province as being of a——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What is the resolution before the chair?

Mr. FOSTER. The resolution is with reference to the granting of Supply. And making ducks and drakes of the basis of the franchise, treating one province in one way and another province in another way—

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is wandering away——

Mr. FOSTER.—is not a proper handling of this great question. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance know that negotiations have been on the basis of this difference between ourselves with regard to this franchise measure. Now, is it not possible that this matter can be arranged and arranged quickly? Is it not possible that the Prime Minister himself can take a position which will get rid of this subject and remove the check that exists between the King's business and this parliament? That taken out of the road, there will be no difficulty, as my right hon. friend well knows. We should then have the disputed question put to one side and we could get on without the disputed question always continually obtruding itself and getting in front of the real business of the country.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). How would it do for me to say a word or two just now. that my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) may know that I am in the House. I was away for a day or two——

Mr. FOSTER. What were you doing?

Mr. PATERSON. I was talking about the obstructive tactics of the opposition. Now, to diverge for a moment before dealing with the question which I rose to discuss, I may say that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) might be a little more careful about the speeches he makes in this House. You have heard him, Mr. Chairman, scores and scores of times declare that the Liberals had adopted a platform in 1893, but, getting in power, had not carried out a single plank of it. He says now that we did carry out one at least —we amended the Franchise Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) will allow me. I have heard members of the opposition make a statement on that point, but every one of them that I have heard has said that every plank of the Liberal platform had been sacrificed except one—that with reference to the Franchise Bill.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has repeated—and 'Hansard' will show—that every principle laid down by us was violated—not one was carried out. Even the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has so far forgotten the facts as to state that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When?

Mr. PATERSON. Many a time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When? Tell me of one time.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot recall them at the moment. I cannot recount exactly when the hon. gentleman spoke——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) that he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. PATERSON. Then the hon. gentleman has sat in his place and heard his supporters make statements that were untrue and has not contradicted them. The hon. member does not deny that these statements have been made——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I challenge the minister now—he wants to be very truthful —to put the statement before us: When that was made?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not playing this game of obstruction, understand. I cannot be drawn out in that way. I am within the judgment of the House whether that statement has or has not been repeated. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) alluded to the fact the other night that we had carried out this one plank and he has heard the——

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. And now you want to override it.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not going into a discussion of the platform. It is a good platform. There is one plank that has not been carried out—the reform of the Senate. We had the plebiscite. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will not deny that that is another plank that we have carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not deny that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) had a plebiscite.

Mr. PATERSON. The people——

Mr. FOSTER. The people got no show in it.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, the people voted in it. If hon. members cannot recall matters that have been of such great interest to the country it is a pity. Now, the hon.

member to whom I wish particularly to refer is not present, but some of the others who spoke on the matter with which I wish to deal are here. They spoke of me as having made a statement that was misleading and almost untrue. If I had done that, and my attention were called to it, I would at once take it back. But I cannot take it back and still tell the truth as I understand it. The member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) said :

The Hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is reported to have said: 'In his department there were 1,800 men who could not get their pay because the Tory obstructionists would not vote supplies.'

And that he calls a misleading statement. But it is an actual fact, and so I cannot take back my statement. Any one who contradicts that statement is making a misstatement absolutely. The men are not yet paid. I asked, when I came back, if they had been paid, and they said 'No.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) said that he could send the cheques out if he got the vote put through.

Mr. PATERSON. If I said that, I said what was inaccurate.

Mr. FOSTER. And may be doing the same now.

Mr. PATERSON. It would be inaccurate to state that until these resolutions were embodied in a Supply Bill and passed the money could be used.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman gave me the distinct impression, by explicit statement, that if the vote were put through he would pay his men, and the vote was put through with that understanding. It was on Friday, I think, and the hon. gentlemen pointed out that the vote then under discussion would pay the outside service, and said that if he got the other on Monday it would be in time enough, and the vote for the inside service was passed on Monday.

Mr. PATERSON. I could not get the pay for these men unless that vote passed in committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend deny that he gave us to understand that if that vote passed, he could pay his men ?

Mr. PATERSON. What I gave you to understand was that it would facilitate the paying of the men.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr PATERSON. Let me bring it a little closer home to the leader of the opposition. He knows that they wanted me to leave one item, he knows that when that item was passed they only let it go through the committee on the understanding that it was to be debated on concurrence with the same latitude as that given in committee. Therefore so far as my getting the money was concerned, I was not advanced one step. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not deny that. It is on 'Hansard.' Why did my hon. friend want the item to stand ? It was because, he said, the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) wanted to discuss it. They found fault with me because I went to Brantford. But where was the hon. member for Brantford himself ? He was away when my estimates came up, and the whip of the other side said to me : Do not go on with your estimates because the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is not here. I said I did not care, that I wanted to get the money. But we did not get my estimates through that night. We did not even get them voted through the committee although we sat until four o'clock in the morning. We were met by obstruction pure and simple—nothing else—obstruction undisguised and deliberate. We were told by the hon. gentleman then leading the House (Mr. Taylor) : Withdraw your Election Bill and your estimates will go through in two minutes. That was the statement made. The statement I made at Brantford therefore was absolutely correct. It accurately described the position to-day.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the hon. Minister of Customs going to resign ? He made a certain statement at Brantford and has had the verdict of his own county only yesterday.

Mr. PATERSON. But that was given four years ago.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There was a verdict yesterday too.

Mr. PATERSON. It was given four years ago but repeated with greater emphasis, so I am told, yesterday. I have no intention of resigning, at any rate until I have placed this matter clearly before the people as I did up there. The men are without pay because the Supply is not voted. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask, why not bring down the Supply Bill ? But concurrence must come first. When my items came to be concurred in, what would the leader of the opposition say ? He would say : We cannot concur because the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has something to say on the question, and it will have to stand. That is on 'Hansard.' To say that I made a misleading statement when I said that the government officials could not be paid because of the obstructive tactics of the opposition, is to make an utterly unfounded charge. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not wait until I was present to attack me. I went to Brantford, but not solely to take part in the provincial elections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Of course not.

Mr. PATERSON. One hon. gentleman mentions the fact that I made no allusion to local politics whatever but only to Dominion politics. I did take the opportunity of meeting the electors and putting before them the conduct of the opposition in this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. You got your verdict.

Mr. PATERSON. No, but you will get your verdict when you go before the people themselves. If there is anything in the minds of the people at present on which, when the government ask for a verdict, they will get a favourable verdict by an overwhelming majority, it is this question of obstruction. I can tell you that the rules of this House must be revised in such a manner that while the amplest time will be given for the discussion of every question and the investigation of every subject, there must be a means devised whereby the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the little clique of men around him will not be able to keep this House sitting indefinitely. That is the issue that will be pronounced upon, and the party which will favour a revision of the rules in order that something within the lines of decency may be maintained and the country's money saved, will be endorsed by the people, and the party which will be entrusted with the carrying out of that reform will be the party that has ever carried out all reforms.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. All reforms that have ever been carried out in this country. Does any one suppose that these men could go to the country and ask the people to sustain them on an issue pledging themselves that if they came in they would pass an Act that would limit their own powers of oratory to something like decency? It is hard on the civil servants and on members of parliament, but every day this obstruction continues, it strengthens the Liberal party. Therefore I can take some consolation out of it whilst being compelled to sit here and listen to the long windy harangues made for the sole purpose of obstruction on the other side. My reputation for veracity I have fully established, and I will say no more.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One does not wonder that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) should have come back in rather bad humour. Of course we must make some allowances for his spleen, and I trust sincerely that hon. gentlemen on this side will take that into account and not lay too much emphasis upon the display we have had from him just now. The hon. gentleman entered into controversy—and that brings me to my feet—as to whether or not he gave the House to understand that if these items were put through the committee, he would be able to pay his men. He refers to the fact that we asked him to hold over an item of $5,000. We did make that request, but then we let it go through because he pressed us to do so in order that he might have the whole item passed and therefore be able to pay his officers. Either he knew that when he was speaking just now, or his memory stands sadly in need of correction. Just look at what he said on May 29. It will be found on page 8738 of unrevised 'Hansard':

Had you not better let me have this money now? The men need their pay.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are you referring to the first item here?

Mr. PATERSON. It will be of no use to give us that, as it is only part of the item. The cheques can perhaps be issued if the items are passed, even before the Supply Bill.

Mr. PATERSON. I said 'perhaps.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we will compromise by letting you have the first one, amounting to $1,815,000.

Mr. PATERSON. I will take that, of course, if I cannot get more; but I do not know whether the Auditor General will care to give a credit so that we can issue the cheques unless the whole item passes.

And the whole item did pass. It passed because of the representation of the minister that upon obtaining that item, he would be enabled to pay the salaries of his men. He went away the next day to the ridings of Brant and there he told the people that these men were without their pay because of the obstruction of the opposition.

Mr. PATERSON. Did you notice that I said 'perhaps'? You did not emphasize that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do not let my hon. friend get any more uneasy than he is at present. He seems to be extremely uneasy.

Mr. PATERSON. Not at all.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am sure the hon. the leader of the opposition does not want to be unfair. Look at the vote. That particular item referred to is only one of a vote of five items, and the whole vote could not be reported unless that particular item were passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend need not be afraid, I shall read the whole record. The minister went on to say:

Besides, I want to go away next Tuesday, and it would oblige me if the item were passed.

Mr. PATERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend is very censorious of the hon. member for Brantford because he was away in his

constituency during the time of the local election. We did ask the usual courtesy that the minister would hold an item over until the hon. member for Brantford returned, and we were told by the Minister of Customs that he should be in his seat. But the Minister of Customs did not think it unbecoming his status here as minister to leave his position in this House and go to the ridings of North and South Brant for the purpose of taking part in the very same election. If it was wrong for my hon. friend from Brantford to go to his riding, how much more was it absolutely unworthy of the Minister of Customs to leave his public duties here and go to North and South Brant for the same purpose? The only difference between the two is that my hon. friend from Brantford has come back with victories in the two ridings to his credit, and the Minister of Customs has come back in a somewhat censorious and irritable frame of mind which has led him to make the exhibition he has just made. The hon. minister continued:

I am afraid that if we have two days discussion in order to get into Supply, I will have to go without it.

That is to say he placed his interference in this local election before the object of getting Supply to pay the officers of his department. He had to choose between the two, and he preferred to go to that riding to take part in a provincial election rather than remain here for the purpose of getting through with these items. Then he continued :

Will you give me the next item, which is for the salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors, as well as the salaries and expenses of the statistical branch here in Ottawa?

And I replied :

We will see about the others on Monday.

Mr. PATERSON. What did the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) say between ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am taking the discussion between the hon. gentleman and myself at present. The minister then said :

Will you let us get into Supply on Monday?

And I answered:

Did you ever know us to fail? A man who is not satisfied with a million and a half a day is very hard to please.

And my hon. friend then said:

It is really making a discrimination between the officers. Those of the outside ports will be able to get their money while those in Ottawa will not.

Could anything be more distinct and explicit? Yet this same hon. gentleman, with these words still ringing through this chamber, went to the riding of Brant and said that the opposition had prevented him from paying his officers, and he has endeavoured to impress us with his extreme regard for the truth in the face of these facts. I shall leave the record to the House so far as that is concerned. I then said:

They will get their salaries as quickly as the outside officers if you get the other item on Monday.

Showing the sense in which I most distinctly understood the hon. gentleman and the sense in which he wished to be understood. Yet he did not consider it beneath his dignity as a public man to make the misstatement he did make—I shall use no harsher word—in the riding of Brant. Let me refer to what took place on Monday—see page 9860 of the unrevised 'Hansard.' On the item 'expense of maintenance of revenue cruisers and preventive service, $40,000,' I said:

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) desired to have some item reserved. Perhaps you will let the last item stand?

Mr. PATERSON. That would stop the whole item.

What was the advantage of passing the whole item? It was in order that the outside as well as the inside officers might be paid, as the hon. gentleman represented they would be paid if these items passed. The hon. Minister of Finance said :

The several items constitute one resolution, so that there would be nothing to report.

I then asked: Will you have any supplementaries? And the Minister of Customs replied

We may have, but I do not like to pledge myself that we shall have. Let the hon. member have the discussion on concurrence.

That was the hon. minister's own suggestion, with which he found fault just now. The hon. gentleman's memory does not seem to be very good. I then asked :

When does the minister expect to be back?

And the minister replied

On Monday next.

I then said

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose the hon. member for Brantford wishes to discuss this on concurrence, I suppose you will not have any objection to his speaking three or four times if it is necessary to answer you?

Mr. PATERSON. If it is necessary to explain himself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As long as there will be some freedom of discussion.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot promise about the rules of the House, but I do not think there will be any trouble about that. The fact is, he should be here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister should not go away.

So the whole item went through on the full and distinct understanding that the money would be available, not only to pay the outside but the inside service as well.

Mr. PATERSON. When?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At once. Did not the hon. gentleman understand that?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Need I read it again? Will the minister endeavour to grasp this: He said

It is really making a discrimination between the officers. Those at the outside ports will be able to get their money while those in Ottawa will not.

Anything more distinct and explicit than that, I cannot imagine. Whether the minister said something he did not intend saying, I do not know; but, his distinct words gave us to understand beyond doubt that if the two items, not only for the inside but the outside service, passed, he would be able to pay his men at once; and because of that representation, we let the item go through, so that there would be no discussion in that committee, even although the hon. member for Brantford had specially come to me and asked that some item should be reserved so that he should be able to discuss these estimates. He had also gone to the chief whip and left the same message with him. But notwithstanding that, I agreed to the hon. minister's request in order that there might be no inconvenience, so far as his officers were concerned. We let the item go through because of the minister's representation that if they did those men would get their money at once.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has taken a position which is unworthy of him. His position is nothing but a perfect quibble, and he knows it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Nonsense.

Mr. PATERSON. When I asked to have that item agreed to, it was because, as I said, that perhaps if it passed the committee, the Auditor General might give a line of credit for it, but I did not commit myself to that.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why did you not say that in Brantford?

Mr. PATERSON. I said in Brantford the absolute truth, and I stick to it here. The hon. gentleman tries to cloud the issue and make out that I made a mis-statement, but he knows that if these men are without their pay it is due to the obstructive tactics of the opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON. Why then have the men not got their money?

Mr. FOSTER. You have not asked for it.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I have. If it were asked for to-day, what would be the statement we would be met with? We would be told that the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was not in his place. And when the item came up for concurrence, the leader of the opposition would say that there was an understanding that it should not go through its final stage until the hon. member for Brantford was here.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you know if he would say that?

Mr. PATERSON. He would be bound to say it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crawford). This whole discussion is out of order. I have allowed considerable latitude, but now have to insist on the House taking up Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree that the obstructive tactics of the Minister of Customs should be suppressed.

Mr. PATERSON. Will you give concurrence on the customs estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. Bring down your Supply Bill on your customs estimates and we will pass it right through.

Mr. FIELDING. We would like to have the railway estimates concurred with it.

Mr. FOSTER. May be you had better not wait too long. After all this dignified discussion, has the Minister of Railways anything further to say in defence of the circular he issued?

Mr. GRAHAM. My conduct in that connection needs no defence.

Mr. FOSTER. It is defenceless.

Mr. GRAHAM. That there may be no misunderstanding about it, I will read these two letters. This letter was received by the department on May 15, from the Auditor General:

Sir,—I have to call your attention to the fact that of a great portion of the estimates for 1908-9 only one-eighth has been voted by parliament. Please note that we have no authority to exceed this until further Supply has been granted.

Now here is the important part:

In view of the discussions which have taken place in parliament in reference to overdrawing the appropriation, it would be advisable to notify all your officials charged with the expenditure of public money, that they must not under any circumstances exceed the appropriation.

That is dated May 15. Then on May 20 this letter was sent by the department to the various officers:

Sir,—I am directed to inform you that the attention of the department has been drawn by the Auditor General to the fact that of a great portion of the estimates of 1908-9, only one-eighth has been voted by parliament, and that until further Supplies have been granted, the expenditure must not under any circumstances exceed the appropriation. Be pleased to see that in dealing with the expenditures for work under your control this limitation is closely adhered to.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the date on which you authorized that circular by Mr. Pottinger ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The authorization of that circular would be the letter I have just read of May 20.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister's explanation does not help him out. I did not know that he has such timely notice, that he was told by the Auditor General on the 15th of May that his money had run out, and that he must take measures to replenish it; and it was not until June 5, twelve o'clock at night, that he mustered up courage to ask that this vote be taken into consideration. How does the minister excuse such negligence? Those on the Intercolonial that are doing their work and earning their pay, come up on pay day and find no money; although an intimation is given by the Auditor General on the 15th of May warning the minister that there are breakers ahead, and to look out. The minister lolls away from May 15 to June 5, that is twenty days, before he musters up courage to come down to the House and ask for money to pay his employees. In all my parliamentary experience I do not know of such a case of lack of provision in a minister. May I ask another question: Has the minister, been paying out of advances made to him by the Auditor General, over and above what vote he has had?

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course we had the supplementary estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean out of advances authorized by letter of credit or otherwise, by the Auditor General?

Mr. GRAHAM. Nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to say to the Minister of Finance, in order to make this matter clear, that if the Minister of Customs really wants to pay his men, and he has not got through committee all that he has asked for, and has not up to this moment taken the additional step to make it available, if the Minister of Finance asks this House to make what the committee has granted available, they will do it in as quick a time as it is possible to put anything through this House.

Mr. FIELDING. That, so far as it goes, is very encouraging, and is a departure from the policy laid down by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who said that we would not get one copper.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said so, too.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Customs has made a statement that I ask him to retract or else make it good.

Mr. PATERSON. I think I can make it good.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will accept your denial meanwhile.

Mr. FIELDING. I made no allusion to the hon. member for North Toronto in the matter, I am dealing with the official utterance conveyed to this House by that very responsible officer of the opposition, my esteemed friend from Leeds, who stated most positively and emphatically that it was the determination of the hon. gentleman opposite not to allow one dollar to pass until this devilish Bill——

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to correct my hon. friend. I said I spoke for myself, only so far as I was concerned. Turn up 'Hansard,' and you will see it.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is too modest. I am assuming that he spoke, at all events, with the authority of his long experience and great knowledge.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are assuming what is incorrect.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He is only allowing twelve and a half cents on the dollar to go through.

Mr. FIELDING. Then I will take the statement of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that, although the opposition are pretending that they are not obstructing Supply, all they have allowed is twelve and a half cents on the dollar.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is all the government are worth.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend from North Toronto says they are willing to let the customs officers be paid. That is such a vast improvement upon the conduct of the opposition that I welcome it. Now why does he make a distinction between the customs officer, worthy as he may be, and an officer of the Intercolonial ? Is it fair to say : We are going to let the customs man get his money, but the poor man who labours on the Intercolonial must wait ? I appeal to my hon. friend, if he is so considerate of the other departments as he says he is now, and is willing to pay the customs employees, this vote for the Intercolonial, although it is a large and important vote, is one largely of a routine character ; then why not pay the railway men as well as the customs men ?

Mr. PATERSON. In reference to the remark of the hon. member for North Toronto, I would ask him to look at page 9739 where he will find an interjection made by himself.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a very easy way for you to get them their salaries.

That is like what the hon. member for Leeds said: Withdraw your Bill, and you will get your money, and not otherwise. I am not, of course, a member of their caucus, but I know the papers stated that the hon. gentlemen opposite solemnly met together and determined that Supply should not go through until that Bill was withdrawn. The papers may have been wrong in that, I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister should not reveal what takes place in caucus.

Mr. PATERSON. I have verified my statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think if the Minister of Customs makes another record today such as that he has made in Brant, we will be willing to admit him to our caucus.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am anxious to get this vote through if possible. It is $9,035,000 for the Intercolonial, the Windsor branch and the branch in Prince Edward Island. If we are allowed to put this through, it is really being allowed to use the money that we have in the Receiver General's hands. Any discussion on the management can be had on capital expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. The Finance Minister asked why, if we were willing to let the item go through to pay the customs officers, we should not be equally ready to let this item go through to pay the expenditure incurred on the Intercolonial. There is a very great difference and a very much stronger reason why we should have it. In view of the disclosures which have been brought out by the Public Accounts Committee in regard to the jobbery, connected with the Intercolonial Railway in the last few years in the purchase of land and supplies and other things, we should have full information on each item before it is allowed to pass. With regard to the salaries of customs collectors we know what they are and we expect that they will be paid that money and that there will be no jobbery connected with them.

Mr. GRAHAM. These items are really salaries. We will have a large appropriation for capital expenditure on which these matters can be discussed.

Mr. SPROULE. I was referring to the observation of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As a matter of fact, as I understand, the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway go to the credit of the Receiver General.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And you are not able to utilize the moneys received for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the position.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many men are employed on the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister tell us why he wants $1,400,000 more and also give us a statement as to what the receipts and expenditures are at the present time and whether they are falling off or increasing?

Mr. GRAHAM. The number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway is approximately 9,000—something under 9,000.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to ask the minister if every one of the 9,000 employees of the Intercolonial Railway got the circulars which have been under consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no idea. We sent the letter to the general manager.

Mr. KEMP. The minister does not know how many circulars were issued?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not.

Mr. KEMP. Is it fair to suppose that each one got this circular?

Mr. GRAHAM. Probably the heads of the departments got it.

Mr. KEMP. You only want to get rid of the heads of the departments?

Mr. GRAHAM. We do not want to get rid of anybody.

Mr. FOSTER. My telegram said that 'similar notices were sent to employees individually' and from other information we find that the circular was posted up in public places as well.

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot imagine that they would get 9,000 copies of this notice printed and send them to all the employees. I think that must be a mistake. The custom, whenever any change of rule is made, is that the notice is posted up so that the employees can see it. In reply to my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) instead of this being in excess of last year's vote by $1,400,000 it is really the same amount we expended last year, because, in the Supplemental Estimates, we had to ask for $1,400,000. The receipts are falling off as the receipts of other railways are falling off.

Mr. HAGGART. To what extent?

Mr. GRAHAM. The receipts fell off as compared with last year, up to the 31st May, by about $180,000—for two months.

Mr. KEMP. Is the Intercolonial Railway reducing its staff under these circumstances the same as the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have not been doing it to the same extent. In order to find out the position of the railway with regard to its employees, salaries and wages I have asked for a complete list of the employees, the salaries obtained and the date of employment. I might further add that several of the brotherhoods have already asked for increases in what they call the schedule and these matters will have to come up for consideration a little later on.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the minister give us a statement of the receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908 ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will give the statement to my hon. friend after lunch.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to an article which recently appeared in the 'Daily Times' of Moncton in which it is alleged that there has been a great deterioration in the Intercolonial Railway service and I would like to hear what explanation the minister has to make in reference to the allegations contained in this article. The article appeared on the 11th May and is as follows :

Mechanical department of the Intercolonial Railway in a deplorable state.

If the numerous reports being circulated by the railway men are correct, the mechanical department of the Intercolonial Railway is in a deplorable condition. The locomotives and cars are said to be in the worst state of repair known in the history of the road.

For months the Maritime Express trains have almost always been late. This results, railway men declare, more from inefficient locomotives than from bad coal, as recently reported; and as proof of this within a couple of weeks a new batch of locomotives, recently arrived from Kingston, have been running these trains with the result that a marked improvement is noticeable in the time.

These new locomotives, we presume, are like all others purchased for some years, paid for out of capital account. Indeed, it is declared by railway men who know a good deal of the working of the mechanical department, that if it had not been for the additions to the rolling stock supplied the past year at the expense of capital the road would have been completely tied up before this. The policy for the past year has been to skimp everything not chargeable to capital so that Mr. Butler or Mr. Graham may be able to show as large a surplus as possible for the benefit of the electorate in the coming elections. The earnings for February are said to have been very disappointing to the deputy minister and every expedient imaginable was enforced to keep the expenses down to March 31, the end of the financial year. As a result the shops here, and in fact at all repair shops, have not had force enough employed to keep pace with the work. We are informed there are no less than thirty locomotives lying in the Moncton yard awaiting repairs, and probably as many more at River du Loup, Halifax and other repair points. The bulk of these locomotives are said to be of the modern class and fit to do good work if they were only given the necessary repairs. Here in round figures is three-quarters of a million dollars worth of locomotives lying idle for want of repairs, and the minister reporting to parliament that the great development of traffic over the road necessitates the purchase of more locomotives and cars to provide for this increased traffic.

From the information we have there has been for some time sufficient locomotives and cars on the Intercolonial to meet all the requirements of legitimate traffic, if such locomotives and cars were kept in an efficient state of repair. According to the last report of the Minister of Railways, 23 locomotives were purchased between July, 1906, and March 31, 1907, and since that about as many more have, we understand, been acquired on the same account and more expected to be provided for in the pending estimates.

What we have said in regard to locomotives applies with equal force to the cars. Hundreds, if not thousands, of comparatively good cars are lying in sidings along the road awaiting repairs. Some of them have been idle for years and exposed to the weather are deteriorating very rapidly, and more are being purchased every year out of capital to keep the traffic moving. If only a royal commission of independent experts could be had to deal with the mechanical department of the railway, in our opinion a state of affairs would be revealed that would shock the country. A scandal involving the loss of $50,000 or $100,000 to the taxpayers is the subject of comment all over the country. In this case there is a public investment of from twelve to fifteen millions in rolling stock. If a large percentage of this stock is allowed through mismanagement and wire-pulling to lie idle and deteriorate, is it not practically as bad for the taxpayer as grafting on a large scale?

Only yesterday in Montreal I was informed by a very prominent citizen of New Brunswick that there were numerous complaints of deterioration on the Intercolonial railway, both as regards the operation of the trains and the road bed. It was stated that ballasting was neglected, that in many places where ties were absolutely necessary they were not put in notwithstanding that last year the department bought $100,000 worth of ties. It is also stated that several accidents which have recently occurred on the line resulted from deterioration of the road bed. Only a few days ago it was reported in the press that a train had two runs off between Montreal and Moncton. I would like to know what the Minister of Railways and Canals has to say in reference to the allegations which are contained in

this paper which is published at the headquarters of the railway in Moncton and contains information which no doubt could be verified by the newspaper writer on the ground.

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman when he says these statements can be verified.

Mr. CROCKET. I said they are in a position to verify them because they are on the ground.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a reason why they should not make such statements because they are in a position to know better. That article complains we have not a sufficient staff and the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) suggested we should decrease the staff. Owing to the great increase of traffic all railways on this continent are endeavouring to reduce their expenses and the number of men employed, and some of them have shut up their shops for a considerable time. This article says we have not a sufficient number of men employed.

Mr. CROCKET. I did not so read the article. The article complains that repairs to rolling stock were being neglected, that new cars and locomotives were being bought on capital account while the railway has locomotives which could do the work if they were put in proper repair, and, that this has not been done because it is the policy of the railway to scimp everything except what was chargeable to capital account so that a surplus might appear on working expenses.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me point out the absolute fallacy of the statement that last year every effort was made not to spend much money out of revenue but to take it out of capital so that at the end of the year we could show a surplus. Now here are the figures: During the 9 months of 1907 we expended on locomotives and repairs to same, $476,210.12; and during the year ending 1908 we expended on locomotives and repairs to same, $476,210.12; and during the year ending 1908 we expended $783,200.72 on locomotives out of the revenue, which is the largest amount that was ever expended out of revenue for this purpose. This shows that that part of the statement in the newspaper is not correct.

Mr. CROCKET. Does that sum you have mentioned not include the purchase of locomitives?

Mr. GRAHAM. On repairs to locomotives we spent more money during the year just closed than ever before has been spent out of revenue account.

Mr. HAGGART. How much did you spend on repairs to locomotives?

Mr. GRAHAM. $783,200, including the purchase of 4 new locomotives.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, that is a mistake.

Mr. FOWLER. How many locomotives did you repair for this immense sum?

Mr. HAGGART. There is some mistake somewhere there.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me conclude the statement.

Mr. FOWLER. Surely you know how many locomotives you repaired.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not that information here.

Mr. FOWLER. That would purchase about 40 locomotives.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get the information as to that afterwards but the point is that all this money came out of revenue and we expended more out of revenue for this purpose than ever before. On cars and repairs to passenger cars in 1907 we spent $166,813.88 and in 1908 we expended $310,-214.15. Now I am speaking of revenue alone, and take the freight car department—during the nine months of 1907 we spent $327,650.24, and during the year 1908 we spent $604,984.64. This shows we have taken more out of revenue for the maintenance of the road in these three departments than ever before so far as I can find the figures. The statement is therefore not well-founded that we are skimping that department. The excess of revenue over expenditure for the year ending March 31, 1908 was $16,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the expenditure on capital account for the year ending March 31, 1908.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Immediately after luncheon hour the minister should give us a statement with regard to the fiscal year just ended for which we have not yet seen the figures. It would greatly advance the items before the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. The difficulty is in furnishing all the data up to March 31, 1908, We have not yet received that information. it has not come from the manager. We have a few items from the accountant which I have given to the House, but the general manager has not made any report and we have not all the information up to the end of the year just closed. I can give the information for the previous year but not for the year closing March 31, 1908.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister might give what he has. That would, I suppose, include a statement of the receipts and expenditures and a statement of the expenditures on capital account.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will give all the information possible.

Mr. FOWLER. I asked the minister a question regarding one James A. Stewart. The parties advising the minister I think know perfectly well the James A. Stewart to whom I refer. But the man described to me was a brakeman of whom I was not asking at all. The James A. Stewart of whom I was asking is a gentleman who goes around on the different trains, jumping on at little way stations, checking up the conductors. In vulgar parlance he is known as a railway pimp.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend was wrong in supposing that we knew the man referred to. There is a James A. Stewart on the road and there is a James Stewart. He asked for information about James A Stewart and we gave it. Now we will try James.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps the hon. minister will be able now to give some details about Mr. James Stewart who is a spotter on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course my hon. friend will take back that expression 'spotter.' Mr. Stewart is a very useful officer, such as they have on all railways. He is a travelling auditor who checks up any place, either on the train or at the stations, he thinks necessary. Like all inspectors or auditors he does not notify people when he is going to make his inspection. I think he has been a very useful officer.

Mr. FOWLER. My information is quite different. I think that the term 'spotter' is the one usually applied, but if it be not a proper term, I shall call him travelling auditor. My information is that this man makes himself objectionable indeed, not only to conductors on the road, but very often to others. I do not think you will find on any railway in this country, or in connection with any other work, any better class of men than the conductors on the Intercolonial Railway. That is the universal opinion held of these men. Mr. Stewart is not only objectionable to them, but also to the travelling public. It is said, for instance, that he will go into a pullman car, when people are in bed, draw the curtains and rouse them up, which certainly he has no right to do and which is exceedingly objectionable and improper, particularly in the case of ladies. It does not seem to me that this gentleman is a desirable person for the occupation given him, and I trust that the minister will look into this matter and see if he cannot replace this man with another —if it be necessary to have such a man, and I do not think it is with the class employed on the Intercolonial Railway—who can do his business without making himself objectionable to the employees of the road or the travelling public.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can certainly second the remarks of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fowler) with respect to the character and the class of men who are engaged as conductors on the Intercolonial Railway. It has been my privilege and pleasure to give this testimony on may occasions heretofore. We also have a very high class of men engaged as station agents in charge of the stations along the line. Those agents have to submit to a regular audit. It is not an audit which takes place by prior arrangement, but very suddenly and at times unexpectedly. Those men do not complain of this. Men who are properly discharging their duty in any capacity have no right to complain of any audit, and I am sure that the conductors, so far as I have knowledge of those gentlemen on the Intercolonial Railway—and I know pretty nearly all of them personally—do not complain of the audit. I have had occasion to call the attention of the minister and his deputy to the auditor who has been named. Rightly or wrongly complaints are made of the manner in which he performs his duties, and I think that an inquiry has been made. If these allegations be true, he is certainly not a fit person to continue in the government employ, and I apprehend that the department are inquiring into that matter, if they are not, it will be their duty to make an inquiry. Some time ago I called the attention especially of the deputy minister to allegations that were being made, and being made by those who would probably be in a position to know whereof they speak.

Mr. GRAHAM. My information is that if there were certain allegations they have never been substantiated. However, there is no necessity to discuss the matter. It is not necessary that any officer of the Intercolonial Railway should inconvenience the travelling public in the performance of his duty, and we shall not allow that. I shall have inquiries made to see how this man is performing his duty.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the assertion be true that he opens berths at night, he should not be retained twenty-five minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. I have no personal knowledge, but I have been informed that such in the case. I am informed by most credible authority that that has occurred more than once. I do not want to do any injustice to Mr. Stewart, and I am not speaking from personal knowledge, but I am informed that he is not always in a fit condition to attend to his duty. That is very serious. The ex-minister (Mr. Emmerson) has pointed out that he has also heard allegations against this man and has properly drawn attention to the delicate position he occupies. It is quite different from that of an auditor auditing the accounts of a railway station. This man goes on

trains and is supposed to act somewhat in the position of a spy, and I do not use that term with all the meaning attached to it. I do not intend it in that way entirely, but he is there to see that each conductor gives a proper return of the fares paid in to him. Before there is any necessity for that sort of thing there must be a certain amount of suspicion in the minds of those who employ the conductors and set this man as a check on them, and I do not think that the result has shown any defalcation on their part. I should judge from the testimony which the ex-minister (Mr. Emmerson) has given of the conductors, that there would not be very great necessity for that kind of thing, and that it is not likely anything would result derogatory to the men from the inspection by this travelling auditor, as he is called. But it does not seem, from the information at hand, that any effort has yet been made to find out whether these allegations are true, no investigation has been held. It seems to me that the matter has been brought to the attention of the department by a person who naturally would have some influence in the department and whose word ought to be accepted, I mean the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) the ex-Minister of Railways. The ex-minister having made a complaint to the department, and having severed his connection with the department over which he had been for some years the responsible head, his complaint should have received a little more attention than apparently it has received from the present responsible officers. I judge from what the minister has said that no investigation of any kind has taken place, although these complaints are being constantly made and have been made for the last year or more with regard to the conduct of this man. It is said that he is not always in a proper condition to perform his duties. I do not know if that is so, but if it is, surely it is a matter that deserves very careful consideration, because it is one affecting not only the conductor who is doing his work in an unobjectionable way, but it weakens the loyalty of those men towards the department. Then again you are interfering with the comfort of the travelling public, which is another matter for consideration. For these reasons I think the minister should have taken some better measures than he has to ascertain whether these complaints are well founded.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the minister be good enough to explain what the duties of this man are ? Is he authorized to go along with the passenger train as a detective upon the conduct of the conductors and of the passengers ? It is hardly the proper way to treat a lot of conductors, who are supposed to be honourable men, to engage a spotter of this kind to go along with them.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have to leave in a few minutes, and I would like to say a word. It is but fair to state that I only called the attention of the deputy minister to this matter within the last few weeks, as it only came to my notice about then. Previous to that I had heard no complaints, either from Moncton or elsewhere along the line. When I did call his attention to it he told me that an inquiry would be made at once, and I have since understood from him that he had taken steps to have the matter inquired into, and if the complaints were confirmed he would feel obliged to call this gentleman to account.

Mr. GRAHAM. In answer to the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes), it is the custom of all great railway lines to employ men of this class to accompany the trains. The Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk, as every person knows who is familiar with railway work, have these men. I admit their duties are delicate, and ought to be performed with a great deal of care so as to give no offence, or as little as possible. They can stop at the stations and take a check of the tickets sold, and see that everything is carried on right. They can travel on the trains and check the conductors' tickets and passengers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why should he intrude upon passengers ?

Mr. GRAHAM. He should not intrude upon the passengers in the way the hon. gentleman complained of. If he has done that, it is quite wrong, it would not be defensible.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister has spoken about the likelihood of an application being made from the employees on the Intercolonial or some of them, for an increase in their rate of pay. I think the minister might give to parliament a list of the various classes of employees and the rate of pay which is attached to each, so that we may be able to form an idea as to whether the rates paid are sufficient. I presume the minister has a list of the rates of pay of the different classes of officials, and he might take parliament into his confidence and let us know what the rate is.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can get a list of that kind, but if I were to start reading it to the House it would be very tedious. I can get a list prepared and present it on any item of capital expenditure we may discuss later.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not quite satisfied with the answer of the minister with regard to this man Stewart. I would like to know what steps have been taken to investigate these complaints that have been

already made to the department, and what steps the minister proposes to take. It is a matter of great importance, both to the men on that road, and the people who travel upon it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand that some such complaint as this was made publicly against this man in a newspaper some time ago, and on his issuing a writ to sue the newspaper, it apologized. I believe the complaint was made against two officials, and the newspaper apologized. I understand some complaint was made against them for misconduct on a pullman car. The only reply I can give is that this complaint has been shown to be untrue. However, I will make inquiry. We cannot permit that kind of conduct on the train. I cannot think that the newspaper report is true. No official would go through a pullman car and look into the different berths.

Mr. FOWLER. He might look into a berth to see whether it was occupied by one or two people, in order to make his check correct, to see whether the return the conductor was making was correct. I think the minister ought to agree to hold an investigation. You investigate matters of a much more trivial nature than this. It need not be a costly investigation. You have your road superintendents there, and you might charge one of them with holding a court of inquiry. You could very easily investigate by letting the conductors know that, if there were complaints against Mr. Stewart, they should prefer them at such a time. Or, you might do it by giving public notice. Any passenger who wishes to complain of having been misused by this gentleman in the alleged discharge of his duty, would be glad to know that he could go before your investigator and give evidence with respect to the matter. I cannot think it possible that the railway management desires to have one of its employees perform his duties in an objectionable manner. There is no reason why there should not be a travelling auditor, no reason why the trains should not be checked up. I find no fault with that, but I find fault with the manner in which this man is alleged to have performed that very delicate duty. I think the minister ought to tell us that he will hold such an investigation. If he will do so, I shall be quite satisfied—and that should be a consideration with him, I think.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not customary to advertise for complaints. We might do a large business in them if we took that means. If any person will make a specific complaint of wrong-doing by this officer, giving some idea of time, I will be happy to investigate it thoroughly.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister knows the difficulty there is in getting any one to make a specific complaint. People will put up with a great deal when they are travelling;—they will grumble about it and will avoid the road if they can find any other way to go; but when it comes to making a complaint and making a court matter of it, that is entirely different. The knowledge of this fact probably encourages this man to go in his improper course. And so with the conductors—they do not like to make a complaint, for fear there will be a black mark against them so far as the management is concerned. But this matter can be investigated by the proper officials. It is not necessary to advertise for complaints; but if it were known that such an investigation were to be held, I am sure such complaints would be entered. At the present time, no doubt, the travelling public think that this kind of treatment is part of the policy of the road. It injures the government, of course; and, from that point of view, it would be better for me to have it go on; but I am speaking from the standpoint of the road and the public.

Mr. CROCKET. I notice that on May 18, the minister stated, in answer to my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid), that there were twenty-one locomotives belonging to the Intercolonial lying idle at Moncton awaiting repairs, two at Rivière du Loup and one at Campbellton. That would appear to bear out, to a considerable extent, the article I read before we rose at one o'clock, so far as locomotives are concerned. How many new locomotives were purchased by the Railway Department last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the hon. gentleman mean the last fiscal year—the year ending March 31st last?

Mr. CROCKET. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. The report for that year has not been made-yet. We have been discussing the previous year. But I will get the information for the hon. gentleman if I can.

Mr. FOWLER. While the minister is looking that up, I would like to ask with regard to this amount of $783,000 which the minister says he spent last year for repairing engines. He claims to have two hundred engines——

Mr. TAYLOR. There are 370 engines.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, $783,000 would represent between $5,000 and $6,000 each for 150 engines. Surely, there would not be repairs to more than 150 out of 370. There must be some mistake.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman will see that the point we were discussing was how much we have spent out of revenue. I understand that there are four new locomotives in that amount.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman said it was for repairs.

Mr. CROCKET. Would not the four locomotives be charged to capital?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, these were paid out of revenue. Let me point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) that if he will study the statistics, he will find that the railways figure on spending an average of about $2,200 a year for repairs on each engine.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I would like to ask the minister if he has received any complaints of the condition of the road between Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have had some complaint that the cars were not as good as they thought they ought to have for that section of the road.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is the minister prepared to do anything to remedy this state of affairs? Perhaps he does not realize the importance of affording good accommodation on that part of the road. Passengers to and from Prince Edward Island pass over this portion of the road. It must be remembered that there is a large and growing tourist travel to Prince Edward Island. It is well known that the province is becoming, perhaps the best summer resort in Canada. It was first taken advantage of by the Americans, but now also by people from all parts of Canada. I have here a letter written by the late premier of the province in regard to this matter. This will show that I am not talking about this in any merely captious manner—the late Arthur Peters, premier of the province, thought it worth while to write to the Minister of Railways and Canals on this subject. The Steam Navigation Company of Prince Edward Island, which is subsidized by this government, put on the route some of the best boats in Canada—some of the best boats in America indeed, affording accommodation second to no passenger boats in the Dominion. Had this government fulfilled their share of the contract as well as the Steam Navigation Company has fulfilled its share, there would be no complaint. But, on this part of the road between Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene, there is very inferior accommodation. When a man has travelled by palace car from New York, Boston, Toronto, Ottawa or Montreal, he is not likely to be pleased if compelled to ride in a car in which all classes of people ride together. I will read what the late premier of Prince Edward Island said, and I hope the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham will take this matter more seriously.

Minister of Railways and Canals, Ottawa.

Sir,—The attention of the government of Prnce Edward Island has been called to the very unsatisfactory conditions of the Intercolonial Railway connection between Painsec Junction and Pointe Du Chene, over which most of the passengers, tourists, &c., from New Brunswick, the United States and western Canada have to travel when coming to this province. From information furnished to the government and which is known to be reliable, it appears that only one passenger car is provided between these two points to carry all classes of passengers and all kinds and conditions are huddled together—first class passengers (including ladies) being compelled to travel with Indians, Italians and filthy persons of all kinds, the car itself being frequently in a dirty state and utterly unfit for a passenger paying a first class fare to enter and to travel by.

This was addressed to the Minister of Railways and Canals two years ago, and I think it presents a condition that the minister must take into account. This is a state of affairs which interferes with the travelling public in coming to the province in the summer time, and I hope it is not going to continue. I would like the minister to say what he proposes, now that the tourist traffic is beginning for the season, to do to remedy this grievance. This letter is addressed to him by the premier of the province.

Mr. GRAHAM. What date?

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) Dated the 3rd November, 1906. I would like the minister to say what he is going to do with regard to it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think, if my hon. friend had read all of that return, he would have discovered that steps have been taken and that we have given instructions to remedy, in so far as possible, the train service, because it is very important and it carries a large tourist trade to, perhaps, the most beautiful summer resorts in the Dominion of Canada. We appreciate very highly the line from Painsec Junction to Pointe du Chêne and we have given instructions to remedy the conditions there, and we will see that they are carried out.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) That is very unsatisfactory to me. The minister says that the return which I have in my hand contains what the government is going to do. It is not what the return shows it is going to do, but what is it going to do? How many cars is the minister going to place upon that line? Is he going to place a sleeper on that section of road? It is all very well for the government to put me off by saying that they are going to do something; let the minister tell us what they are going to do.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend does not pretend that there has been nothing done for the improvement of that service. If he does he is wrong about that.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) What has been done?

Mr. GRAHAM. Better cars have been put on, and that is really the gist of the trouble. I think it would be unwise to say that we would put a chair car or a sleeping car on that branch of 14 miles. A first class car has been provided, and that is about all the accommodation that could be expected for that short distance.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) Is there a first class car and a second class car?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Boston train runs through without any break to the port, and I am not sure how many cars are on the other train. There are some times four and some times five and, I think, always more than one.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) The Minister of Railways and Canals, some time ago, in this House, told us that they were providing some motor cars to run on short lines, and I would like to know what progress has been made in regard to them?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have purchased four of these cars. I may say there is a difference of opinion and that negotiations are now proceeding between the brotherhoods and the management as to the manning of these cars, &c. Personally, I have been on one of these cars and I am inclined to think they will be very practical, but up to the present time we have run them in but two places—St. John and Halifax. We hope in a short time to have them in service.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) When the question was discussed in this House the idea was that two of them would be operated on two short lines in my province.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that will be the ultimate destiny of two motor cars.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) When will the ultimate destiny come ?

Mr. GRAHAM. When we can conclude certain negotiations now going on about the running of these cars. When we get those negotiations settled I think my hon. friend can rest assured that the proposition to put two motor cars on the island will be fully considered.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) What did these motor cars cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $17,000 each.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) What is the difference in the cost of operation as between a motor car and a train operated by steam power?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is one of the questions under discussion. It ought to decrease the running expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. When the minister talks about trouble as to the manning of these cars he seems to be very mysterious about it. What is the trouble? I think the House would like to know. The minister has had these cars for nearly two years. Sufficient experiments ought to have been made in two years' time to have enabled the government to come to a pretty satisfactory conclusion, to know how they are to be run and to judge as to whether they can be run as economically as cars operated by steam power. They have been running between St. John, Rothesay and Hampton. What has been the experience of them? I have seen them puffing around there and everybody staring at them, but nobody particularly riding on them and the general impression I got from train men was that they were a costly and not very useful luxury. We ought to have some conclusion that we could tie to.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that experience has shown that they will be more economical when we have them operating properly.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you not have them operating properly?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) used the word 'trouble.' I prefer not to call it that, but to call it a difference of opinion. We have been running a car at St. John and I think every person will agree that it has been a success there.

Mr. FOWLER. For how long a time did you run it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think for the whole of last summer. I know that they were running them when I was there last fall. The brotherhoods are inclined to think that they ought to be manned with a larger number of men than we think are necessary. That may look to be a small matter, but it is quite far-reaching. We want to start them on a proper basis, if possible. I think they will be a success eventually.

Mr. GANONG. How does the number of men you employed correspond with the number of men employed on American roads that are using a similar car?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am told that the American companies man their cars with one less man than our men think we ought to have on them. Of course, you can understand that there is a little prejudice against an innovation of this kind, and it is not so easy to have it running as smoothly as it might.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any additional expense entailed by reason of having an engine always ready to haul them into port? They seem to be like the old automobiles ; it was generally necessary to get a farmer with a yoke of oxen to haul them into town. The minister told my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin) that it

was the intention to unload two of them on to a branch road on Prince Edward Island. There would be no serious objection by the people living along the Intercolonial Railway to having two of them or perhaps the whole four put on the island. You might use one of them between Painsec and Shediac.

Mr. GRAHAM. They have petitioned for one there.

Mr. FOWLER. Better let them have it. To come from the ridiculous to the sublime; how many official cars have you?

Mr. GRAHAM. Does my hon. friend mean in connection with the road altogether?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will call them government official cars, there are six altogether.

Mr. FOWLER. By whom are they used?

Mr. GRAHAM. One by the general manager, one by the traffic manager, No. 109 by the Minister of Railways, No. 28 is used occasionally.

Mr. FOWLER. By whom?

Mr. GRAHAM. By the ministers and other people.

Mr. FOWLER. What do you mean by other people?

Mr. GRAHAM. Wait until I get through with the list—No. 139 is used by the deputy minister and by the Prime Minister occasionally when he requires it. The Ottawa is used by Mr. Schreiber consulting engineer when he makes official trips.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you keep that car fully equipped with a porter and all that sort of thing just to be used by Mr. Schreiber when he makes an official trip which is not very often?

Mr. GRAHAM. That car is used by Mr. Schreiber and occasionally by ministers when they require it. It is not kept specially for Mr. Schreiber although he does use it when he goes on his trips.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister looked any further into the question of charging tolls for passengers across the Fredericton and St. Marys Railway bridge? I brought the matter to his notice some time ago.

Mr. GRAHAM. We did take that matter up at the request of my hon. friend, but they are pretty slow in giving us a reply and I will jog their memory again.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). The former Minister of Railways said he would test the motor car service on two sections of the road in my province; one, the section between Lake Verde and Port Vernon and the other the section from Montague bridge to Cardigan. The present Minister of Railways has not carried out that promise. He is testing these cars somewhere in Nova Scotia and if they are a success we won't get them, but if they are not a success he will send them over to the island. If you had a motor car on the short spur between Port Vernon and Lake Verde you would save an hour in time. The minister apparently does not appreciate how slow his trains are on the island. From Murray Harbour to Charlottetown is 50 miles and it takes four or five hours to do that 50 miles. One of the reasons for the delay is this loop line. I hope the minister will devise some means to overcome that delay.

Mr. FOWLER. To return to the official car question—these six cars are exclusive of the Governor General's car and the Railway Commission car?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there porters attached to them all the time?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Supposing there is a tour of inspection by the Minister of Railways with some of his officials, who pays the cost of the up-keep of the car during the time it is running? Who pays for the eatables and drinkables? Of course water is cheap and we will confine the question to the eatables, presuming that there would not be anything on board but water. Who pays for the supplies?

Mr. GRAHAM. The ordinary travelling expenses are paid by the department. The minister himself pays anything above that.

Mr. FOWLER. What do you mean by the ordinary travelling expenses?

Mr. GRAHAM. The ordinary expenses on the car. After the official work is done I pay my own board.

Mr. FOWLER. Suppose the minister was to start from Ottawa to make a trip over the Intercolonial Railway accompanied by some of his officials, does the government pay the expenses connected with the food supply on that car?

Mr. GRAHAM. The department would pay the expenses of the minister and any of his staff when making an official visit, but if he had any guests with him the minister would pay their expenses himself.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister would pay the guests' expenses?

Mr. GRAHAM. I should think he would; I know I would.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister then has had no experience of that kind as yet so he is speaking theoretically.

Mr. GRAHAM. The minister has never taken any guests with him on one of these official trips except his own wife, outside of his staff, except from one station to another where perhaps some of the members might travel or perhaps I would ask persons with whom I was doing business to come from one station to another.

Mr. FOWLER. That would apply to the other officials too?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister ought to know whether the department in all cases pays the expenses incurred, that is all the expenses in connection with the upkeep of the car during the time the tour lasts, all supplies, &c., for the use of the official car are paid.

Mr. GRAHAM. The railway pays when the official is on official business, or any person is using the car on official business. Then the country pays and it ought to pay, but if it is being used on any other kind of business the users ought to pay it themselves and do, so far as I know. I have no intimation that they do not.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister or some of his officials ought to know. Suppose for instance the Minister of Agriculture should go on a junketing tour, would he pay the cost of the car?

Mr. GRAHAM. He would absolutely pay the cost of the car, every cent of it.

Mr. FOWLER. I know the Minister of Agriculture would want to.

Mr. FISHER. And does.

Mr. GANONG. The minister stated that there would be a surplus of $16,000 this year. It will surprise the country to learn that after the immense capital expenditure they have simply been able to squeeze out a $16,000 surplus. I am not living on the Intercolonial Railway, in fact I have only been on it once in two years. The statements I have heard in regard to the road are from people who travel it regularly, and if these statements are correct the article read by the member for York this morning was none too strong. It is not a question of $16,000 surplus or $160,000 surplus; it is a question of efficiency and safety. If what I hear is correct there is neither efficiency nor safety to-day on the Intercolonial Railway. I have perhaps been in a position to hear more of it than usual during the last six months as my home has been closed and when I have been there I have been staying at the hotels and have come in contact with the travellers, the men who do the great business of this country. You can scarcely talk to a traveller who will not admit that he is afraid to travel on the Intercolonial Railway. I asked one young man about three weeks ago and he shrugged his shoulder and said: Off again, on again, yours again Flannigan. He expressed his opinion of the road as he found it. I have found others who said they made it a rule, if at all possible, to return to Montreal and the west by the Canadian Pacific Railway. If these are facts it is time the country understood it. If the roadbed and equipment are in such shape that it is not safe to travel, the people should know it even if the government cannot force out more than a $16,000 surplus. We know it has been very difficult for the Intercolonial Railway in the last few months to keep up to time. The trains have been behind time almost every day and it is stated the reason is that the roadbed and equipment are not fit to run. It is also stated that the engineers and drivers have direct orders not to run over thirty-five miles an hour. I have heard these things from more than one source, I cannot vouch for the truth of the statements but I am giving the minister an opportunity to deny these reports if they are not well-founded.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have to say that the Intercolonial Railway will compare with any railway in the Dominion of Canada as to its accidents per mile. Its roadbed is equal to any other roadbed on the continent. I know as many commercial travellers possibly as any man in this House; I am very intimate with many of them for many reasons, and four out of five of the commercial men from this end of the country speak in the highest terms of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GANONG. The gentlemen with whom I talked were principally from points west of the maritime provinces.

Mr. GRAHAM. They must be east by west. If there is one class who speak highly of the Intercolonial Railway, it is the commercial travellers. As to rolling stock I think the Grand Trunk Railway has an average of 13 per cent of its motive power lying to one side for repairs. Ten per cent of motive power is a small percentage to be in for repairs. The Intercolonial Railway at the present time has between 8 per cent and 9 per cent of its motive power off duty for repairs. The management and the people are not afraid to compare the Intercolonial Railway with any other road. I know, of course, that there is a prejudice against a government-run road whatever party may be in power and the question of whether company management with larger rates and a different system of control is not the most satifactory is always a matter for debate, but at the present moment, so far as the rolling stock, roadbed and number of accidents are concerned, I am willing to have the Intercolonial Railway compared with any road on the continent.

Mr. GANONG. Have orders been issued not to run beyond thirty-five miles an hour?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a customary order on most well-run railways in this hard climate to restrict the rate of speed at the time of the year when the frost is coming from the ground.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not know that any member on either side of the House who travels on the Intercolonial Railway entertains the same opinion of that road as the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong).

Mr. GANONG. I have not expressed any opinion of my own.

Mr. LOGAN. My hon. friend has given some opinions which he has heard, although he himself has only been upon the road once in two years. If my hon. friend, who is a fair man, were to travel on the Intercolonial Railway as we do who live on it, he would not entertain such an erroneous opinion with reference to the road, not only as to rolling stock but as to roadbed. The roadbed of the Intercolonial Railway should be the pride of the people of Canada. Anybody who travels over other railways will realize that the roadbed is a level and sound roadbed, that it is kept up in good condition, and that it is a smoother road to ride on than other railroads, in Eastern Canada at any rate. As far as the service is concerned—the courtesy of the officers, the maintenance of the road and the general condition of the roads—it will compare favourably with any railway on the whole continent. I do not deny that there is a shortage of power, not for express trains, but for freight traffic, and there is some considerable necessity for increasing the rolling stock. As far as the express service of the road is concerned—and I can speak as one who uses the road very frequently—I would rather take the Intercolonial from Nova Scotia to Montreal than the Canadian Pacific Railway, even if it took two days to go by the Intercolonial to one day by the Canadian Pacific Railway. So superior is the one service over the other that if the people, in my part of the country at any rate, had to choose between the two, they would not hesitate to give the preference to the Intercolonial. If my hon. friend travelled on the road as much as I do, he would entertain an entirely different opinion and not believe all the stories he hears.

Mr. GANONG. I am simply giving the minister an opportunity to contradict these stories and have his contradictions put in print. I have no grievance against the Intercolonial Railway. I have simply stated facts which I could prove if necessary. I have asked the minister if he can controvert them and he has not seen fit to do so. Has he given an order that the trains shall only run thirty-five miles an hour?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend needs a reply again. I have told him once before that orders are given on all roads, at certain times of the year, in this very severe climate, to restrict the speed of the trains. If my hon. friend travels very much he will find that he frequently travels at a lesser speed than thirty-five miles an hour rather than faster.

Mr. GANONG. Possibly the order, like the letter which was read, was given by some official of the road.

Mr. CROCKET. Will the hon. minister state what amount was expended last year on repairs to the roadbed?

Mr. GRAHAM. On maintenance of way and structures there was expended $1,636,-950. That would include buildings.

Mr. CROCKET. How much this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. For the nine months of last year, $1,112,038, a little larger in proportion.

Mr. FOWLER. In making up your account do you take into consideration the depreciation of your rolling stock? What is the average life of a locomotive?

Mr. GRAHAM. About twenty to twenty-five years.

Mr. FOWLER. And a passenger car?

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps a little less.

Mr. FOWLER. In making up your account, by which you show a surplus of $18,-000, do you take into consideration the depreciation of your rolling stock?

Mr. GRAHAM. Railway accounts are not kept that way. We are supposed to spend a certain amount each year in keeping up our rolling stock. We make up in that way what we lose by depreciation. No railway company takes any cognizance of depreciation in the value of its rolling stock because that is offset by the expenditure on maintenance and repairs.

Mr. FOWLER. If the life of a locomotive is twenty-five years, that would be 4 per cent on the cost which you would have to expend.

Mr. GRAHAM. This includes four new locomotives.

Mr. FOWLER. If you have 370 locomotives, and the life of each is twenty-five years, you would need to buy nine new ones in addition to the amount spent on repairs, to offset your yearly depreciation. Last year you only got four new ones and you have used up nine. That would mean five locomotives short, and if a locomotive is worth $12,000, that would be a shortage of $60 000. Where then is your surplus?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is altogether too intricate. If this $700,000 repairs

or an amount approximating, is spent yearly, a locomotive will last more than twenty five years. Some of these repairs practically amount to rebuilding the locomotive, and you cannot apply to such a locomotive the twenty-five years limitation. Three-fourths of our repaired locomotives are practically new.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister then misled me when he said that the life of a locomotive was twenty-five years. Surely he does not mean that a locomotive will last twenty-five years straight away without any repairs. What he must mean is that twenty-five years is the average life, when kept in repair. A farmer, who keeps his farm wagon in repair, would be able to run it for twenty-five years, but at the end of that term it is probably no good. If he did not keep it in repair, he could not run it that long. So it must be with a locomotive. Has the minister made a fair allowance for depreciation having regard to the fact that the life of a locomotive is twenty-five years, and that consequently he requires to have nine new locomotives every year?

The minister said it was a matter of bookkeeping. It certainly is. And this whole surplus is entirely a matter of bookkeeping. What is true of the locomotives is true of the passenger and freight car: and the only way by which you can reasonably figure out a surplus is by making an allowance, the same as every other road does, for depreciation of your rolling stock. But the minister buys locomotives and charges them up to capital. I venture to say that the amount charged to capital on the Intercolonial is at least three times what the rolling stock is worth. And that goes on accumulating, because no proper allowance has been made for depreciation of rolling stock in years past.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister has not yet stated the number of new locomotives purchased for the year ending March 31, 1908.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) is perfectly correct in the explanation he has given of what ought to be charged to capital and what to revenue. There are on the Intercolonial, I understand, 370 locomotives. Now, the life of a locomotive is twenty years—that is the time allowed by railways generally. In other words, five per cent of the locomotives need to be replaced each year. In the case of the Intercolonial, there ought to be eighteen new locomotives bought. But, in order to make a good showing, almost all the locomotives are charged to capital account. There are only four locomotives on the Intercolonial charged to revenue, where there ought to be eighteen. The life of a locomotive, the life of a rail, the life of a car—all these things are perfectly well known, and, unless you make the requisite charge to revenue for depreciation, you do not know really where you stand. As a result of the government's method of book-keeping, you have a surplus this year of some hundreds——

Mr. GRAHAM. Of $16,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, $16,000. And this is after the bright promises that were made by the minister's predecessor, and of the charge of $4,380,000 to capital account.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does not the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) think we had better get rid of the road?

Mr. HAGGART. Better manage it properly.

Mr. GERMAN. How did you manage it?

Mr. HAGGART. I did manage it properly. I had no such charges to capital account as you see to-day. I would like to know the receipts and expenditures of the last two months. The minister tells us that there is a loss of $180,000 on receipts. How do these receipts and expenditures compare with those of the same two months last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have not the statement of expenditure for the last two months. As ex-minister the hon. gentleman knows that, in the regular routine, we do not get these figures so soon. I have a statement merely that the receipts have fallen off.

Mr. HAGGART. You have the figures for April and May?

Mr. GRAHAM. The receipts, but not the expenditure. That is, I gave an approximate statement of the receipts, but we have not the detailed statement.

Mr. HAGGART. Why, within five days after the end of the month, the minister ought to have the receipts and expenditures. And, more than that, he ought to have from his officials an estimate of the receipts and expenditure of the next month. The officials ought to keep the minister informed on that subject. The minister asks us for the same amount as last year. Surely, he does not intend to keep up the same expenditure if the falling off in business is to be $800,000? He must reduce his estimate of expenditure. What is the estimate of expenditure for the year coming?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that it is impossible to make an estimate of the receipts from the present conditions. We hope they will improve, and are rather disappointed that there has been a falling off in the revenue for the last couple of months. As I have said, the difficulty of

this discussion is that we are dealing with more than one year. There is the year ending March 31, 1907, the report for which is before the House, then, there is the year ending 31st of March, 1908, the report of which is not before the House, and now my hon. friend wants me to discuss the current year. I cannot give him details which I have not myself.

Mr. HAGGART. But the minister is before the committee asking for $9,000,000 to carry on the Intercolonial for the current year.

Mr. FOSTER. And asking for the same amount as last year.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. And he ought to have the receipts and expenditures for the last two months, and also an estimate of the present month. And he ought to have an estimate for the year for which he is asking this $9,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The only way by which we can judge the business of this year is by the business of last year. Either the hon. gentleman or I, or any body else, can guess at what the business will be, but that is the only way we have of getting at it.

Mr. HAGGART. And yet we had the delightful promises of the minister's predecessor concerning the year just closed. On the basis of the information he had, he estimated a constantly increasing revenue, and a surplus of $700,000, $800,000 or $1,000,000. But I suppose all this work of imagination is finished and is not to go on under the present practical management. Still, the minister ought to be able to give us an estimate whether the revenue is likely to continue as it is or to improve. If there is to be an improvement he ought to tell us about when it may be expected to begin and how it is likely the road will stand at the end of the year.

Mr. FOWLER. In view of what has occurred in the minister's constituency, he must naturally feel depressed and not in a condition of mind to give the sort of statement the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) desires. If conditions had been different in Brockville and throughout Ontario, perhaps the minister would have told us that he would have a surplus of a million and a half next year. Now, I would like to ask the minister the number of first-class cars he has on the Intercolonial, the number of second-class cars and also freight cars, baggage cars, coal cars and flats.

Mr. GRAHAM. This return is up to the 31st of March, 1907, the latest we have. Locomotives, 370 ; first-class sleepers, 40 ; second-class sleepers, 38; parlour cars, 9 ; dining cars, 8; first-class passenger, 137 ; second-class passenger, 97 ; postal and smoking cars, 36 ; express and baggage cars, 60; box cars, 5,596; refrigerator cars, 909; platform cars, 2,780 ; pulp wood cars, 50; oil tank cars, 25; hopper cars, 1,114; coal cars, 471; stock cars, 123; auxiliary and tool cars, 21; convertible dump cars, 130; vans, 119.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, will the minister give me the average life of each of these classes of cars ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I could not give that information definitely. The average life, I imagine, taking all the cars together, would be 20 or 25 years. I am told there are some cars in the service that have lasted 40 years.

Mr. FOWLER. Estimating the average life of a passenger car at 25 years, you have 137 first-class cars, that would be about six cars a year. How many first-class passenger cars did you charge to maintenance?

Mr. GRAHAM. While the deputy is getting the figures, I may say that we spent $310,214 out of revenue.

Mr. FOWLER. That was for repairs.

Mr. GRAHAM. The deputy will get more definite information. On repairs to freight cars, $310,214. This plan has been adopted by the management and the department. Of course the question of capital and revenue is one that we might discuss for weeks and weeks. You may discuss it with any railway on this continent and you will find the same adverse opinion. When railways do a good business there is more to expend out of revenue. We are trying to arrive at a basis by which we would get rid of this yearly discussion as to what should be charged to capital and what to revenue account. A year ago last April we adopted the method of charging each month up to betterment the sum of $25,000; to maintenance and equipment each month, $3,000. We hope in time this will adjust itself so that we may not have the same kind of discussion as to capital and revenue.

Two locomotives—switching.

The following cars were rebuilt in the shops at Moncton: 9 box, 11 platform, 1 oil tank, 2 coal—20 tons.

50 platform cars were fitted with racks for carrying pulpwood.

211 60,000-pound box cars were fitted with end doors for loading rails, making 579 cars in all fitted in the shops to the end of March.

Mr. FOWLER. That is just putting doors in.

Mr. GRAHAM. The following cars were practically rebuilt:

9 box, 11 platform, 1 oil tank, 2 coal—20 tons.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Carried.

Mr. FOWLER. No it is not; we have not got the information. What new passenger cars were bought?

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave my hon. friend all the information I find in the report for 1907.

Mr. FOWLER. Then that means that for the year 1907 there were no new first class cars. There were 137 passenger cars in use and from the statement which the minister has just given us as to the life of a passenger car there should have been added six new cars. None was added. What is the value of a passenger car? We are looking at this elusive surplus and trying to locate it.

Mr. GRAHAM. About $18,000 or $19,000.

Mr. FOWLER. We should have had six new ones and, taking it at the lowest figure, $108,000 more of this surplus is gone. There was only $16,000 to start with, and if we take ten locomotives out of it at $12,000 apiece, that is $120,000, and six new passenger cars at $18,000 make $108,000, so that there are $228,000 gone out of your $16,000. Were there any new second class cars added?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. FOWLER. How many second class cars were there?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there were 97.

Mr. FOWLER. Would a second class car last as long as a first class car—scarcely?

Mr. GRAHAM. Scarcely.

Mr. FOWLER. We will say 20 years for that. That would be 5 per cent each year and that would represent five new cars. What is the value of a second class passenger car?

Mr. GRAHAM. Between $14,000 and $15,000.

Mr. FOWLER. There is $70,000 more; that is, in round numbers, $300,000 gone out of your $16,000. What is the life of a box car?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is getting into the intricacies of car building. It is somewhere between 15 and 20 years.

Mr. FOWLER. How many of these box cars were there again?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have given the hon. gentleman the statement from the report. If he will refer to page 103 he will find the figures.

Mr. FOWLER. Thirty-six postal smoking cars. What is the average life of a postal smoking car?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine they will average the same as the rest.

Mr. FOWLER. Say 25 years. Putting the cost at $15,000, that is $315,000. Express and baggage cars, 60; what would be the average life of this car—20 years?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have told my hon. friend several times, but for his purpose he can take 20 years for them all.

Mr. FOWLER. If we take 20 years that would be three new cars, and what would be the value of an express baggage car?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $7,000.

Mr. FOWLER. That would be $21,000. That is $336,000 gone out of your surplus already. Box cars; what is the average life of a box car? Call it 20 years and there are in round numbers 6,000 of them. That would be 300 box cars to be added each year. How many did you add out of revenue?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will find the whole statement at page 102.

Mr. FOWLER. There were nine added. These were not new cars, they were rebuilt cars. That would not be really worth the full amount of a new car.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will have to look out or he will get tangled in his logic about locomotives if he does not take these as practically new cars.

Mr. FOWLER. Not at all, it will be the minister who will get tangled as to the life of a locomotive.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not at all; it depends upon the point of view.

Mr. FOWLER. Not at all. As a matter of fact these rebuilt cars are not the same as new cars, but we will take them as being the same as new cars, and you have your 291 of a depreciation. What is the value of a box car?

Mr. GRAHAM. $990.

Mr. FOWLER. Call it $1,000 on 290; that would be $290,000 more. That will be $336,000 plus $290,000 out of your surplus. Taking 20 years as the average life of a refrigerator car you have added five of them at a cost of about $8,000. Your large platform cars would cost an average of about $850 each, you have 2,780 of these cars and you rebuilt 11 which we will be generous and say are equal to 10 new cars, and therefore your depreciation on these platform cars would amount to about $126,000. Take that out of your $16,000 surplus and what is left. Then you have 1,114 hopper cars with an average life of 20 years and you did not add on any, and hence we will call that 55 hopper cars at $550 a car which would make about $27,000. The minister will notice how fair I am in giving him the benefit of every doubt in these calculations.

Mr. GRAHAM. The figures are fair but the argument is all wrong.

Mr. FOWLER. I don't think it is.

Mr. GRAHAM. You could not apply it to any railway in the world.

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, yes, you can, you will find an article in the last 'Harpers' Magazine' which shows how this matter is regarded by other railways, and which will prove that it is the practice of other railways. There are 17 Gondola coal cars and 171 other coal cars at an average of about $500 each which would give you a basis of 24 cars to figure on, which would be worth $12,000, and that you take almost the whole surplus for the depreciation of coal cars alone. Then there are 900 stock cars worth about $500 each, and you have auxiliary and tool cars and convertible dump cars which would be worth about $500 each. But taking the whole thing the depreciation of rolling stock would total up about $808,000 on your road for one year.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the cost of the new steel coal cars ?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $1,600 for a 50 ton car.

Mr. FOWLER. If an honest and business like account had been kept showing the profit, and the real depreciation on the rolling stock, a depreciation which should be met every year out of your revenue, instead of having a surplus of $16,000 you would have had a deficit of nearly $800,000. That is the real condition of affairs. In order to put that road at the end of 1907 in the condition it was at the end of 1906 in the matter of rolling stock; in order to make up for the depreciation of your rolling stock between the 31st March, 1906, and the 31st March, 1907, you should have expended absolutely out of revenue $800,000 more than you did, to say nothing of the new rolling stock which must be required on account of the extension of new business and which might fairly enough be charged to capital. I repeat, and I emphasize it that you should have expended in the year 1907 about $800,000 more out of revenue than you did to keep your rolling stock in the same condition as it was in 1906, and in the calculation I have given you the benefit of the doubt in every case and have calculated most generously in favour of the management of the railway. Therefore the Intercolonial instead of having a surplus of $16,000 at the end of the year has a deficit of $792,000 and I challenge the Minister of Railways or any gentleman sitting behind him to controvert these figures. I say that what I have pointed out is the business experience of all railways. The result is that to-day we have charged up to capital account rolling stock to an amount more than double, I believe three times, the actual value of the rolling stock upon the Intercolonial Railway. That is the condition of affairs and I do not see why the minister is not ready to meet it fairly, instead of saying my argument is not in accord with the facts in regard to other railways. Railways are run as business propositions and that is the only business way of looking at it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Railways are run as business propositions but not according to the proposition of my hon. friend. No railway makes up its accounts as he says. They may approximate it but he cannot find any railway on the continent that does it year after year, magazine articles, notwithstanding. In a good year railways expend liberally out of revenue but when the year is not so good they expend more liberally out of capital. Sometimes they raise money by issuing bonds, &c. If the member inquires he will find that is true. As I said, we did start on the 1st of April last year laying aside $25,000 a month in order to equalize, as far as possible, the expenditure between revenue and capital. Let me point out what has been done. We have spent more than $25,000 a month out of revenue in 1907-1908.

Mr. FOWLER. If I am wrong why should you ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member is wrong because he is extreme.

Mr. FOWLER. Well you are doing something along that line.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not to that extent and no railway on the continent does.

Mr. FOWLER. If we did it at all we should pay all possible out of revenue.

Mr. GRAHAM. In 1907-1908 we have purchased 166 60,000-pounds box cars at $990 each, $156,400 ; 130 hopper cars, $73,060 ; five refrigerator cars, $7,950 ; 100 flats, $87,000 ; 9 stock cars, $81,000 ; 8 conductors' vans $13,120 ; one dining car from the Pullman Company, $27,150 ; one sleeper, $19,500 ; two express cars, $14,000 ; two postal cars, $17,350 four locomotives, ten wheel standard passenger locomotives, and on these we have paid $23,600. Thus in 1907-1908 we have paid out of revenue for the things I have read $443,467.50.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be but was that enough ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it was plenty.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister has admitted the whole case.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not at all.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, because you have admitted the principle.

Mr. GRAHAM. You can carry a principle to an extreme. The hon. member

takes a certain set of figures and argues from them. I can argue him out of doors, I can turn any man in Canada into a bankrupt in fifteen minutes, if I am allowed to lay down my own figures.

Mr. FOWLER. I was practically allowing the minister to make the figures. I was only making the additions and multiplications.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend cannot apply his argument to any railway as he seeks to apply it to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOWLER. I say that is the way every other railway is conducted as a matter of fact. Would the stock of any railway be worth anything on the market if it was necessary for the railway, in order to keep up the rolling stock, to borrow from capital?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Grand Trunk last year paid for 455 box cars and 55 furniture cars out of capital account.

Mr. FOWLER. Because they were increasing their mileage.

Mr. GRAHAM. Where has the Grand Trunk increased its mileage in order to get the cars ?

Mr. FOWLER. So far as that is concerned, I say that no railway could possibly buy that out of capital account and keep up its rolling stock.

Mr. GRAHAM. They did it last year.

Mr. FOWLER. The thing is absurd on the face of it.

Mr. GRAHAM. But they did it.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. GRAHAM. You said any railway and I gave the Grand Trunk.

Mr. FOWLER. I started with the statement that it might be necessary to take money from capital account to build rolling stock if there was an increased traffic on the road which required additional rolling stock and that is what occurred with the Grand Trunk Railway. But I defy the minister to show where the Grand Trunk Railway paid from capital account to keep up the ordinary rolling stock.

Mr. GRAHAM. Nor have we. We had an increase in traffic and we bought more rolling stock.

Mr. FOWLER. But you have gone back in your traffic.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is only in the last few months, and so has the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. FOWLER. According to your report you did not require additional power last year. If you had shown that your traffic had increased and consequently it was necessary to get additional rolling stock over and above what the road was supplied with, you would have an answer, but you have not shown anything of the kind, because in 1907 you did not buy any additional cars. You did not buy a single passenger car. You repaired some box and freights and that is all you did.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. FOWLER. I am taking the report here.

Mr. GRAHAM. I read from revenue and that is what the report says. You take the other line of argument and say if the Grand Trunk wants new rolling stock or new business they can buy it from capital. That is what we did. We increased our rolling stock in 1906-1907 not out of revenue but out of capital as the Grand Trunk Railway did.

Mr. FOWLER. You bought 20 new locomotives charged to capital account, increased equipment. If that were necessary on account of increased traffic on the road it would be all right. I did not discuss that point, I was taking the stock you had and showing what you had done in the way of keeping it up from revenue.

Mr. GRAHAM. That has nothing to do with the argument.

Mr. FOWLER. It has. I put exactly on the same plane as the 200 or 400 additional box cars that the Grand Trunk bought by reason of increased traffic, 20 locomotives, 3 locomotives for switching and 115 hopper cars. On account of your increased traffic you bought these but what did you charge to revenue ? Nine box cars, 11 platform cars, one oil tank and 2 coal cars. The others were repairs, fitting flat cars with racks for pulpwood, &c. Where you had increased traffic and by reason of that required more rolling stock, you would have a right to charge that to capital account and I find no fault with that. I laid down that principle when I was making my argument, but when it came to replace the cars you had in the beginning of 1906, at the beginning of 1907-1908 I claim that you did not make the replacement and that your stock was depreciated by nearly $800,000. Those are facts the minister cannot get away from.

Mr. CROCKET. The Minister of Railways, when he made his annual statement to the House, spoke of the claims department, and said it was the intention of the department, as I understood him, to reorganize that department of the service.

Is there any further statement to be made on that subject?

Mr. GRAHAM. The reason I made that statement as to the claims department is that an amendment was moved to the law applied to the government railway, bringing accidents occurring on that road more into line with those on ordinary railways, so far as claims are concerned. But I have been so busy since the session opened that I have not been able to do what I intended in regard to the matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) will see that it opens up a new avenue as to suits to be taken against the government, for the evidence needed under the old Act was considerably different from that under the new. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I think it was, brought in an amendment that has gone through the Senate, and, in face of that, I thought we would have to reorganize the claims department. I intend to pay some attention to the matter later on.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Something certainly ought to be done, because if a person has a claim it is apt to be referred to the claims department at Moncton, and it is months before one seems to be able to get an answer from that office. I think the minister ought to put men in there who know their business. The men who are in there may know their business, but if so they are very dilatory.

Mr. CROCKET. At the time to which I refer the minister also stated that he expected to be able to make an announcement to the House with respect to a number of claims standing against the department at the time. I understood that there were many claims concerning which there was no liability under the law as it stood before the amendment to which the minister referred, but which he proposes to open in view of the change of the law, and that he expected before the end of the season to submit a proposal to parliament for their settlement.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know that I would quite call it an 'announcement.' I have been looking into these claims for accidents along the line, cattle killed and that kind of thing.

Mr. FOWLER. People injured?

Mr. FOSTER. Baggage lost?

Mr. GRAHAM. The baggage lost comes under another department and we are trying to reorganize that. Since I made my brief statement in the House, I have received innumerable claims. I am having these compiled. All of them, possibly, will not be good, but some of them may. Looking at it from a financial standpoint, my personal view is in favour of not standing upon the technicalities of the law in these matters. If some person has suffered loss, and it is the government's fault, the government ought not to shield itself behind the technicality. That is the way I feel about it. When I have these claims compiled and am able to size up the list, I shall be in a better position to make a statement.

Mr. CROCKET. Who is in charge of the claims department?

Mr. GRAHAM. Freight claims—Mr. Cameron.

Mr. CROCKET. But there is an officer called, I think, 'chief claims agent'; has there been an appointment made to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Allan?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Layton is doing the work temporarily; there has been no permanent appointment.

Mr. CROCKET. Is Mr. Layton a lawyer? Or what qualifications does he possess for the performance of these duties?

Mr. GRAHAM. I hope my hon. friend will not think I am trying to be facetious about lawyers. I understand that the gentleman is not a lawyer. I may be wrong, but I think that in the settlement of claims such as these, in nine times out of ten, a little practical, hard-headed sense is better as a means of settlement that expert legal knowledge—though the two together would be good.

Mr. HAGGART. They do not generally go together.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would hardly go so far as that. But I have perhaps a peculiar idea as to the settlement of these things. I think that a shrewd business man who is in touch with the conditions would be as competent as a legal man to settle these claims.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it not a fact that the department requires legal advice for the proper settlement of all claims.

Mr. GRAHAM. In case of a question of legal liability, we have a law branch of our department, and that is referred to as a general thing.

Mr. CROCKET. When was Mr. Layton appointed?

Mr. GRAHAM. A couple or three months ago, I think.

Mr. CROCKET. At what salary?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the figure before me. I think it is a little less than that of the former occupant of the office. I will give the information to-morrow.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this the same gentleman who was business manager of the St. John 'Sun'?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am sure I do not know.

Mr. CROCKET. Where did he reside?—what county was he taken from?

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand he lived in Woodstock.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to ask the minister once more in regard to a point about which I have been inquiring for six months—the connection of the Intercolonial with the Quebec Central at Lévis. I do not want to annoy the minister about this, but I think he should take the subject into consideration as well as any other. I have been waiting six months and I think I ought to have a reply and that some action ought to be taken in the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) that no question of annoyance arises, because I think the minister is here to be used, in reason, in all these affairs. I took the matter up with the Quebec Central and had some correspondence about it. But we have been unable, so far as the minister is concerned, to bring about the result the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morin) would like. Speaking from my recollection of the correspondence, I think the trains usually make the connection in time for the passengers, but occasionally they miss it. The Intercolonial train is a through train, and in my dealings with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk, or any other road, I have—and I think fairly—taken the ground that we should not do anything that can reasonably be avoided to interfere with the running of through trains on time. The through train has connections to make at both ends, and we ought not to hamper it for local purposes and endanger those connections. Passengers going across the continent take these trains and depend upon making their connections at Montreal, Detroit and Chicago. For that reason, the Intercolonial Railway being a thorough train, we try to keep our trains on time, and if we were to make any more stops we would have to make the maritime express practically a local instead of a through train. If my hon. friend has any more complaint to make about it, he would do well to refer to the Railway Commission or I will refer it myself. I have told him about all the correspondence I had with the commission.

Mr. MORIN. I wish to speak to the minister about the connection of passenger trains at Harlaka Junction. Harlaka Junction is four and a quarter miles from Lévis East on the Intercolonial Railway. The Quebec Central Railway trains running from Sherbrooke to Lévis have to stop at that junction before they can get the right of way to go on to Lévis. When the Quebec Central Railway train reaches Harlaka Junction, the engineer has to go to the office in order to get permission to go on to Lévis. Very often the telegraph operator tells him that the Halifax train has not yet left St. Charles junction, which is nine miles from Harlaka junction. Then we have to wait at Harlaka junction until the Halifax train covers these nine miles, after which she goes on ahead to Lévis. So that we cannot leave Harlaka junction until the Halifax train has left Lévis for Montreal. If we want to go to Montreal, we cannot catch the Halifax train which has gone ahead, but have to wait from one o'clock in the afternoon until nine in the evening. That is in the winter time. All you need to do, to remedy this, is to leave Lévis five minutes later than your schedule time, which will give time for the Quebec Central train to get there and make connection with the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. When you get to Lévis in the winter, the Quebec Central mails are piled up on the trucks at one o'clock, and they have to remain there until nine o'clock in the evening instead of going immediately ahead to Montreal, so that the people between Lévis and Montreal, instead of getting their mails that day, only get them the next day. I spoke to the minister about it and also to the commissioners. The commissioners told me that they have no control over the Intercolonial, but that if the minister would give them control they would have the matter fixed up in one minute because that could be very easily done. I made a draft showing them the location of the country. I do not know whether the minister does not want to make the alteration, but the change is none the less required.

Mr. GRAHAM. Has that occurred lately?

Mr. MORIN. Probably in January.

Mr. GRAHAM. We took the matter up then, and I am informed that the superintendent issued orders that when the Quebec Central Railway was ahead of the maritice express it should run into Lévis and not be detained at Harlaka Junction. That does away with his complaint.

Mr. STANFIELD. Of course with the curtailment of business on the railway, a large number of men have had to be laid off on the Intercolonial, as on other roads, —conductors, engineers, brakesmen and others. Conductors who have been on the road for years are put back to braking, brakesmen are put back on specials, and special men are laid off. We all admit that when business is poor, we have to curtail, but I do not think it fair that this curtailment should be confined to these men. If my memory serves me right, some years ago when the business of the railway increased considerably, a large number of officials were added, and I think that if this rule is to work for the one class, it should be made to work for the both. If you have to lay off the working men, you should lay off some of the petty officials whom you put on when business is good. All I ask is a square deal for the man who draws a small salary and that you should lay off some of the officials who are still drawing full pay

and travelling about at the country's expense.

Mr. LOGAN. What officials should be laid off?

Mr. STANFIELD. I can take the book and tell you some.

Mr. CROCKET. How many officials are there in the claims branch ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not seem to have the information here.

Mr. CROCKET. Can he say what proportion of this sum he is asking for to-day is for wages?

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave a while ago the amount of the working expenses for 1907, as something over $4,000,000. We have not got the details. I have not got a complete list of the employees. When you come to working expenses, it is like an office staff running a business. You have a certain staff, and if the work declines, perhaps you could do it for a little less, but you have to keep your organization intact.

Mr. STANFIELD. Who is the inspector of coal and what are his duties?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot tell who he is.

Mr. STANFIELD. The one I have in mind was a barber. Why can he not be laid off and some engineer appointed who knows more about coal than a barber does?

Mr. GRAHAM. Engineers are a highly paid class of men, and I imagine they would not care to take a position of that kind.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the department putting on the Ocean Limited this summer, between Halifax and Montreal?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Ocean Limited is not altogether encouraging so far as traffic is concerned, but we expect to put in on about July 5.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you an inspector of stationery now?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there is no person bearing that title.

Mr. FOWLER. I think there was one. I think it was necessary to get rid of the gentleman who was purchasing agent, and a new position was created called the inspector of stationery, and this gentleman was appointed thereto. The position carried with it I think $2,000 a year.

Mr. GRAHAM. That office is abolished, and the occupant is enjoying the benefits of the provident fund organized by the men.

Mr. FOWLER. Why was that important office created, and why was it abolished?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a matter of ancient history, and I cannot tell. It was created and abolished some time before I came on the scene. I suppose it was abolished because the office was no longer required.

Mr. FOWLER. Would that mean that all the stationery that was going to be required the next ten years was bought under this gentleman's regime? I cannot understand why the situation was created, just what an inspector of stationery had to do. An hon. gentleman here suggests that there was an inspector of window washing. There are inspectors of all sorts of things, particularly about election times. The minister must not shelter himself behind the fact that he has only recently joined the department.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to place that straight. I have never done that and never will. The hon. gentleman should not make that insinuation.

Mr. FOWLER. I was not saying it in any harsh way, I was saying in a very good natured way, because one could scarcely be ill natured with the minister, he is the very soul of good nature himself. Now it does seem to me that we ought to have a little more information with respect to the need for the creation of this office. When we have a list of these different officials, I think we will find others quite as remarkable as that of inspector of stationery and inspector of window washing. I hope the minister will not fail to bring down a list, with the full titles of the different officers.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister told us this afternoon, in reply to a question with respect to keeping accounts, that it was impossible for him to give the latest monthly receipts and expenditures. He could give the receipts, but it was impossible to give the expenditures for the month of April and the month of May, implying that it took a long period of time to get in the returns. Now I suppose the system of the Intercolonial is kept on the modern railway basis. I understood that the Intercolonial to-day claims that it has just as good form of accounts, just as up to date a system, as the great railways in the United States and Canada. Take the Canadian Pacific railway for instance. The minister knows that the weekly earnings and expenses of the Canadian Pacific railway are given out, and we find them in the financial and trade papers. I do not think it is more than ten days after the expiry of the week when you find a statement of the Canadian Pacific Railway expenditures and income for the week. I suppose that probably about ten days elapse after the end of the week before the statement is published. Now what is there to prevent the minister of the Intercolonial from giving these statements not longer than ten days after expiration of the week? And especially, what is to prevent him from giving us the April statement now, on the 9th June, or the May statement, on the 9th of June? Under a new minister

and under a practically new deputy we had got the idea that we were going to get the Intercolonial run on the very best basis possibly in the matter of accounting and the strictness with which the accounts are kept. What is the difficulty that the minister finds in not being able to give us weekly statements if we ask for them ten days from the end of the week?

Mr. GRAHAM. We can give you weekly statements of the earnings of the road.

Mr. FOSTER. And of your expenditure?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure that my hon. friend is right as to a weekly statement of the expenditure. But we can give the weekly earnings. The routine is this: The pay-rolls are not all returned from the different places to the head office at Moncton until after the 15th of the month. We lay down the rule that we must have the returns of the last month on the 25th of the following month. I can give the hon. gentleman the statement for April, and I can give him the statement for May on the 25th June.

Mr. FOSTER. It takes twenty-five days after the end of the month before you receive the exact statement of the expenditures here at the office?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the head office in a way, and it is not the head office.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, at the minister's office?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And it is impossible under your regulations to get this statement sooner unless you urge your officials outside to accelerate their operations by a number of days which would bring it so many days sooner to the minister. It seems to me that with your continuous system twenty-five days is a long while to wait to get in your returns of the expenditures.

Mr. GRAHAM. It might possibly be done in a shorter time by hiring a larger staff, but I am told that the Grand Trunk system is the same.

Mr. FOWLER. What is your pay-day?

Mr. GRAHAM. The fifteenth.

Mr. FOSTER. What has the department been doing, within the last two years, in relation to the reorganization of its system of accounting so as to put the Intercolonial Railway on exactly the same basis as the great railways of the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that our system of accounting is now the same as that of the great railways of the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. I took the trouble a few months ago to get all the reports of the commission in the United States, and I read over the interesting bulletins published as to how they have gradually gone about the work of getting a proper system of accounting in order that every species of expense might be definitely set out, each under its own heading, and I may say it was most interesting though it was a laborious process. They have co-operated with the railway companies themselves. They have not gone on the assumption that they had all the wisdom that enabled them to adopt a form of accounting and have it absolute from the first. They blocked out their system, got into communication with the railway association of the United States and between the two of them they have passed this series of suggestions and propositions, both working loyally together, the commission stating that the railways have co-operated with them splendidly and with the utmost loyalty. But, when you come up to the end of it, what they propose to get at is that the wayfaring shareholder may know, from the reports of a railway company, just whether it is acting loyally in the way of allocating its expenses; first, to get what is to be charged to maintenance out of revenue, what, if anything, is to be charged to maintenance out of capital, what new work may properly be charged to revenue and what new work may and must be charged to capital. With reference to the exact percentage of depreciation they have not arrived at the present time, at a scientific method of calculating the amount but that is what they are all working up to, as I understand it. A government railway has this constant temptation; there is a bag always near by into which the minister may dip his hand and consequently there is not the same carefulness in keeping the proper proportion of the charges for the maintenance of the road out of revenue, and there is a constant temptation to make a good showing to parliament by endeavouring to take expenditures of this kind out of one category and put them into another. I am glad to hear the minister say this afternoon that they were trying gradually to get this matter into such a position on the Intercolonial Railway that they may eliminate any doubt as to the plan of accounts, and so that we can all know whether an expenditure for maintenance is charged properly to revenue and that expenditures are only charged to capital when they should be charged to capital. I hope that the minister will persevere in that until we get to the time when the two men on the opposite sides of the House can go to the railway accounts and satisfy themselves that the thing is actually being done on a business basis and that there is no attempt to charge expenditures to capital which should be charged to revenue. Am I right in saying that the great railways of the United States lay down practically this rule? The building of this road is charged to capital, the interest on construction while it is being built, is charged

to capital, the equipment is charged to capital; the road is not running, there is nothing coming in and there is nothing else to charge it to but to capital. Now, the road is finished on a certain date. You have paid for the road, your station houses, your terminals, your side-tracking and your rolling stock out of capital. From that time on every breakage in the rolling stock, the wear and tear of the road must be made good out of the revenue of the road. Am I right in that or not? If I am wrong then the fundamental position needs to be revised, but that is what I have got from my reading and I believe it to be at the present time the rule of all the great roads. Will the minister tell me if I am right in that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have been reading up this subject myself as my hon. friend will understand and I have learned something about it. The companies do not pretend to try to maintain any number of cars, but they are aiming at maintaining the tonnage of their rolling stock.

Mr. FOSTER. In efficiency?

Mr. GRAHAM. In efficiency, practically. My hon. friend was talking about the number of cars, but you cannot discuss it from the point of view of the number of cars, because the cars that may be built are very much larger than the cars they displace. The idea is to keep up the efficiency and tonnage.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, we will consider the matter according to that. Therefore the road has to have a percentage of the different classes of rolling stock put on each year out of revenue sufficient to keep up the efficiency. The minister is right in that. You might have three box cars one year and you might have next year a box car which has double the capacity. You may double the efficiency by increasing the power of your locomotives but all depreciation must be met out of the revenue of the road, so as to keep it up to its standard efficiency. If you require rolling stock for additional mileage of road that goes to capital unless you have abundant revenue and you wish to take it out of revenue. If there is great increase of traffic the extra rolling stock to accommodate it is taken out of capital, but out of revenue must be taken what is necessary to maintain its efficiency after you procure it. That is the proper principle and the minister has failed to show that he conducts his road on that scientific basis. The minister has also failed to show the House that he took sufficient out of the revenues of the road to maintain its efficiency by providing for loss and depreciation. It would be the best thing that could happen the railway if the policy I have set out were rigorously adhered to, and that no matter what the deficit should be that the minister could show what the railroad actually costs us. That has not been done in the past. The minister would have the support of the country if he put his railway on that basis even if he faced a deficit which he would explain to the country so that the country might come to a conclusion as to what was best to do.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the Auditor General's Report page W—37 there is an expenditure of $5,406.90, for Mr. Schreiber and engineers in connection with the National Transcontinental Railway western division, and amongst other items there is $261 for supplies for the private car of Mr. Schreiber. What has the government got to do with paying expenses on the National Transcontinental Railway western division?

Mr. GRAHAM. The government guarantees the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific for the western division and we have an inspecting engineer with his staff to see that the road is constructed up the standard, and on his report the securities are released by the government to the company. This is for the pay of Mr. Schreiber and his staff.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the Transcontinental Railway reimburse the government for this outlay?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have to undertake this work for our own defense to see that the contract is properly carried out.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the minister now tell me how many locomotives were purchased in the year ending 31st March, 1908?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not remember that any were purchased but I know some were delivered. I will get the information later.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the minister reducing the grades on the Intercolonial Railway to a modern standard?

Mr. GRAHAM. All we have recently done is where we are double tracking from Moncton to Painsec junction. Of course the question of reducing the grades is a very important one.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is absolutely necessary.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have some large grades but it is a big question and one which concerns the solution of the transportation problem.

Mr. DANIEL. I see by the Auditor General's Report that $3,751,694 were expended in purchasing supplies for the Intercolonial Railway during the year, and in looking over the names of those who supply these goods I can find none who are not politically the friends of the present government. It may be considered fair by the government to buy exclusively from their political friends, but I think it may be looked upon that it is not entirely a just method

of conducting business in connection with a railway which belongs to the people of Canada as a whole and not to the people of one political party. Among those expenditures I find quite a large amount for advertising, but the advertisements appear to be published only in papers supporting the present government. Even if it was considered that the Intercolonial Railway was a fair pasture for the supporters of the government to feed in, what sort of business sense is there in confining the advertising of excursions and the time tables of the Intercolonial Railway, which are for the purpose of inducing as many people as possible to travel by that road, in papers going to only one-half of the people? If these excursions, for instance, have not been as largely patronized as might be desired, I think it is partly the fault of those in charge of the railway owing to this method of advertising. If there is any reason for this I would like the minister to explain it, but if not, I would be glad to see him make a change from a system which I think is inexcusable from every point of view.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would be glad to have this item passed before six o'clock, but I might say I have been for some time thinking over the question of advertising which is larger than it looks. In connection with the Intercolonial Railway it is more important to my mind than some other things, although I may be partial in that respect. I intend before very long to look into the question of advertising; I have not had time to do it yet.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is the purchasing agent of the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. FOWLER. What is his salary?

Mr. GRAHAM. $135 per month.

Mr. FOWLER. I would suppose that it would be his duty to purchase direct from the factories or the wholesalers and not the middlemen, but I find quite the contrary to be the case.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DANIEL. Before six o'clock the minister commenced to give some explanation of his policy with regard to expenditure on the Intercolonial, especially in connection with the advertising. I took the opportunity to bring to his notice that even in the matter of time tables, excursions and things of that kind, the public were not properly notified, and consequently the Intercolonial lost a good deal of patronage. I was in hopes that when a man from Ontario was made a minister, the Intercolonial would be carried on more as a business proposition and not be so entirely a part of the political machine as it had been. I looked for a considerable change in many respects, more especially in the manner of giving contracts and making expenditures. Take this small matter of advertising, there is absolutely no excuse why these advertisements should not be made general. Surely the minister does not want us to think that the Intercolonial management does not really want the money of Conservatives to help to cut down the deficit. The mode in which these things are carried on—advertising in such a way as to only reach one half of the people—would lead one to conclude that the management do not want the other half to travel on the railway or have any connection with it. The minister ought to let us know whether we can really hope that there will be a change in the future and that the Intercolonial will be run more on a business basis. I am not saying that this government is alone to blame in this connection, but there must be a change somewhere sometime if that railway is to be managed as it ought to be. I shall be glad to have a statement from the minister of the policy he intends following.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not have the floor when the House rose, but as regards supplies, they are purchased by tenders at present. The policy is to accept the lowest tender, but there is a great deal of myth about this newspaper advertising for tenders and giving the contract to the lowest. If I were a business man, running the Intercolonial or the Canadian Pacific Railway or Grand Trunk, I would not feel myself bound to accept the lowest tender in every case, but in many cases I would go out in the open market, and in nine times out of ten make a better bargain. If I had a building to put up I would do, as other railway managers do, get it put up by a contractor, who had given me proof of his competence and thoroughness, and not necessarily advertise for the lowest tender. It is necessary however for the government to advertise in the case of these large works. That is the system we have adopted and to which we adhere, but a great deal can be said against the acceptance of the lowest tender being an absolute safeguard.

Mr. SPROULE. It is an easy matter in this day for any man to know, when tenders are submitted, whether they are reasonably low or not. It must be apparent to any one, who has to do with public works, that those who tender frequently act in collusion and put up the prices very high. Just look at our contracts for

dredging. It must be apparent to any one who knows anything of the cost of dredging, that many of the contracts are entirely too high. Any intelligent engineer knows whether these tenders are too high or not, and the government is not bound to accept any, even the lowest tender, if it is not a reasonable one. Provided however the government exercise proper diligence, the acceptance of the lower tender is the best policy. Accepting the lowest tender is not always a guarantee that good value is had. The tenderers may be in collusion to raise prices, or, for that matter, there may be only one tender. You avoid the difficulty by employing an agent, but, if you pay a commission, as you have done in the case of some land purchases of from forty to sixty per cent, or if you purchase through such an agent as Merwin, who bought goods at a profit to himself of fifty to seventy-five per cent, of course, you are not getting good value for the money. The minister would be much safer if he sent out an intelligent man to buy in the open market at the best value he could get—he could buy better and cheaper than the government can. But, unfortunately, the government relies upon the plea of having accepted the lowest tender, which, often, is only an excuse for great extravagance. Whether the government can or cannot lay down a hard and fast rule that they will buy by tender only, at least they can give a better example of the way business should be done than many of the instances we have had in the last few years in the purchase of supplies for the Intercolonial.

Mr. GANONG. Are the accounts kept in such a way that the minister can tell us the expenditure on coal month by month? For instance, what value of coal has been used for the months of January, February, March, April and May of this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. You might as well put in June.

Mr. GANONG. I am not asking as to the particular date, but whether the books are so kept that the expenditure month by month can be shown?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. Take, for instance, the month of March, say——

Mr. GANONG. February and March say.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have the figures for March only. The amount spent for coal for passenger engines was $32,068.87 and for coal for freight engines $114,332.92.

Mr. GANONG. Can the minister tell me what was the expenditure for March of last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was : Coal for freight engines, $81,654.18, and coal for passenger engines, $29,418.15.

Mr. GANONG. There seems to be an increase of about $36,000 or $37,000 for this year. But I understood there was less traffic this year than last.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; we had a slight increase in March —an oasis in the desert.

Mr. GANONG. I think it would be interesting if the minister would bring down a statement showing the amount of coal used each month from January last up to the end of May, giving comparisons with the same months last year and with figures also showing the comparison of the tonnage of freight hauled. I am advised that the coal bill of this year has been very much in excess of that of last year and that this is largely accounted for—of course, I cannot say that I know this, for I am not a railroad man—by the fact that the road bed is not kept in first-class condition and that the engines have not been in shape to steam. That is, I am told the money of the country is wasted because the railway has not been kept in shape.

Mr. DANIEL. On pages W—143 and 144 of the Auditor General's Report, I find charges for legal services by several gentlemen amounting in the aggregate to quite a large sum, having reference to the arbitration with the Grand Trunk Railway with regard to the amounts which may be due to the Intercolonial from the Grand Trunk. So far as my memory goes, we have never had a statement of the results of that arbitration. If so, I think it is only right that the minister should give us the facts and state what amount has been received.

Mr. GRAHAM. This matter is still before the arbitrators, of course. It involves the question of the adjustment of freight, maintenance, &c. There were several cases before the board of arbitration when Judge Killam died. We had expected that the two arbitrators would select a third arbitrator in place of Judge Killam, but they have not done so yet. Speaking roughly, and on information, I may say that the board of arbitrators has laid down certain principles on which further readjustments have been made. Several decisions have been given, and I think on the whole the government has benefited by the awards in its favour to the extent of a balance of between $30,000 and $40,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Have the Grand Trunk Railway paid anything over?

Mr. GRAHAM. They have paid some of these items. There are other items before the board for adjustment, but they cannot be adjusted until another arbitrator is selected in the place of the late Judge Killam.

Mr. DANIEL. On page 142 there seems to have been a large amount of money paid to the Grand Trunk Railway by the Inter-

colonial, especially at Montreal. Has the Intercolonial no employees in Montreal? Do the Grand Trunk employees do all the cleaning of the cars and things of that kind? It would appear so, from the charges that are placed here: Cleaning trucks, cleaning sleepers, parlour cars and ordinary cars, and things of that kind. I also see quite a large amount paid to the Grand Trunk Railway for Grand Trunk cars, I suppose, that have been smashed or damaged on the Intercolonial; but I do not see any contra account of a payment made by the Grand Trunk and other railways for cars belonging to the Intercolonial that have been similarly damaged. Take into consideration the large number of Intercolonial cars that are scattered all over the country on other railways, I should think there ought to be some revenue from that source, as well as an expenditure by the Intercolonial for that purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM. We pay $140,000 a year to the Grand Trunk for running rights over their line from Ste Rosalie to Montreal, paying in proportion to the expense for maintenance. They supply the men. If any of our cars are broken by other lines, we collect from them, as they collect from us.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the Railway Department buying any coal from the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think some coal is being taken from that company.

Mr. CROCKET. I see last year you bought 356 tons from that company. Where is the bulk of the coal bought for the operation of the railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. We buy from several coal companies, from the Cumberland, Springhill, Maritime, Inverness, Dominion, Nova Scotia, and several companies in New Brunswick. The price is a little higher than it was last year.

Mr. BLAIN. I see an item of $16,000 for advertising. I understand that it came out in an investigation before the committee that the papers in which the government advertised are all of one shade of politics. May I ask the minister if he proposes to continue that policy, or does he propose to broaden it a little?

Mr. GRAHAM. We discussed the question of advertising before six o'clock. The whole question is one which I intend to take up, but I am not prepared to say what I shall do until I see what the conditions are.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister still pursue the same line of advertising the railroad by means of pictures and displays at different exhibitions throughout the country, showing the beautiful scenery along the route of the Intercolonial; and is there an officer employed for that purpose by the railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have done something of that kind. We had a very good display at the automobile show, both in Toronto and in Montreal. I think the Creighton Advertising Department is in charge of that.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you an advertising department?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have a traffic manager, under whom Mr. Creighton attends largely to the advertising.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister says he proposes to take this matter up for consideration, and if he is going to leave the impression upon the public that there is no politics in the management of the Intercolonial we shall expect that some of these advertisements will appear in Conservative newspapers. I have before me a long list of newspapers with a very small circulation, but containing advertisements of the government, while papers with three times the circulation in the same city and town, are omitted. I would like to remind the minister that it would be rather difficult for him to make the Canadian people believe that there are no politics in the management of the Intercolonial Railway, when, in putting an advertisement into a newspaper, he selects the one having a small circulation and allows the one having a large circulation to go without any advertisement whatever. I hope the minister will investigate this matter, keeping this point before him and that next year, when we see this large list of newspapers receiving pretty large amounts of money, we will find that advertisements have been published in the newspapers having a large circulation. Perhaps the minister might indicate what he proposes to do on that point. I do not think that it requires very much investigation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have made a statement, three times, twice in reply to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and once in reply to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) concerning that.

Mr. BLAIN. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that he proposes to look into this matter in the days to come. Surely the hon. gentleman would not require very much time to indicate to the House what he proposes to do on a question of this kind. The minister has not much faith in his own policy with respect to asking for public tenders. He suggests that if he would apply his own mind to the subject he would not ask for tenders in many cases at all. Yet, my hon. friend knows that the people believe that tenders should be asked for. The policy that my hon. friend adopts in putting a number of reformers on the list and handing them a slip asking for ten-

ders is a policy that does not involve the principle of inviting public tenders at all. It is a political policy adopted by the minister for the purpose of distributing public patronage among his political friends. My hon. friend understands that. He has had a wide experience in Ontario and, having brought that experience with him and, I suppose, having profited by the result, I was very much surprised that he should adopt the same policy in the new office he has been selected to occupy. I do not think it will appeal to the minister's good judgment to say that after being several months in the department he would come forward and, on these two points, put himself in opposition to the Canadian people, by saying, with respect to the question of public advertisement, that, if his own opinion were to prevail he would not ask for tenders at all simply going to his own friends and allowing them to put up a building costing $25,000 or $30,000 because they happened to be in the business. He would not give a Conservative in any part of Canada any opportunity whatever to tender for the construction of any public work. These are matters that it would not take my hon. friend a very long time to decide. The only answer is that he must be careful of the interests of his party before he comes to a decision. My hon. friend, who wants to lead in the expenditure of money is not willing to adopt the policies which are adopted by smaller institutions and organizations throughout the country because he says he would not, if he had his own way, ask for tenders at all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the minister whether he accepts the lowest tender in purchasing concrete pipes ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The department accepts the lowest tender in every case unless some reason can be shown why it should not do so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister be good enough to give us some reason why he did not accept the lowest tender in connection with concrete piping. I asked a question on the 13th April and I had the answer of the minister forwarded to parties who tendered. I will just quote a few words from a letter I received in reply :

> If you compare the prices our is much more favourable, without any discount, but when you deduct 15 per cent I certainly should have had the contract.

This is a most reliable firm. They sent in their tender and their tender was not only lower than the figures which the contract was let for but in addition to that they were willing to take off 15 per cent and they did not receive the contract.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will remember that he is warned every day, with respect to the sale of patent medicines, not to take anything that he is told is just as good. The pipe tendered for in this instance was not the kind that the specification called for. Our engineer of maintenance of ways reported that the other pipe was the pipe we wanted. That is why we did not take it.

Mr. GANONG. Was it because you wanted Wallberg to supply it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend, with his usual wisdom, does not know that it was not Mr. Wallberg at all who is interested in this contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not think that is a satisfactory answer. I am well aware that these people put in a tender in the same way as the others were put in and that they were ready and willing to manufacture these goods under any specification that was proposed to them. There is no occasion for the minister to make the statement he has made in that regard.

Mr. GRAHAM. I assure my hon. friend that the goods are purchased always from the lowest tenderers unless there is some good reason given to the contrary. I am not so wedded to the tender system, as my hon. friend seems to be, and which he regards as a panacea for everything, as to say that I will take something that I do not want, but I will get the full particulars for my hon. friend and I think he will find that there is no reason for complaint on behalf of his friends.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How can the minister state that the lowest tenders are always accepted when here we have a most reliable company which is not only the lowest tenderer, but which offered 15 per cent off the tender price in addition, and yet it did not get the contract ? I notice from the reply given by the minister in 'Hansard' that this Kemptville Company has been supplying a large quantity of concrete piping for two years. How can he condemn the concrete piping of the other companies when he has made no endeavour to compare one with the other.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not condemning the quality of the piping of any other firm. We wanted a flat bottom piping and they offered us round piping.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not believe that is a sufficient excuse for the minister to throw away the people's money as he has done. This firm if it were given a chance could have supplied the department with flat bottom piping at a great deal less cost than he paid to the other firm.

Mr. GRAHAM. As to the tiling, the hon. gentleman is no doubt speaking from a letter he has in his possession. He evidently knows something of the tile business but not enough to form a correct judgment in reference to it. We wanted flat bottomed piping which is the more expensive of

the two and this firm offered us round piping.

Mr. TAYLOR. Were tenders called for flat bottom piping?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine they were. The engineer recommended flat bottom tiling and we took it from the Kemptville people on tender and there is nothing extraordinary about it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am informed that this company to which I refer sent in their application in accordance with the tender.

Mr. SCHELL. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) know whether this company tendered for round or for flat bottomed pipe ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As I understand it they tendered for the pipe called for by the department.

Mr. SCHELL. I put in several thousand tons of this piping last year and I am very familiar with the business. I know that flat bottom concrete pipe for railway culverts will cost from 10 to 20 per cent more according to the size than the round pipe costs. All the railway engineers and the municipal engineers for sewage pipe insist on flat bottom pipe for sizes between 24 and 30 inches in diameter because it will stand a greater strain than the round pipe. It is absurd to say one kind of pipe is the same as the other. The Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Northern all use flat bottom pipe. If the hon. gentleman can tell me the size and what they were bidding on I can show the absurdity of his position if he claims that round pipe is the same as flat bottomed pipe.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This firm has several branches in Canada and in the United States and they are a responsible firm and are in the habit of furnishing the material for railway and municipal work. I know these men and I am satisfied they would not tender for round pipe if the tender called for flat bottomed pipe and they say they complied with the tender.

Mr. CROCKET. According to the Auditor General's Report, T. McAvity & Sons, of St. John, N.B., were paid $27,896.40 last year for supplies for the Intercolonial Railway. Were tenders asked for the supply of this hardware?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, yes, in every case.

Mr. CROCKET. By public advertisement or by circulars to those on the patronage list ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed by circular to a very large number of people.

Mr. CROCKET. What other firms were invited to tender for this hardware ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am told there are somewhere in the vicinity of 75 names on the list altogether.

Mr. CROCKET. Were 75 other firms invited to tender for that hardware ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine they would be, all the hardware firms we had the names of.

Mr. CROCKET. Was any other firm at St. John invited to tender ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I could not say.

Mr. CROCKET. Would the McAvity firm be the only one in New Brunswick that would be invited to tender ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not, but I cannot say as I am not conversant with the location of the different firms.

Mr. BLAIN. What is it necessary for a man to do in order to get on the patronage list ? My hon. friend from Toronto says a good subscription to the election fund.

Mr. GRAHAM. He knows.

Mr. FIELDING. He is thinking of the old days.

Mr. BLAIN. He will not be better informed than the minister himself because he has had experience in these matters. The minister says there is public advertisement, but when we come to the point we find there is a list of friends and when goods are required those on that list are notified and they are asked to give prices to the department.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend has said that I said there was public advertisement. I was perfectly frank with my friend from Fredericton, and said they were asked by circular.

Mr. BLAIN. I said that my hon. friend was trying to leave the impression that these goods were purchased after public advertisement, and then he tried to qualify it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not try to qualify it, I made no qualification. My hon. friend should not repeat that when he knows I did not say it.

Mr. BLAIN. It is no use trying to suggest to the House that my hon. friend is purchasing goods after public advertisement by tender. What qualification must a man have to get on the list ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is not nearly so childlike and bland as he pretends. He is one of the strongest partisans in the Dominion of Canada ; he bends every energy to that point and I do not blame him, and yet he wants the House to

believe he is so innocent that he does not know anything about government patronage and never heard of such a thing in his life. He knows that so long as governments are in power in this or any other country and are run on the party system, so long will there be a slight tendency for the government in power, whether Liberal, Conservative or Independent, to have, to use an old phrase, a slight cant so far as their friends are concerned. That is the case with all the provincial governments and every government where the party system is in force. What the country first demands and is interested in is that we get value for our money, not that goods be bought from my hon. friend's friends. When we ask a dozen or more good firms to compete and they do compete and we buy at the lowest price, I think it can be taken that we have received good value.

Mr. FOWLER. In this case I question whether more than one firm were asked to tender, for if more firms in New Brunswick were asked to tender. I do not believe that McAvity & Sons would succeed in every case in getting the order. What other firms in New Brunswick were invited ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I can bring the list tomorrow, but I am sorry to say I cannot give the names as I am not familiar with the locations.

Mr. FOWLER. I am speaking of the firms in New Brunswick. T. McAvity & Sons and McLean, Holt & Company are practically the same firm.

Mr. CROCKET. I see that L. S. Macoun, of Ottawa, who last year sold $74,000 worth of goods to the Militia Department, is now working into the Railway Department. He has been selling wooden water buckets, varnish brushes, fire-clay and lead pipe and managed to get from the Railway Department on stores account last year, $182.31. He, I understand, is very closely connected with a member of the government, and I had his own statement the other day that he did not keep a shop or factory and had no supplies of his own to sell. I take it therefore that this is another case of the Intercolonial Railway buying from a middleman. It occurred to me that Wallberg had better be looking after himself when I found Macoun figuring in the Railway Department on stores account as well as in the Militia Department. I would like to ask the minister if tenders were asked for these goods supplied by Mr. Macoun.

Mr. GRAHAM. Tenders no doubt were asked for and the lowest accepted.

Mr. FOWLER. Is Mr. Macoun on the list?

Mr. GRAHAM. He seems to be on that list. This confirms what nine out of ten business men will agree to, and that is that calling for tenders is not a panacea for everything. It is the only thing parliament will allow a minister to do, but it is not always the best way. Speaking of middlemen, ask for tenders for some item, and you will find the manufacturer giving you a tender higher than that made by a middleman, who is his agent, tendering for the same goods. You ask how that is. They give the agent a commission and he divides his commission. It is cheaper for the government, by the tender system, to buy from the agent often than from the manufacturer himself.

Mr. FOWLER. That has not been shown in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can show cases time and again in my department in which the original manufacturer has tendered at a higher price than his agent for the same goods.

Mr. FOWLER. You forget about Merwin.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was speaking generally. It may seem heresy to say that the tender system is not always the best, but that is the experience of business men on many occasions.

Mr. FOWLER. Did the company advance Mr. Macoun the money before the goods were delivered as was done in the case of the copper purchase?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know to what my hon. friend refers when he speaks of the copper purchase. No money is advanced by this department.

Mr. FOWLER. It is singular that the minister does not know about the copper purchase, but he has been so taken up with the little matter in Brockville that he has not had time to keep himself posted on what is going on in the committees. This copper transaction——

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Order.

Mr. FOWLER. I forgot—there is our censor again. But surely, Mr. Chairman, you will not refuse me the opportunity of giving the Minister of Railways much needed information. I would be most happy to inform him what I meant by the transaction in copper, but I must bow to the decision of my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Ross) as expressed through you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That is the first sensible thing you have done to-day.

Mr. DANIEL. I see another firm here which has been supplying blankets and towels and things of that kind called the Peter McSweeney Company of Moncton. Is that the senator of that name?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. DANIEL. It is a good deal like his name anyway.

Mr. STAPLES. I also notice an account of Macfarlane & Thompson. The Minister of Railways seems to be buying from that firm. That is the firm of which Senator Thompson is a member.

Mr. FOWLER. This is dangerously close to a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. I think the party has done well enough by these senators by giving them a seat for life with a salary of $2,500 a year. Still you continue to load them with benefits by putting them on the patronage list. That is rather unfair to the rest of your supporters. There are other firms which have Liberal leanings as well as the firms of Peter McSweeney and Macfarlane & Thompson. I think that for the services rendered his country Mr. McSweeney was too well paid by putting him in the Senate and I can say the same of Senator Thompson. You put these gentlemen in the Senate, a position to which one would rather be surprised that they would even aspire to, and yet you are not satisfied with that but you put them on the patronage list and give them a large amount of patronage, thus enabling them to make, in addition to their large salaries which they draw as senators, large profits on the merchandise they sell the various departments of the government. On behalf of the other firms which do give you loyal and honest support, I protest against the minister doing this. He should strike these men off the patronage list. I have no personal concern in the matter, but am actuated merely by a love of fair play and a square deal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Was the iron purchased by public tender or private sale?

Mr. GRAHAM. All the stores are purchased in the same way.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Am I to understand that the large amount of iron purchased, $76,000, page 126—W, and $34,000, page 127—W——

Mr. GRAHAM. From whom ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. From the Nova Scotia Coal and Steel Company and the Portland Rolling Mills.

Mr. GRAHAM. We buy these supplies from the lowest tenderer, and I am very glad to purchase goods from the Nova Scotia Steel Company or any other Canadian company which is developing our resources. We give them no advantage.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If others are not on the list, as I understand it, then they cannot possibly tender. Is it possible that contracts for these large amounts are simply given to those who are on the patronage list? That is a most outrageous piece of business management.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Carried.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) would say 'carried' to anything this government could propose. Just as long as you can get your hand into the public chest and pull out money, it is all right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Hand it out to party friends and everything is lovely. Here is a contract of about $125,000 handed over to party friends. Does the minister think that is fair and reasonable? Does he say that these large contracts should be open to tender only by parties who are on the patronage list?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman will not speak of the capital invested in the Nova Scotia Steel Company as Liberal capital?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am not referring to it as being Liberal capital. But what excuse has the minister for not advertising such contracts as this? Surely, they should be advertised very widely, instead of being open only to a few party friends of the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) allows himself to be led away. He should not feel any sorer than I do. I have been told that I am sore over the result in Brockville, but he should not allow himself to be bad-natured over the result in East Lambton. These things happen to the best of men.

Mr. BLAIN. Not many happened like East Lambton.

Mr. GRAHAM. But it did happen in East Lambton. We cannot help these calamities. As to this contract being given to a friend of this government, I think the hon. gentleman would hardly venture to call the president of the Nova Scotia Steel Company a friend of this government. If he were to do so, he would get into trouble. It is a good substantial firm, with a good substantial Conservative as its president. But, it being the lowest tenderer, we bought the goods from this company.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But the point is that only those on the list are given the privilege of tendering. As to East Lambton, the hon. gentleman knows that that is one of the ridings in which there is a very considerable overlapping, and the town and township in which I live happened to send something over 400 to add to the majority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very much afraid that we may begin to talk about what happened yester-

day. Certainly. they can take very little satisfaction out of it. But does not the minister think it unreasonable and unbusinesslike for him, in making an expenditure of over $100,000 for such commodities as iron and steel, that he should not invite tenders widely? Or does he expect to continue to ask tenders from a few political friends?

Mr. JOHNSTON. On this question of——

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman I was asking a question of the minister and I think——

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am not going to obstruct; I will give you lots of opportunity to do that. I was about to say: On this question of purchasing supplies, I would like to say a word or two to the minister. But, before doing that, let me address an observation to my hon. friend from East Lambton. He need not get fussy about the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company or any of the large companies doing business in the eastern part of this country ; he will find that they are doing business in a legitimate way and are neither receiving nor asking favours from this government. When the hon. gentleman says that I am content to have this money go into the pockets of party friends, I want to say that the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company is not a party friend of mine. Its warmest friends have never charged it with being a friend of the Liberal government. Its history for twenty years in Nova Scotia has been exactly the reverse. The president of the company is the bell-wether of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) knows that very well. It ill-becomes any member on that side to charge the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company with receiving undue advantage from any government. There are some of us who might have reasons to complain, but certainly not hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. But, though they are no party friends of mine, or of the government I support, they should receive their legitimate share of the business of the government. I would go so far as to say to the minister that, in a matter of this kind the purchase of bar iron, &c., if there are any preferences to be given, they should go to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company; and I will tell you why: If my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) will take the trouble to inquire, he will find that this company is one of the best customers the Intercolonial has. I am not aware that they have ever asked for any preference, but I say that if the time ever comes when they do, then, in the interests of the road and of the country as well as of the company, he would be very well justified in giving them the preference.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not wish to have words put in my mouth that I did not use. I did not object to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, as such, receiving this contract. But, as I understand it, when these supplies are needed, tenders are asked for only from a certain number of firms. There is no reason why the minister should not be able to estimate in advance, more or less accurately, how much of these supplies he is going to need in the course of a year. It seems to me that it is not reasonable that so large a contract for such supplies as these should merely be peddled round, as it were, amongst the minister's party friends.

Mr. HAGGART. Was there any competition with the Nova Scotia Steel Company with this order? I understood from the minister that there were seventy-five persons on the patronage list who furnish supplies to the Intercolonial. I suppose that out of that seventy-five there was only the Nova Scotia Steel Company who were able to supply the coal. Is the minister certain that there was competition with the Nova Scotia Company for that coal ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no doubt of the competition. As a matter of fact, we have all the leading firms on the list.

Mr. HAGGART. Who awards the contracts?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contracts are awarded by the minister and his deputy.

Mr. HAGGART. There has been a change since I was minister. At that time, unless there was some objection to the material the contracts were awarded by the manager of the Intercolonial, Mr. Pottinger. In case there was a tie, or the material was not up to the standard, the decision was left to the scientific branch of McGill University. In the case of oil, for instance, as to which was the best lubricant, the question was left to the scientists of McGill, who always made a report to the department, and on their report the contract was made. But it never came before the minister unless there was a tie, or some question which the head of the department could alone decide.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have followed the system adopted by my predecessors, which I think is a right one. It is better to have the tenders sent to the head office for decision. Being myself responsible to the House and to the country, I feel like seeing how the awards are given every time. I can assure my hon. friend that unless there is some good reason for it the contract is always given to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. FOWLER. I see you bought a quantity of blankets. What need have you for blankets?

Mr. GRAHAM. For the sleeping cars.

Mr. FOWLER. I see an item here for the Peter McSweeney Company, of which

the chief is Senator McSweeney. He is in fact the whole company, and he has profited to a large extent in the way of supplying blankets, towelling, cotton and flannelettes. What do you do with flannelettes? Do you make night gowns for the porters, or was it just because there was a desire on the part of the department to give a little patronage to the senator, who is not receiving quite enough in his sessional indemnity? There was a considerable amount of this flannelette, 576½ yards. I think the senator might have thrown in that half yard. It does seem to me that a man occupying so distinguished a position as senator of Canada, should not have charged this government for that half yard. Perhaps the minister will explain what that flannelette was used for.

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine it was used in the sleeping cars. It also might possibly be used as cushions for the dining tables.

Mr. FOWLER. How about the oil you are buying from the New Brunswick Petroleum Company? Did you buy that oil from the wells, or did you buy it through middlemen?

Mr. GRAHAM. My information is that it was bought from the producers.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you buy your oil in the same way that you buy the flannelette?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not by the yard, no.

Mr. FOWLER. I mean, do you ask for tenders from certain persons who are upon the list or do you buy in the open market? On page W—147 I see you pay a large sum of money for oil to the Galena Signal Oil Company. Then there is the Imperial Oil Company of St. John, I think that is managed by a good Liberal, the present mayor of the city, Mr. Bullock, who figures largely on this list, some $25,000. Then there is the Keenleyside Oil Company. I presume some of this must be lubricating oil, and some of it crude oil. What do you use the crude oil for?

Mr. GRAHAM. For forging work, heating rivets. Our lubricating oil is purchased by tender on a guarantee that a certain quantity will serve for a thousand engine miles. The Galena Signal Oil Company has the contract at the present time. I think we got one or two other tenders. One of the things that we are trying to get down to a practical basis is the cost of lubrication per mile. We buy oil on the guarantee of a certain cost, reckoned on the mileage of the locomotive.

Mr. FOWLER. Did you buy this lubricating oil on tender open to all the world?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that at one time we had tenders from all the oil companies practically.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you ask for tenders every year?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are not a great many oil companies. The Imperial Oil Company of Canada is really a branch of the Standard Oil Company. We made a contract with it for a term of years.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is the Galena Oil Company operating?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is an American company. I am told that it is practically an offshoot of the Standard Oil Company. It has a branch, I understand, in Toronto.

Mr. FOWLER. There are Canadian oil companies. There is the Canadian Oil Company and the Queen City Oil Company. Why have these not had an opportunity of tendering?

Mr. GRAHAM. They did have an opportunity. This is the only company that gives the required guarantee. We are reducing the cost of lubrication and we are carrying on a test. These people make a specialty of it and I imagine they are supplying the lubrication for 75 or 90 per cent. of the railways of the continent.

Mr. FOWLER. The government should give the preference to the home companies. We have the Queen City, the Canadian Company, and I am told there are other Canadian companies. I do not think you should make a contract for three or four years. Suppose these people were not able, in this particular year, to compete with the American company, perhaps next year they would be able to compete and I think a contract should be made from year to year so as to give our home companies an opportunity.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a peculiar situation. We have to give the contract for a term of years to get a proper price. My hon. friend will see the importance of it both with respect to the rolling stock and the cost of the lubrication itself. This company make a specialty of it and they send a man around on the locomotives and cars to see that the consumption is kept within proper bounds because they have to guarantee the amount of oil we use per mile at a certain price. Canadian companies should have an opportunity to compete and when our contract runs out I would be very glad to give them that opportunity. Everything being equal, I would prefer the Canadian companies under all circumstances.

Mr. FOWLER. This is a three or five years contract and unfortunately the minister will not have an opportunity of giving the contract to a Canadian company. It will be in other hands.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend may.

Mr. FOWLER. But I do not see how any company could possibly send a man on every engine to see that you did not use too much oil.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not on every engine. They keep a man there a great deal of the time. He is not on every engine but he practically instructs them in the use of oil and keeps his eye on the consumption.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a large purchase of iron in the city of St. John from McAvity and the McLean Holt Company amounting to $51,213. Do I understand the minister that in buying that iron and ironwork from these two firms, which are practically as I understand it, one firm, every one of the other 74 had an opportunity to put in their price for these goods ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend will find, as a matter of fact, that there were quite a number of tenders. My hon. friend speaks of the other 74 ; I did not mean to say that there were 74 iron or hardware men, but of the large number that are on the list all that are engaged in that business were, I have no doubt, given an opportunity to tender. We never invite tenders but the Montreal and Toronto men are keen competitors in iron and steel goods. It is not at all likely that these goods were all bought in one purchase. It would be throughout the year and the total would be made up by portions of the different stores purchased.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it confined to two firms in St. John ?

Mr. GRAHAM. All these purchases which are spread over the year are the subject of competition. They would form part of a large amount of stores that were purchased during the year.

Mr. FOSTER. These were all the purchases that were made from McAvity ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think they would not be bought at one time but on several different occasions.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand it they would be bought in small quantities as they were needed ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. What I was trying to make sure of was whether there was any competition or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. For these parcels of goods bought throughout the year Montreal and Toronto iron firms had a chance to compete ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend will find that is absolutely true.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, I understand this is confined to persons who are on the patronage list.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice you have been buying some railway ties from Pearson, B. F., of Halifax. That, I take it, is Mr. B. F. Pearson, sometimes known as the Eastern Supply Company, sometimes as B. F. Pearson, sometimes as Matthew Lodge, sometimes as Henderson, sometimes as the St. John Sun Publishing Company, Limited, sometimes as the Morning 'Chronicle,' Halifax, sometimes as the Glace Bay 'Times,' and sometimes as the Halifax 'Echo.' He has a variety of names ; he appears in a variety of characters. He is in point of fact a lawyer of the city of Halifax and he sells ties—railway ties—not neck ties—but railway ties to the government. I could understand that it might be reasonable for a Senator to sell flannelette if he happened to be in the dry goods business, but why a gentleman of the legal profession would be around peddling hemlock ties to the government is something I cannot understand. This man does not get out these ties, he is not a lumberman, he has no mills, but he is simply in the same position as regards the Intercolonial Railway as Mr. Macoun is in as regards the Department of Militia and Defence and the Intercolonial Railway. Neither of these gentlemen is a producer of anything, neither of them keeps a shop. In fact, as I understand it, one of them was very indignant when he was asked if he kept a shop. He was horror stricken that it would be put up to him for a moment that he would be engaged in such a business as shop-keeper and I suppose that Mr. Pearson would be quite indignant if it were intimated to him he was a shop-keeper or that he kept a retail lumber yard. For the year ending 31st March, 1906, Mr. Pearson sold over $100,000 ties to the government. Under what circumstances were these ties bought from Mr. Pearson of Halifax, lawyer, proprietor of the St. John 'Sun,' Morning 'Chronicle,' the Glace Bay 'Times,' the Halifax 'Echo,' chief push of the Eastern Supply Company, member of the Nova Scotia legislature, and local government; a man of a variety of titles and a variety of occupations and a many sided man, taking him altogether ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We use nearly 1,000,000 ties a year, and I do not know under what circumstances these particular ties were got. The price has increased materially during the past few years, and one of the greatest difficulties of all railways is to get ties at all. Even if my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) were to offer ties to us I would be prepared to accept them so long as we had not to pay more than the fair market price. We fix the price we will pay for ties and make

all the contracts we can. We care not whether we buy from a professional man or any one else so long as we get them at a fair price. We have refused to purchase ties because too high a price was asked for them. The fact that Mr. Pearson may be called a middleman by my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) would not make any difference to me in the purchase of ties if I got them at a proper value.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister think one would be straining his imagination if he were to suggest that the person who owned these ties thought it necessary in order to sell them to the department to interest Mr. Pearson who seems to have the ear of the government? I fancy that the man who produced these ties has found it necessary to interest Mr. Pearson by the promise of a commission before he was able to make a sale to the government, and I know that the gentleman who did produce them has political views which are not in accord with the administration. I believe that is actually what occurred. The minister has told us that the patronage of the government naturally goes to its political friends. Mr. Pearson is a political friend of the government, but I believe the government has been more of a friend to Mr. Pearson than Mr. Pearson has been to the government, for I do not believe he has returned dollar for dollar that they have him. He certainly did not in the Halifax land case where he made a profit of $28,000 which he divided with his friends, Mr. Pearson's share alone being $14,000. I have no doubt he got a very handsome commission in connection with the sale of these ties, because I know as a matter of fact that the ties were produced by a man who was not in political accord with the government, and he was only able to sell the ties to the government by reason of the fact that he employed Mr. Pearson as a middle man. That is one of the evils of the system which the Minister of Railways defends. No man along the line of the Intercolonial Railway who is not a political supporter of the government can sell any material to the railway in any large quantities.

Mr. GRAHAM. What about the Nova Scotia Steel Company?

Mr. FOWLER. The Nova Scotia Steel Company stands in a peculiar position because they are the largest patrons of the Intercolonial Railway in the matter of freight and the department would make an exception in their favour, but outside of that and some small things the officers of the department are not allowed to buy from others than political supporters. Here is Mr. S. S. Ryan, who runs a small farm across from Moncton in the county of Albert, who was formerly local member for the county, but he was defeated last election; he sells thousands and thousands of dollars worth of lumber to the Intercolonial which the Intercolonial could buy cheaper from the various mills, but these mill owners being enterprising men they are Conservatives, and therefore they have to sell to the Intercolonial Railway through Mr. Ryan or some other friend of the government. In that way, through political exigencies, the Department of Railways, pays a great more money for all its supplies than it is necessary to pay. That is one reason why the road has to be run at a loss. This new minister coming from the province of Ontario he was not governed by local considerations as a minister from New Brunswick would be, and we did hope on the principle that a new broom sweeps clean, that the political management of the road would end and that it would be run as a business proposition, but our hopes have been disappointed. There is no reason in the world why the Intercolonial Railway should not pay as well as any other trunk line in Canada. Along its route are thriving and prosperous towns and productive farms. There is no better country under the sun than that through which the greater portion of the Intercolonial Railway runs. The minister knows that it runs through a splendid country and that throughout the length of the line there is local traffic. The Canadian Pacific Railway, that great trunk road, for 700 or 800 miles has no possibility of any local traffic of any amount being created, and yet the Canadian Pacific Railway is able to make in some years as high as 15 per cent on its capital stock, which was originally, to some extent, watered. The Intercolonial Railway, on the other hand, running through a better average country than the Canadian Pacific Railway, has a deficit as I proved this afternoon, logically, if not to the satisfaction of the minister, of about $800,000 on the year's working of the road for 1906-7. The minister must see that in order to bring about a change in the results he must effect a change in the manner of conducting the road. I advise the minister if he wants to go down in history as one of the best ministers the Intercolonial has had, to make these changes, to apply the pruning knife, to abolish the patronage system, to cut out the politics and run the road as a business proposition. If the minister adopts that policy and method, the road, instead of being an annual loss to the exchequer of this country, will pay a handsome dividend upon the capital employed. The minister is young and full of vitality and some brains——

Mr. GRAHAM. In a modified form.

Mr. FOWLER. He may not have a long period of office before him but in view of the circumstances of the last few days we will have no election this year so he is at

least sure of another year in office, and if he is industrious and earnest and attempts to accomplish these reforms he will make for himself a reputation such as no other Minister of Railways has made, at least since 1896.

Mr. OSLER. I was sorry to hear the minister so strongly defend the patronage system. I thought it was something which while more or less recognized was still something to be ashamed of. I do not think there is a more corrupting influence in public life than the patronage system as carried on in Canada either by the Dominion or any local government. There is practically no direct purchase, every thing has to go through a middleman, unless the man is on the patronage list. If he quarrels with the government he is at once stricken off the list without question and if he has goods which the government must have they can only be sold to the government through a middleman. You cannot get a contract to carry the troops from Toronto to Niagara except it goes through a middleman. I say what I know. There is no more paralyzing system in the world than the system of the patronage committee and the middleman. I am sure that the minister is himself anxious to do what is absolutely right for the country and his department and I commend to him Lord Cromer's book on 'Modern Egypt,' just published, which is one of the most interesting books that can be read. I sent to the library but it was not there. I regret that as I would have liked to read to the minister a paragraph from that book. In summing up the reasons why Egypt has been changed from one of the most corrupt countries in the world to one where everything is honestly administered, Lord Cromer says in the chapter headed, 'Corruption,' that one of the chief influences in overcoming corruption was that when the government came under the control of the English a policy was adopted of letting public works and buying supplies by public tender. That one order did more to bring about a reign of honesty in Egypt than all other reforms put together. If this government will only adopt that principle, they will find that the Intercolonial Railway as many other departments, will run smoothly and at once a different tone will be brought into our public life. You cannot have honesty when you have a system of patronage committees and patronage firms from whom you buy ; it is an impossibility. There must be more or less corruption under such circumstances, and I am sorry to hear the minister so strongly defend the patronage system. I know that this has been more or less the condition under all our governments, local and Dominion, but I appeal to the minister to see whether he could not change that as far as his department is concerned. If he does so he will deserve the thanks of the whole people, and I ask him to seriously consider the suggestion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sure we all appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) and I hope the minister will take them to heart. What number of commission agents has the hon. gentleman in the United States gathering trade for the railroad ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have no agents in the United States. It is a mistake to say that we do not advertise for tenders. Nothing is purchased without tender. The great majority of our goods are bought after advertising in the newspapers. My hon. friend (Mr. Osler)) shakes his head. That is absolutely true so far as the Railway Department is concerned. The stores are purchased in the way I have said. The other materials are purchased after advertising in the newspapers for tenders. I can show my hon. friend the tenders.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot quite understand the minister's statement when he says he has not any one receiving commissions. On W—131 I see that we paid John A. Boak a commission of 10 per cent on securing business, $2,982.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was in error; we have an agent in Chicago.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Ticket sellers as well have received in the neighbourhood of $2,000 commission on selling tickets. How many of these agents has the minister got?

Mr. GRAHAM. People who sell tickets always get a commission on them. We have one man in Chicago and I think the other is in Boston. All railroads pay a commission on tickets sold.

Mr. DANIEL. I see on page 137 that $2.288 were paid under the heading of association fees. There are the American Railway Association of New York; the Association of American Railway Accounting officers, Chicago ; the Canadian Car Service Bureau, Montreal; the Canadian Freight Association, Toronto; the Master Car Builders Association, Chicago ; the Railway Car Association, Buffalo, the Railway Equipment and Publication Company, New York. Board of trade fees: Halifax, Moncton, Montreal, Quebec and Toronto, and sundry association fees. I notice one very serious omission. The Board of Trade at St. John is not mentioned at all and no fees are paid it although it is, I presume, about as important as the majority of the others mentioned. What is the object of these payments and what is gained by them?

Mr. GRAHAM. Like all railways, we join these associations for the mutual bene-

fit to be derived, such as information interchangeable among members of the association. All railways join these associations. It is necessary for the Intercolonial to join them if it is to keep up with the other railways. We get the standards of cars and equipment and all that kind of thing.

Mr. DANIEL. Do they issue publications yearly?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice a payment of $1,312 to the Canadian Freight Association of Toronto, being proportion of expenses for nine months. What expenses would those be?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is some sharing of expenses in connection with that association among the different roads. As to the boards of trade, it seems to be necessary, for the benefit of the railway itself, to encourage the boards of trade in these different places. I do not see why St. John was left out.

Mr. DANIEL. I hope the minister will correct that omission, if there is anything to be gained by correcting it at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have an explanation of W—161, reconstruction of accounting system, paid to Kenneth Falconer, $26,252.21.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a return giving all the information with regard to that. This firm reorganized our system of accounting, not only at the head office but the different smaller places, and I am informed that their work has paid the railway already. For example, take the fixing of cost, although we thought we had a fairly good system, we were unable before to fix anything as definite regarding the cost of mileage and that kind of thing. We had in addition an expert, who was the controller of the Chicago and Rock Island Railway, who gave us some very practical views. I feel confident that we got full value by that reorganization.

Mr. FOSTER. How much money was spent on that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave it in the House not long since and it is in 'Hansard.' I think it was in the vicinity of $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Out of what appropriation was that paid?

Mr. GRAHAM. Out of working expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister think that belonged to the working expenses of the railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are charging the account to the working expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly. It is the accounting of your men who are under regular salary for that purpose who are doing it. Here was a special work undertaken by the Intercolonial and you had to pay some $50,000 for it. The country knew nothing about it until the contracts were made and the larger part of the work was done. That illustrates the trouble of having a bulk item of $9,000,000 such as this. It is perfectly possible for the railway department to spend $8,900,000 on one item—advertising, say—and the Auditor General would have no chance to criticise it. This illustration reduces it to an absurdity, but it is only to show what an absolutely blind appropriation this is. On a new arrangement, one not coming up in the ordinary run of the business, the minister committed the country to an expenditure of $50,000, without an order in council or any authority except simply the action of the department itself. And the country knew nothing about it until it came out in the course of the investigation of another department. Has the minister any report from the Falconer firm?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Would he have any objection to bringing it down?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it has been down for some time. Or, perhaps I am wrong about; it may be before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. But not before the House. Well, as we are called upon to pay the bill, the least we can expect is to have the report. What in brief, were the changes made by this firm in the system of bookkeeping?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sufficiently expert to give the House a technical explanation. As a matter of fact, I do not know. And no person, unless he were an expert bookkeeper, would know even if he were told. I am assured by the management that the results are very satisfactory. I will be ready to bring down the report. It is a long report and it will take some time to copy. Maybe the copy before the Public Accounts Committee will be available.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the minister think his statement rather odd? It may be his misfortune, but it certainly is not our fault that, when asked what has resulted from an expenditure of $50,000 he is compelled to say: I cannot tell you and I do not know that you would understand if I did tell you.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, it is true, isn't it?

Mr. FOSTER. You must give the questioner the benefit of the doubt. Certainly, the question is perfectly germane to the subject. We can hardly allow $9,000 000 to go into the hands of the minister to be spent for something that he does not know and cannot tell. I think the minister ought to be able, in consultation with his deputy, to give the main points of the beneficial change

if there was a change, in the system of bookkeeping. In the first place, was the former system of bookkeeping on the Intercolonial a double-entry system?

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will find fault with me for not answering his question directly—but I am informed that the weakness of the old system was that we had not the detailed results that are required in modern railway work.

Mr. FOSTER. In what respect?

Mr. GRAHAM. As to the cost of the service—cost per mile, and so on. Modern railways must keep these in great detail, in order to report to the commission and governments and to apportion costs. While our system of bookkeeping may have given honest results so far as the country is concerned, it did not give us the exact results necessary in the management of our business and so we had to have the system modernised. I admit that I am not competent to discuss the details. But if I were buying a new style of locomotives—I submit this case to my hon. friend—I would decide on the basis of the reports of my engineers and other officials whom I have there for that purpose. And if it were demonstrated to me, that the engine could go at greater speed, or draw heavier trains I think that would be sufficient for me as head of the department, even though I could not explain the details of the working of that engine. So, in this case, I am not competent to go into detail of this accounting system. But the result of it is that our system is greatly improved. On the sheet that I now have before me, there are ninety items specified, giving expenses on a basis of monthly comparison. Under the old system we had only four or five heads altogether. For instance, with the old system, I could not have given the comparisons I gave this afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the minister was not very full in his explanations this afternoon. If he gave us information which he would not have been able to give under the old system I do not know what he could have told us had he not had this new system. I should think he would have been confined simply to nodding his head. Could he not, with that sheet before him give the committee an idea of the difference between the information before and that which is given now? That would illustrate the change of system, I should think.

Mr. GRAHAM. This sheet shows the disbursements for the month under different headings. Under the old system we had four headings, not divided into subdivisions as in this statement. Under this system we have some ninety headings for March, 1908, March, 1907, the nine months ending at a certain date, and the twelve months ending a certain date. Then we have a summary at the end, showing at the end of every month, in each department, the expenses as compared with the corresponding month of the previous year.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a good illustration of what seems to have been done by that firm. For instance, instead of having these expenses divided into three or four large heads, you now run them down into the details. So you not only have a comparison between the whole expenditure, but you run that down into every branch, and find the comparative cost for each one. It is a differentiation of the whole system into a large number of details. But what I wanted to know was if that was done by other railway systems. There was not so much difficulty in adopting it here as to make it necessary to get a firm and pay them $50,000 to help you introduce it. It seems to me that all that would have been necessary was to get the system of this differentiation from one of the great railroads that had adopted it, and get a practical man who had worked it out upon that railway, to indoctrinate your own men with it.

Mr. GRAHAM. The most difficult thing is what the hon. gentleman calls the indoctrination. Men are wedded to an old system, and they often think it is better than a new system that you ask them to adopt. We had to work the system in gradually. The department had practically to keep a number of these men until they did the actual work of installing this new system, and doing it right beside our own men and teaching them as the work went along. In addition to that, we had to send them to different stations. These men were kept for quite a time doing the work with our men.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not disposed to say that the change in the system has not been a good one. But it seems to me it has been effected at a very large expense. Whether it was necessary to spend $50,000 for that teaching is a matter that puzzled me. It seems to me that you could have got three or four experts from a railway that had adopted this system, and these could have taught your own men. Is the system working satisfactorily ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is giving entire satisfaction.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any clash between the Auditor General's Department and the system that was introduced by these gentlemen ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no clash with the Auditor General's Department.

Mr. OSLER. The audit system has been adopted by most of the large railways of

late years, both in Canada and the States. They have one man reporting upon their system of bookkeeping. I have seen two or three reports of railways about the size of the Intercolonial, and it would not require very much change to adapt the system to the Intercolonial. One of the most valuable features of the report of the auditors is the very strict line that is drawn between what shall be charged to capital account and what shall be charged to expenditure.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the report deals with that very matter.

Mr. FOSTER. If these experts have outlined carefully the different kinds of expenditures, what should go to capital and what should go to revenue, has the department that feature of the report and are you carrying it out?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have the report, and I may say that we are approximating to the principle laid down in that report. As I explained this afternoon we expect, by the new method we have adopted, to shortly be in a position to absolutely follow the lines of the report.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the minister is being indoctrinated?

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps indoctrinated with the theory, but the practice is rapidly approximating to the point of indoctrination.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will have to get a hustle on because some of the sentiments he gave expression to to-night do not appear to be in strict line with these principles.

Mr. OSLER. Will the general report as to the system of bookkeeping and capital account be issued and distributed? I think it would be very useful if it were distributed to members.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have it printed in the instruction book which contains what my hon. friend suggests as to the capital account, revenue and expenditure. I will be glad to send it to my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister bring down the report?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will take some time to copy.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. In that case I will bring it down.

Mr. FOSTER. Coming down to the item proposed, I would like to ask the minister if he would be kind enough to give us the distribution of the $9,000,000. He has spent $50,000 in getting the indoctrination which brings out in detail what is absolutely necessary in order to come at a proper understanding of the working of the department. Now let us apply this doctrine of differentiation to the $9,000,000. The minister is asking for $9,000,000 and I would like him to divide this into the chief items and give the committee some little guide as to the points within which they should keep for each.

Mr. GRAHAM. That has never been done in the history of the railway. I do not think it has ever been done in the history of any railway. The vote has never been asked in that way. I have not the figures divided in that way and they could not possibly be so divided.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister mean to say that he has had no estimate put before him of the amount that is to be devoted to advertising, salaries and wages and the different amounts that are to make up the large lines of expenditure? Surely no estimate can be made up to give $9,000,000 unless it is just simply to say: We will ask for what we asked for last year. Surely no estimate is made up unless it is made up in detail and by getting the bulk sum by adding the detailed estimates. The deputy minister must have the detailed estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend will turn to pages 82, 83, 84 of the report of the Department of Railways and Canals he will find a detailed statement as to where these amounts went.

Maintenance of way and structures, $1,111,888.68.
Maintenance of equipment, $1,180,521.16.

The different heads of expenditure are given there. As a matter of fact, we can only take these items, and I imagine that the only way we can make an estimate upon these is to assume that the equipment will be increased as our business is increased. The only way we can do is to base the business of this year on last year's business, believing and hoping that the amount of business will be up to last year's at least. Last year we spent $9,000,000. We asked for an estimate of something like $7,000,000 and in the Supply estimates we had to ask for $1,400,000 more. Our estimate for next year is absolutely based upon the expenditure of last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the minister bears out what I have said, that in making up the estimates for the year he sat down and looked at the report of last year and found it totalled up so much. He came to the conclusion he would want as much this year and put it down. Does the minister mean to say that his officers do not provide him with an estimate, for instance, of the maintenance of way, or how much will be spent for advertising, how much for ties

and other things of that kind, which are matters of absolute calculation? I do not ask for the details of everything. It would be impossible to get down to absolute truth in reference to all the details, but I cannot think that it is not possible to make a definite division of an estimate of the moneys voted by parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is one of the difficulties: We have to ask on capital account, more money than we spend every year because we have to provide enough for a certain work. Perhaps we have too much for a certain work. If you divide this up under special headings and tie us to these votes we cannot run the railway. You cannot run the railway in that particular way. We would have to ask for a larger vote than $9,000,000. We give a plain statement of what was done with the money last year, and we propose to do the same this year. If we had to specialize this it would make it impossible for a minister to accept the vote and run the road unless he asked for more money than he needed.

Mr. FOSTER. It means that you do not sit down and carefully calculate what you require for the road, thus setting yourself a limit, and endeavouring to work your road economically so as to keep within your appropriation, if it is possible to do so. The minister may ask a little more than he will probably expend but he decides as nearly as possible what he may require and he may add to it so as to be sure that he does not crimp himself.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend must see the impracticability of applying his logic to the operation of a railway. This railway is hampered as no other railway is in having to come to parliament for supplies. If we had so much for maintenance of way for instance, and some unforeseen occurrence arose we could only use the money voted for maintenance of way and could not take from any other vote. We would therefore be in an awkward position. The only practical way is to hold the management responsible for the way in which the money is expended and allow the lump sum voted to be distributed as the interests of the road for the year may demand. There has got to be elasticity and flexibility in a vote for the operation of a railway or else you simply cannot carry it on.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be something in what the minister says, but so far as his argument goes about requiring money because of an accident or some unforeseen occurrence the minister has always power to get money, and his argument on that ground falls. Does not the minister think that it puts a check on extravagance and tends to good and economic administration that you should have your vote divided into different sections rather than to have it in a lump sum. Of course it is very convenient to take a lump vote and apply it just as you please but the other system is in my opinion the better one. Suppose you take a vote for maintenance of way now and it is found to be insufficient, you can get a supplementary vote when parliament meets next November. Parliament is practically always within reach to give a supplementary vote if it be necessary.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am firmly convinced that if my hon. friend thinks it out he will find it would be unworkable to divide this vote into details so much for each branch. While it sounds all right theoretically it would be impracticable in the working out. I know my hon. friend does not want to hamper the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. No, but I would like to hamper the minister a little in some of his extravagant expenditures.

Mr. GRAHAM. This minister does not need hampering as much as some hon. gentlemen opposite required to be hampered during their administration.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not reasonable to vote money for the working of a railway in detail unless you vote several millions of dollars more than you would vote under the present system, and if you did that it would be an incentive to extravagance rather than to economy in every department. We make as full a statement of our expenditure as any railroad company in the world ; there is no railway in the world so criticised by its stockholders as is the management of the Intercolonial Railway in this House ; there is no concealment, and with all that before the country it is unnecessary and impracticable to divide this vote up into sections.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does not the minister have his officers prepare a general statement on which he bases his total estimate for the coming year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. In making up the estimates they go into the different branches and take into consideration the expenditure of the previous year and the probable increased business of the coming year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are there no special changes ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are no special changes to come out of revenue. It is practically the same as last year. It may vary one way or the other. It cost $9,000,000 practically last year and will not cost much more next year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are you cutting the wages?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have not cut the wages at all; in fact all the men are asking for more.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are you cutting any men out?

Mr. GRAHAM. Some members, as the hon. member for Colchester this afternoon, complains that several men had been what we call set back for a time in order to relieve the condition. That is they are doing other work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are they not doing that on all railways in the country?

Mr. GRAHAM. All roads are reducing expenditure. It is more difficult for a government road to reduce expenditure than an ordinary road, although we hope to keep the expenditure low.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the policy of the department in this respect, to discharge some men and keep others employed full time or to keep all the men employed on reduced time so as to keep their families in more or less comfort and when conditions improve and there is demand for more men, have the complete staff available? It has come to be recognized that in order to produce stability in service, as well as for the benefit of the homes of these people, it is better to keep the whole staff employed but to run them on shorter hours.

Mr. GRAHAM. The unions all over America govern that, the various brotherhoods of railway workers. As far as I recollect their rules are that a certain standard of salary must be maintained, that the men must earn a certain amount. I think under the rules we would have to drop the men rather than take the position suggested by my hon. friend, although in many cases I believe it to be preferable.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not think in any case the minister should be run by the union. The employment of these men should be made as regular as possible even if they only get one trip or one job where formerly they would have two or three. I do not think that the other method is the proper way to treat the labouring men in this country. There should be some system, and I do not think any road could establish it better than the government road.

Mr. DANIEL. In St. John the Intercolonial Railway is widening two bridges over the railway track at Wall street and Stanley street. These are traversed by the electric railway and vehicles and also foot passengers. Complaints are publicly made of danger to foot passangers on both these bridges as there is no division between the portion of the bridge for vehicles, traffic and the portion for foot passengers, so that skittish horses which are apt to be frightened by the trains passing below the bridges, may run among the foot passengers and injure them.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I understood the bridges were built according to plans approved by the city engineer of St. John and by the engineers of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DANIEL. The bridges are all right, it is the question of the safety of foot passengers. There is plenty of room to rail off the foot bridge from the other part.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At page W—123, it appears the Montreal Cotton Company have received some $25,500 for cotton waste. I notice that the prices range from 6½ cents to about 60 cents a pound. Was this by public tender or by private tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend will explain what he means by private tender?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As I understand your private tender it can be nothing more than a letter to those on the patronage list.

Mr. GRAHAM. These are by tender, by circular I think. I give my friend the benefit of the doubt and say it is by circular.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This is a large item for material that is available in many parts of the country, and I would ask how many of those circulars were sent out.

Mr. GRAHAM. There would be quite a number, but I could not tell without having them here.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will certainly have to get Falconer and his firm on again when the minister is asking $9,000,000 which he will not divide or give any particulars of. Then when the hon. gentleman is asked what was expended last year and how, he does not seem disposed to give the information.

Mr. GRAHAM. What information?

Mr. FOSTER. This very thing we have been talking of.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is mistaken about that as about the other. I tell him there was competition. If I had to give all the information he wants, it would necessitate my bringing over the particulars of every tender for the last year. I can get that information if necessary, but it is impracticable to carry a list of the names of all the tenders and pile them up in the House. If he is anxious, I will get the list and let him have it in the morning.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where is this Cotton Company situated?

Mr. GRAHAM. In Montreal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Practically all the supplies, the minister purchased by the month. If the minister is compelled to purchase $2,000 worth of this material and $150,000 worth of iron and steel, there is no excuse for his not advertising throughout the country and getting the benefit of competition. If, on the other hand, he is

purchasing by the month from these stores, he must expect to pay the highest prices.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an item here for car repairs by other railways $41,000. What check has the Intercolonial on that ?

Mr. GRAHAM. These repairs are paid under the standard rules of the Master Car Builders Association. All railways pay the same tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the judge of the necessity for repairs ? Suppose one of your cars employed on some other road, possibly in the United States, has to be repaired, who is to be the judge of the repairs required ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The representative of the Master Car Builders Association on that railroad is the judge.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Intercolonial, in repairing the cars of other roads, acts on the same principle ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the proportion of idle cars on the Intercolonial as compared with last year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year we were something over 2,500 cars short of the regular supply. This year we are very near to what ought to be our normal supply.

Mr. FOSTER. The difference is measured by the difference between your shortage last year and your having the normal number at present ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister see any improvement on what seemed to be a great abuse as to the number of Intercolonial cars that were outside the jurisdiction of the Intercolonial and in use on other roads?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is remedied this year from the fact that the other roads do not want our cars and are glad to get rid of them and not have to pay the expense. Another idea we have been adopting is getting our pulp wood cars made in such a way, that the roads on the other side of the line will not be able to use them for other traffic.

Mr. FOSTER. When they do use them, they pay a certain rate per day ?

Mr. GRAHAM. All we get now is 25 cents a day. It used to be 50 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that pay for the wear and tear ? There is a chance for great imposition by the bigger roads on the smaller in that respect.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they not some regulations in the United States lately, compelling these railways to pay for the detention of cars ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The roads are all members of the same association and the fee is the same. A couple of roads refused to remain in the association if the fees were not reduced and it was reduced to 25 cents. They were probably the chief offenders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When your cars get over to the United States, do they keep them long before they send them back, if they want them ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That often happens. We send an ordinary box car with pulp wood, and if the other road is short of rolling stock, they will send it on from one road to another and each railroad will keep it awhile. We will find a car sometimes out at the Rockies months before getting it back. We charge for the amount of time it is used, and the charge hardly pays for the wear and tear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who keeps the account ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have a regular car account.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How do you know how long one road keeps it and then how long another road keeps it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Each road is supposed to report every day. We get information from the various lines where our car is.

Mr. FOSTER. While they have that car and are running it around from road to road and repairing it when necessary, do they charge you for repairs ? If so how do you make up this item of $41,000 for car repairs ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are certain divisions as to repairs on different roads. They are under the rules of the Master Car Builders' Association. We are all under the same rules and regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. But the minister does not know whether these are all charged up to the Intercolonial.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I can give that information to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is something in the nature of a clearing house between banks.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is and it isn't.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it all reported to some central accountant amongst the different roads, or do you have to enter this up as between yourselves and fifteen or twenty different roads in the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Master Car Builders' Association lay down rules as to what constitute repairs and what must be done. If there is a dispute in carrying that out, they adjudicate and give a decision.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Suppose a car is broken on a foreign road. Say, for instance, an Intercolonial car is running over the Boston and Maine and is smashed, the Intercolonial does not pay for that?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, under the regulations the road that smashes the car pays.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why cannot the minister run the trains on time? A short time ago the minister gave me a statement of the running of the Maritime Express for several months, and I think he will agree that there were only about two days a month for three or four months when the train was on time. It was late by from five minutes to nine hours.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a large railway problem why trains do not run on time. In the first place, this is a long run—a thousand miles. We try to run on time, but I regret that we do not always succeed. If the hon. gentdeman will look carefully into it, I think he will see that, in quite a number of instances, the lateness of the train is insignificant—a matter of a few minutes. Of course, a matter of even five or ten minutes is sometimes enough to lose a connection. I remember that, in a matter of causing trains to connect which we discussed this session, we had to make quite an allowance for lateness. My own idea is that perhaps we make too many stops on this Maritime Express. We try, more than a company road would, to accommodate the smaller places. We have petitions from many of the smaller towns on the line, and I am quite unpopular in some of them because I do not have the train stop. There are many reasons why trains are late, but I think that, in this case, one of the reasons is the many stops that we make.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand that this maritime express is supposed to be a fast train. It should run nearly on time. Take the Grand Trunk's International Limited—I do not think it is late once in a month, but runs sharp on time always. Then take the train to the coast, which has a run of 3,000 miles, and it runs on time practically every day. Of course, a local train carrying express and required to stop often may easily be late. But I am told that one reason why this Maritime Express is late is that there are generally one or two government private cars on.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. J. D. REID. What I am saying is that the International Limited, for instance, will not take on a private car. If this is not the reason why the Maritime Express is late, then I would like to know what the reason is. Out of thirty times in a month, I am sure it was late twenty-five times—I think that would be the average. If the Intercolonial is running a fast train it ought to run it on time, as the other roads do and not have it from ten minutes to nine hours late.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman should know that he is wrong about the Canadian Pacific Railway fast train being on time. It was about nine hours late yesterday, I believe.

Mr. J. D. REID. The limited train?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so. I am not saying that disparagingly for these difficulties will arise. We have the Ocean Limited which would correspond to the fast train on the Grand Trunk. No official cars are allowed to be carried on that train. But the Maritime Express is a through train and stops at as many places as possible to accommodate the people. It is not as fast a train as the Ocean Limited. I am confident that the lateness—which is liable to happen to any train—is not caused by official cars being carried.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Some time ago I asked about an accident that occurred on the Intercolonial between Montreal and Quebec. The train was off the track twice before it reached its destination. Are such accidents frequent?

Mr. GRAHAM. If the hon. gentleman will look up the record, I think he will find that accidents are not more frequent than on any other road—perhaps they are less than on the majority of roads. I have been on the Grand Trunk road myself and it ran off three times between Toronto and Brockville.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What I want to know is, is the Intercolonial track in good condition?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. We have been here now since eleven o'clock, so far as this item is concerned, we have had a pretty good discussion on it. I think we might pass this item and retire to our virtuous couches.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crawford). Carried.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend could not open his heart sufficiently to include the next item?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that ought to be discussed. I think the minister should be satisfied when he has $9,000,000 voted.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not complaining. But there will be many items of capital expenditure for the canals—and this is a canal

item—on which we can have as full a discussion as hon. gentlemen may wish.

Mr. J. D. REID. The trouble is that, when it is put off, we never have a chance to discuss the matter. I do not think it is fair to ask to have the item slide through without discussion.

Mr. GRAHAM. This item includes the men on the canals, and, if a Supply Bill is put through, it would be well to have the money to pay the men.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the amount?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is $1,016,408 including the amount for staff and repairs. I am not urging it, but I am simply pointing out there are many items of capital expenditure on which I will guarantee that full opportunity should be given for discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem like having a meal when you take it off the table.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am simply pointing out the reason why I would like to have this amount voted.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Militia will take up his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 10, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORTS OF DEBATES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I see my hon. friend from St. James division (Mr. Gervais) Chairman of the Debates Committee, is here to-day, so I will now present the motion which I placed in your hands two days ago regarding the fourth report of the Debates Committee. I moved at that time :

That the resolution adopted by this House on the 20th of May last adopting the fourth report of the committee appointed to supervise the official debates of the House, be reconsidered and rescinded; that the said fourth report of the said committee be referred back to said committee with instructions to inquire into the necessity of and demand for said additional translator, and the qualifications of said E. Charlier to act as such translator and to be appointed to such new position, and to inquire also as to such additional measures as may be necessary to ensure the prompt and efficient translation of the official documents of this House.

I would just say, in support of this motion that there is no doubt—I fancy the House does not doubt—that such a motion can be made. I quote from page 452 of Bourinot's parliamentary procedure, 3rd edition :

Circumstances, however, may arise to render it necessary that the House should reconsider its previous judgment on a question, and in that case there are means afforded by the practice of parliament of again considering the matter. Orders of the House are frequently discharged and resolutions rescinded. The latter part of the thirteenth rule of the House of Commons provides: 'No member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose that such vote be rescinded.'

Now, in regard to this particular report, the motion was made by my hon. friend the chairman of the committee on May 20th. Some discussion arose concerning the matter on the following day, May 21st. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said at that time :

That was a good reason and it is only for that reason. It is fair to the chairman of the committee to say that the report of the committee which was adopted yesterday was not open to the same objection as the report which was presented a few days ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not yesterday's report involve a charge on the revenue?

Mr. FIELDING. No; the chairman of the committee told me of the report yesterday before it was presented and I said at once: Are you proposing to increase any salaries. He said, No; we are proposing to fill a vacancy, this adds nothing to the expenditure; and I said: If that is the case the objection which was taken before would not apply, and the assurance was given me that it was not a proposal to create any new vacancy or to create any increase in salary.

Mr. FOSTER. But it adds to the expenditure?

Mr. FIELDING. The information given me was that it was to fill a vacancy.

On the same day, my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) who, I believe, is a member of the committee said :

The statement of the Finance Minister shows how useful and necessary it is to discuss these matters. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is entirely mistaken in his understanding of what was said to him. There is no doubt that the report of the committee yesterday created a new office and a new expense. It was to appoint a new employee altogether and that at a certain salary, and that is the report which was adopted.

And my right hon. friend the Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier said :

When the report was brought in I inquired from the chairman of the committee and I

understood from him that the report did not involve any new charge on the revenue, but simply filled a vacancy, and I understood under such circumstances there would be no objection at all. I may say to my hon. friend and to the House that if the good faith of anybody has been infringed upon, we will reconsider it. I do not want to have the matter passed in that way. There is no reason why this report should not be debated if it is to be debated at all.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said, further :

Lest I should mislead the House, I want to say at once that I have not the slightest doubt that the chairman of the committee acted in good faith, but from what he said I certainly did understand that this was not creating any new office, but filling a vacancy.

And the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in that debate, said :

I most certainly would like to discuss the matter of adding translators before the report goes through, and I think the suggestion made by the Prime Minister should be carried out, to have this report reconsidered and committed to the House to be discussed when the next report comes up.

In answer to which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister said :

I would not like to take this position to-day in the absence of the chairman of the committee, but, certainly, if there is not a proper understanding of the report, there is room for explanation.

There are other references to this report a little later on, I think. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that I have shown that the report was adopted hastily and under a misunderstanding for there is no doubt whatever that it involves an additional charge upon the revenue, as it calls for a salary of $2,000 a year. Under these circumstances, I think it is a case which would call for the rescinding of the resolution and recommittal of the report of the committee in order that the committee should fully investigate the matter as set out in the resolution which I have had the honour to present. I do not, for a single moment, suppose that my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais), the chairman of the committee, intended to mislead the House—nothing is further from my idea—It is merely one of those cases where, in the haste of the business of the House towards the close of the session, such things may occur without any fault being imputable to anybody. I mentioned this matter to my hon friend (Mr. Gervais) this morning, and suggested to him the propriety of allowing this motion to go through in order that the committee might reconsider the question, as it has evidently been a matter of surprise. My hon. friend did not seem to see the advisability of doing that. Had he agreed to my suggestion, that would have dispensed with the necessity of my calling in question the qualifications of the man whose appointment has been recommended in the report adopted by the House. My information is that Mr. Charlier has been convicted before a criminal court of libel and sentenced to imprisonment and then released on ticket of leave. That alone is a grave enough matter for re-investigation by the committee upon his appointment. He is at present under accusation of blackmail. There is an indictment and the jury in the first trial has disagreed. I do not wish to insist on these two points, but in view of the attitude of the chairman of the committee, I thought I should mention them to the House, and it seems to me these are conclusive reasons why the report should be sent back to the committee, in order that the whole matter may be investigated.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. H. GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James). The scope of the motion which has been moved by the hon. gentleman for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is wider than that of the report which was presented by the Debates Committee and adopted by this House. There are before this House two reports, one in relation to the increase of salaries of the official reporters, another with regard to the reorganization of the translation bureau in order to provide that the French edition of the 'Hansard' should be published within twenty-four hours after the English edition; and now the hon. gentleman wants to have the fourth report of the committee sent back to the Debates Committee for the purpose of making further inquiry in regard to the qualification of one of the appointees, Mr. Charlier. Let me call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that nothing was said against another of the appointees, Mr. Girard, whose engagement is also mentioned in that fourth report.

Now I will deal one by one with the objections the hon. gentleman has made to this report. With regard to the regularity of the report, I may say that the meeting of the Debates Committee which recommended the appointment of Mr. Girard as proof-reader, and of Mr. Charlier as translator, was convened in the usual way, proper notice having been given to each of the members of the committee. When the meeting was called to order, there was a quorum present. The resolution was passed unanimously. I never complained of any resolution which has been passed in this House when I was absent therefrom.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Did not one of the members vote nay on the appointment ?

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) did, at the end. I think the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) moved the resolution for the appointment of Mr. Girard and Mr. Charlier.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And the member for Leeds opposed it.

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes, but in such a way that we considered that the report was unanimously adopted by the committee. Everything was done correctly, according to the rules of parliamentary committees, and according to the regulations and rules of this House. On the same day, when the report was read to the House, no objection was taken to it. Then when the motion was made for concurrence nothing was said against the report, and the report was concurred in by and in virtue of rule 32 of the rules and orders governing the procedure of the House of Commons, and reading as follows :

A motion may be made by unanimous consent to the House without previous notice.

This was done by the unanimous consent of the House, in accordance with the rules of parliament which we have adopted from the British parliament. The moment the British parliament unanimously passes a motion it becomes the law of the land. By unanimous consent the British parliament may repeal the Magna Charta if they wish, providing it is the parliament sitting on the Thames embankment, because no other British house being sovereign could repeal such a law as the Magna Charta. But the moment the Sovereign parliament of England pass any law, unanimously, nothing can come into conflict with it. This resolution, as I say, for concurrence in the report of the Debates Committee, was passed unanimously. Some of the members may have been absent, but the government benches were occupied by ministers of the Crown, and no objection was made to the adoption of the report. I may say that before the House opened I showed that report to ministers of the Crown, and nothing was said against it, because nothing could be said against it. If anybody had raised his finger against the passing of that resolution, the report could not have been concurred in. Now, Mr. Speaker, to show the soundness of my contention that the Debates Committee was entitled and is still entitled to make recommendations for salaries, for increase of salaries, and so forth, I will quote a few precedents. Since as far back as 1880 it has been the constant practice of this House of Commons to accept the recommendations of the Debates Committee, both as regards new salaries and increases of salaries, and those recommendations, when confirmed by this House, have been the laws of the land, and have been carried into full execution. In 1880 the staff of official reporters and translators was appointed by the House upon a recommendation made by the Debates Committee, reading as follows :

The Debates Committee recommended; That six reporters be engaged and recognized as officers of the House, subject to such recommendations as may from time to time be enacted by the Commission of Internal Economy of the House or by the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the Debates of the House.

The salaries recommended were, chief reporter $1,500 ; reporters $1,000 ; assistant to chief reporter $500.

In 1884, as may be seen by the journals of the House, pages 267 and 285, another report was presented to the House, recommending an increase of salaries, including the chief, to $2,000. The report was made on March 21st and concurred in on March 26. Then on the 13th of July, 1905, the Debates Committee presented their sixth report, reading as follows :

Your committee recommends:

1. That the salary of $2,000 per annum at present paid to each member of the staff of official reporters of the debates, be increased to $2,500.

2. That the salary of $1,200 per annum now paid to Mr. Charles W. Boyce, assistant to the chief reporter, be increased to $1,500.

In 1903 there had been some other increases of salaries and some new salaries recommended and confirmed by the House, which went into effect without objection. Therefore I say that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier cannot now raise any objection as it is in the exclusive province of the government to object to increases of expenditure for salaries, and to say that the Debates Committee has been encroaching upon this right of the Crown. As a matter of fact, that fourth report did create a small expenditure, but it was the privilege of the government exclusively to raise any objection and therefore the objection taken on that ground by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is not well founded. According to the third edition of Bourinot, edited by Dr. Flint, it is within the province of the Debates Committee to recommend new salaries, increases in salaries, &c., and these recommendations, when approved by the House, have to be accepted by all parties concerned.

With regard to the question of the reorganization and improvement of the translation bureau or of the official reporters' bureau, I may say that there is a report now before this House, the third report of the Debates Committee, and all the objections which are being raised now by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier will be properly ventilated in due course. The hon. member is trying to raise a debate with regard to a proposed improvement of the translation bureau which question will be properly debated when the third report of the Debates Committee comes before the House for concurrence. On that ground also I take objection and I say that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is not in order when he moves that the fourth report of the Debates Committee be referred back and tries at the same time to debate the third report of the com-

mittee which has not been offered for concurrence.

Then, with regard to the qualification of Mr. Charlier, I may say that the gentleman is quite competent to do the work of translation. I think there is no man better qualified to do French translation for this House. There is not, on the staff of official translators, one man who is a Bachelor of Letters of the University of France. Let me quote to the House the following certificate which shows that Mr. Charlier has been made a Bachelor of Letters by the faculty of Besançon, as well as an official certificate of Lyons, which shows that Mr. Charlier has been made a Bachelor of Science. I will first quote the certificate from the school of Besançon, which is as follows :

(Translation.)

University of France,
Besançon Faculty of Letters,
Besançon Academy.

The undersigned, the secretary of the Besançon Faculty of Letters, certifies that Mr. Charlier (Gustave Edouard), born in Paris, in the department of Seine, on the 9th of February, 1858, has been deemed worthy of the degree of Bachelor in Letters, on the 25th of July, 1876, after the examinations he has passed before the said Faculty according to the regulation of the 25th of July, 1874.

(Signed.) PAPILLON,
Secretary.

Besançon, 9th Nov., 1876.

Certified for the Rector,
The delegated Academy inspector,
(Signed.) R. DUPARAY.

Then there is the following certificate showing that he has been made a Bachelor of Science :

(Translation.)

The Lyon Faculties of Divinity, Sciences and Letters,:

Secretary's Office,
Palais Saint-Pierre.

The undersigned, the Secretary of the Lyon Faculty of Sciences, certifies that Mr. Charlier (Gustave Edouard), born in Paris (Seine), on the 9th of February, 1858, has been declared worthy of the degree of Bachelor in physical and natural sciences, on the 5th of November, 1877.

(Signed.) C. BECQ,
Secretary.

Lyon, 5th Nov., 1877.
Certified, E. Faivre, Dean.

Mr. Charlier has also been employed in several cities of Europe as a private tutor as well as in Rio de Janeiro, and I will quote a letter from the minister of Roumania, in Constantinople, to ensue any gentleman in Canada to make further inquiry about the character, the honesty and the integrity of Mr. Charlier. I challenge the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to prove anything dishonest against Mr. Charlier. One must be fair and just, and the committee will stand by the man against whom nothing has been yet proven. As long as nothing has been proven against him, this House should stand firmly by him and do him justice. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is not satisfied with my statement I will give him a few addresses of people to whom he may go to make further inquiry about the character and qualifications of the new translator. I refer the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to the following letter from Constantinople :

(Translation.)

Legatinunea Romanie, Constantinople,
Royal Rumanion Legation.

I, the undersigned, minister of Rumania in Constantinople, certify that Mr. Edouard Charlier has in a most meritorious way prepared my son Gabriel for the baccalaureata examinations and that I can only congratulate myself upon the relations we had together from October, 1902, to November, 1893.

(Signed) The Minister of Rumania,
MICHER MITILINEU,

Constantinople, 25th June, 5th July, 1904.

He might also inquire about Mr. Charlier from such people as Mr. de Margerie, the French ambassador at Pekin. Comté E. Rodocanachi. Let me also read the following letter :

(Translation.)

Imperial Ottoman High School,
Constantinople, Galata Serai,
January 31st, 1894.

Mr. Edouard Charlier is a professor of great merit who has successfully educated many pupils in distinguished families, more particularly in Constantinople, where he has prepared for baccalaureat examinations the son of H. E. the minister of Rumania, who has splendidly undergone all the written and oral tests and has been admitted with the mention 'very well,' moreover, through his perfect respectability, he is highly recommended to all persons who may apply to him.

The assistant director,
(Signed.) d'HOLLYS.

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend suggest that I should go to Constantinople ?

Mr. GERVAIS. Well, let the hon. gentleman remain in Canada and I will show him that he had more to do with Mr. Charlier than anybody in both Houses of parliament. Do you recall the fact that when M. Cresse, K.C., ex-mayor Laporte, Mr. R. Bickerdike, and M. Catelli, your great friend, and you met in M. Cressé's office to organize an international committee for the establishment of a commercial treaty between Italy and Canada—that Mr. Charlier was appointed secretary of such committee. Do you remember that you asked Mr. Charlier to establish a newspaper for your party?

Mr. MONK. I would like to state to the hon. gentleman that I do not know the gentleman.

Mr. GERVAIS. Have you ever seen Mr. Charlier in your office on St. François Xavier Street ?

Mr. MONK. I do not remember.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Hon. members must address the chair.

Mr. GERVAIS. I do not want to be interrupted because I have to finish my work of showing that Mr. Charlier has been highly appreciated in both South America and France, that he has received a first class education, that he is a French scholar and that he knows more about foreign languages than anybody in my country. Then let me say to the House that when Mr. Charlier was apointed general secretary of that great international committee for the purpose of securing a treaty of commerce between Italy and Canada, he was so appointed because he was perfectly familiar with the Italian language which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier knows, I confess, very well, too. That was one of the qualifications for which my hon. friend accepted Mr. Charlier as secretary of that international committee. When, I may say that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, having read some articles written in the 'Journal de Genève' by Mr. Charlier, said, to his bosom Friend, Mr. Charles Auguste Corneillier : 'Show me the oyster in which you found such a pearl.' It is clear that the hon. member (Mr. Monk) did not have the same opinion of Mr. Charlier as he now holds. Some ten years ago when Mr. Charlier was preparing a pamphlet for the so-called municipal reform league in Montreal the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) highly valued the competency of Mr. Charlier as a linguist. I might quote letters to show that Mr. Charlier is highly appreciated by men having a universal reputation in the world of science and letters. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has lived in Italy for some years and he knows the Rodocanachi family. This family name is well known in Austria, Italy, England and France, and it includes amongst its members quite a number of scientists and men of letters. I have here a certificate as to Mr. Charlier's ability dated April 20, 1889, and written by E. Rodocanachi, Greek consul at Leghorn. I have here another certificate to the same effect from Viscount F. Figueiredo, Rio de Janeiro. These certificates are sufficient to show that Mr. Charlier is a man of repute in literature and a man quite competent to do the work of translating.

Let me refresh the memory of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier by asking him if it was not one of the aims of the international committee to establish a treaty between Canada and Italy, to encourage the importation into Canada of such goods as olive oil, wines, material for making cement, pozzolane and what Mr. Cresse styled piles gum.

Mr. MONK. I would say to my hon. friend that I never heard of this committee. All this is new to me.

Mr. GERVAIS. Were you not at one of the meetings?

Mr. MONK. Never.

Mr. GERVAIS. My information is that the hon. member (Mr. Monk) was at one of the meetings at least.

Mr. LANCASTER. He says he was not.

Mr. GERVAIS. I think the hon. member (Mr. Monk) will not deny that Mr. Charlier went once to his office and that at that time he did not think that Mr. Charlier was so bad. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) does deny that Mr. Charlier went to his office on St. François Xavier street, will he deny that he met Charlier in the office of Mr. L. G. A. Cresse, his bosom friend? I find in 'La Presse' of November 10, 1899, that the Hon. Mr. Taillon, Mr. Cornellier, Mr. Charlier and Mr. Cressé spoke from the same platform when the St. James Workingman's Club was established under the supervision and supreme care of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. This report is worth reading.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. GERVAIS. Here it is:

(Translation.)

Hon. Mr. Taillon speaks at the Conservative Workmen's Club—Liberal deceit—New Cheers for Mr. C. A. Cornellier—a Frenchman from old France speaks sympathetic words.

Last night's meeting of the St. James division Conservative Workmen's Club has been a success, just as every one of the previous meetings of that club. The gathering was presided over by Mr. Azaire Lamarche and the hall was crowded with voters anxious to hear political questions of the day discussed by the orators on the bill.

Minutes being read the following were admitted as members of the club : Messurs. Aza Filiatrault, P. Arthur Côt?, Jas. Champoux, Dr. J. Bte Campeau, O. Rochon, T. Saint-Pierrre, J. Hector Lesage, J. N. Bergeron, A. Houde, H. G. Thibauleau, Arthur Sauvé, E. Neveu, Sr., E. Neveu, L. J. Noël, C. Paquette, J. Ed. Lamothe, Louis Laferriere, J. L. Cadieux.

Mr. Nap. Royal proposed, seconded by Mr. L. T. Frigon, that Mr. Pierre Germain be elected a member of the committee of the club St. Jacques. Carried.

Mr. Joseph Jubinville proposed, seconded by Mr. H. Royal that Mr. J. H. Lesage, advocate, be elected corresponding secretary of the Workmen's Conservative Club, St. James division. Carried.

Mr. Louis T. Frigon, proposed, seconded by Mr. P. Auger, that the name of Mr. R. Wilson Smith, ex-mayor of Montreal, be added to the list of honorary presidents of the Workmen's Conservative Club, St. James division.

That the members of this club take advantage of the present opportunity to assure him that they unanimously join in the hope expressed by the Conservatives of St. Lawrence and St. Louis divisions that he will once more be the Conservative standard bearer in the coming struggle.

Mr. A. Lamarche proposed, seconded by Mr. N. Royal, that Hon. Damien Rolland and Mr. L. G. A. Cressé be appointed honorary vice-presidents. Carried.

Mr. Jos. Venne proposed, seconded by Mr. A. Panneton, that the following gentlemen be added to the list of honorary members : Hon. J. D. Villenueuve, P. Décarie, J. A. David, Arthur Labelle, J. A. Brossard, H. Jeannotte, Frs. Martineau, Jos. Lamarre, A. C. Trudeau, Jos. Letange, E. Pelletier, J. N. Emard, Chas. Grothé, Dr. Racicot, F. Lapointe, Jos. Paquette Toussaint Gauthier.

Mr. J. H. Lesage made a speech and then Mr. Cornellier spoke, and he introduced Mr. Charlier to the meeting and this is what he had to say :

Mr. C. A. Cornellier, whose eloquent voice had been heard many times before in the club, was then loudly called upon to speak. The gifted orator received from the audience a most enthusiastic greeting; indeed the electors of St. James are no strangers to his gift, both as a speaker and an advocate.

I had come this evening, said Mr. Cornellier, to hear the Hon. Mr. Taillon, whom we all regard with veneration and whom we greet with uncovered heads whenever we have the advantage of meeting him.

In a rapid review of the situation with respect to the Transvaal question, Mr. Cornellier then held up to ridicule the defence of Mr. Laurier and his friends in the province of Quebec. 'They contend,' he said, 'that England forced the Canadian government to send a contingent of our soldiers to Africa. That is absolutely untrue. They themselves offered a regiment to England ; the offer was accepted in order not to displease the colony, but a second offer made by Mr. Laurier and his government was refused.'

Here Mr. Cornellier said—I will read it in French.

An hon. MEMBER. Read it in Italian.

Mr. GERVAIS. I could read it in Italian but I cannot speak Italian so fluently as can the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. However, I do understand the Italian language as well as the Spanish language. I will read it in French because I cannot afford the time to translate it.

(Translation.)

Here Mr. Cornellier told an anecdote at which the audience was convulsed with laughter.

In his closing remarks the eloquent speaker said that England might count upon the plighted faith of French Canadians, but that while the latter respected the constitution and the treaties, their love was for France the land of their origin.

I have a surprise in store for you, added Mr. Cornellier; I wish to introduce to you a Frenchman recently arrived but who already loves French Canadians as if he had always lived among them, that gentleman is M. Edouard Charlier.

Mr. Charlier came to the platform and Mr. Cornellier introduced him by saying : —I translate this:—'I want to spring a surprise on you by introducing to you a Frenchman lately arrived in Montreal. but who loves the French Canadians just as much as if he had been born amongst them.' Then came Mr. Charlier's speech, and I quote it from 'La Presse' which at that time was the faithful organ of the member for Jacques Cartier. Mr. Charlier said :

(Translation.)

Mr. Charlier, invited by the chairman to address the meeting, did so in a charming style which captivated his hearers; the patriotic and inspiring nature of his address was such that almost every sentence drew loud applause. He was not yet a Canadian, he said, but would soon really become so. He alluded to the visit made to the province of Quebec by M. Herbette 'that eminent Frenchman and distinguished diplomatist; one of those wise and learned men who modestly labour for the greatness of France, who spare no effort, but devote all their talents and attainments to their country's cause.'

The only thing that Mr. Herbette regrets is that he has been unable to live during some time among the labouring population of this country. Other Frenchmen, said Mr. Charlier would complete his task.

Mr. Charlier expressed great surprise at the manner in which French Canadians adapted themselves to political life and at the interest they take in all public questions.

'You may be truly called a free people' said Mr. Charlier. 'That freedom you have yourselves conquered and you have a right to be proud of it.'

Speaking of foreign immigration, Mr. Charlier said that if we were better known in France, more French labour and capital would find their way to this country. He commended Canadian loyalty and the expansive powers of the race, paying also a graceful tribute to the Catholic clergy that had been the soul of the present greatness of the Canadian people.

The Canadian woman was Mr. Charlier's next theme : 'Among English families' he said, 'one did not find those good Canadian mothers who take so noble a part in the development of the province of Quebec, by their incessant gifts of new citizens, a constant self sacrifice to the greatness of the country.'

This oratorical gem, which we would have liked to be able to print in full, was applauded to the echo.

Mr. Charlier concluded his remarks amid tremendous applause. Then the Hon. Mr. Taillon, ex-Prime Minister of the province of Quebec, spoke and paid a high compliment to Mr. Charlier :

(Translation.)

Hon. Mr. Taillon was received with enthusiasm when he rose to speak. The loud plaudits of the assembly proved that his former electors of St. James division have not forgotten him, but that they still like to hear his manly voice and frank address. 'Some public men,' said Mr. Taillon, 'enjoy great public meetings where large crowds press round the foot of the hustings. For my part, I prefer

club meetings where I may get in touch with the labouring classes. It is in such meetings that elections are really won, for there one meets the intelligent, sincere and devoted workers.

Mr. Taillon then gave the history of the Manitoba school question, explaining the duplicity of Mr. Laurier and his friends as evidenced by the conduct of the Liberal government since their accession to power in Ottawa.

'If,' said Mr. Taillon, 'I were to ask you: Are you proud of being French Canadians ? Are you proud of being Catholics ? you would reply that to put such questions would imply an insult. Indeed you have proved that such would be the case by the applause you have given Mr. Charlier, a Frenchman from old France who spok to us in so patriotic a strain.

Nevertheless, in 1896, public opinion was led astray. The true meaning of this question does not seem to have been understood and it was thought that the difficulty might be solved by placing at the head of affairs a man of our own blood and of our religion. Such a feeling was certainly legitimate ; but we the leaders described the pit-falls and thought it our duty to warn our too confiding countrymen. Were we mistaken ? We have seen them at work ; after having used the Manitoba school question to obtain power, after having embarrassed the government of that day by misleading or ambiguous statements, after defeating by obstruction the Remedial Bill, after having ousted Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Mackenzie Bowell and all friends by an alliance with the fanatical element, Mr. Laurier became the leader of the government ; and then, unexampled treason, he allowed his friend Mr. Greenway, to carry out his infamous plot against our fellow countrymen and co-religionists.

Mr. Taillon then drew attention to Mr. Laurier's tour in Ontario. Sir Wilfrid seemed to say to the fanatics of that province : 'True I was so unfortunate as to displease you in the Transvaal matter, but remember how I pleased you in the Manitoba school matter.'

Moreover, Mr. Laurier has done nothing but sacrifice the French race since he has become prime minister. First of all he has reduced to two the number of French Canadian ministers and Mr. Tarte complained of it at St. Vincent de Paul. He has sacrificed the Acadians by replacing Hon. J. O. Arsenault by an English speaking senator ; he did the same thing in appointing a judge. So much so that l''Evangelien,' a Liberal paper, complained bitterly about it.

More than that, the persecutors of our race in Manitoba have been feasted and rewarded by Mr. Laurier and his friends. Greenway was banquetted when he came to Montreal ; Martin was introduced to the speaker of the House of Commons by Mr. Laurier; Sifton is now a colleague of Messrs. Laurier and Tarte in the cabinet; Mr. Wade, a Winnipeg lawyer, Greenway's accomplice, is now an official of the Laurier government in the Yukon.

Mr. Taillon then pointed out that Mr. Laurier had been false to all his pledges. He had increased the expenditure and the debt which he had promised to reduce; he had not altered the protective tariff of which every vestige was to disappear and Mr. Joe Martin had reproached him publicly with deceiving the people.

Hon. Mr. Taillon explained that if the country was prosperous to-day the fact was due less to Mr. Laurier's policy than to good harvests and to different other circumstances over which the government had no control.

He closed by a warm appealing to the labouring population, tricked by the Liberal party in a manner which called for retributive justice.

The speaker received a genuine ovation as he took his seat.

Before closing, the chairman announced that at an early date a special meeting would be called, at which most of the speakers would be workmen.

The chairman also invited the electors of St. James division to attend the brilliant inaugural meeting of the junior Conservative club which will take place at the Monument National on Tuesday, the 21st instant. Hon. Mr. Flynn and most of the Conservative leaders will attend.

I have in my hand the plan for publishing a French newspaper, which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier knows quite well, and which after having read it, he said was a marvel both of intellectuality and of administrative genius. I have now to read to the House further certificates of the competency and the high qualifications of Mr. Charlier as a translator :

Ottawa, 28th March, 1905.

To the Chairman of the Debates Committee.

Dear Sir,—I hear that it has become necessary to appoint a second proofreader to the Debates staff of the Commons.

You would please me by appointing to that position Mr. Charlier, journalist, of Montreal, whom I know to be thoroughly competent.

I hope you will do all you can in favour of this candidate.

Yours truly,

R. PREFONTAINE.

I insisted on having a more mandatory order from the late Minister of Marine. Here it is :

(Translation.)

Honoré Gervais, Esq., M.P.,
Chairman of the Debates Committee,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

My Dear Gervais,—I specially recommend to you Mr. Edouard Charlier, journalist, for the position of proofreader to the French Debates staff which has been talked about for a while. To my knowledge, Mr. Charlier has all the necessary qualifications to discharge those duties in a proper manner.

Yours truly,

R. PREFONTAINE.

(Translation.)

Honoré Gervais, Esq., M.P.,
Chairman of the Debates Committee,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—You ask me whether I believe that Mr. Charlier would be a good translator on the Debates staff. I say yes, and I rely on facts, Mr. Charlier having, this year, translated in a satisfactory manner about fifty pages of 'Hansard.'

I have the honour to be,

Yourst truly,

(Signed.) WILFRID LAROSE,
Chief Translator.

Then the first appointment of Mr. Charlier was made, and he proved to be a first-class proof-reader, because for the first time in the history of the 'Hansard' of the House of Commons, within four days after the date of prorogation all the proofs had been read and all the printing matter had been delivered to the King's Printer, just because Mr. Charlier had been added to the translation staff. I ask leave to read the following certificate of Dr. Dawson, the King's Printer :

Ottawa, July 26, 1905.

Hon. R. Préfontaine,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Every line of the English Debate has been translated into French and the proofs have been corrected and are, except 15 galleys, now in my hands. This is the first time that this work has been done so quickly and it is largely due to the improvement in the proof-reading which has been recently introduced by the Hansard committee and carried out by the appointment of a new proof-reader Mr. Edouard Charlier.

Yours truly,

S. E. DAWSON,

King's Printer and Controller of Stationery.

Then there was some undue interference from some quarter, and the good work which had been started years ago at my instigation has been handicapped and has been left unfinished. If the Debates Committee had been given a free hand in the supervision of the reporting, translating and printing of the Official Debates, there would be no complaints against our committee today, and within twenty-four hours after the publication of the unrevised English edition, there would be a French edition of the Debates for distribution throughout the province of Quebec. But the remarks on that point I reserve until the third report of the committee will come up for adoption.

Now, it is said that Mr. Charlier has been convicted of libel. That is true ; but, Mr. Speaker, please listen to the circumstances of the case. I may say at the outset that there are now sitting in this parliament at least five members and senators who have been in jail either for libel or contempt of court. In that there is nothing dishonourable, nothing to complain of ; because these questions of libel and contempt of court are differently appreciated according to the condition of mind that prevails in different ages. What was a criminal libel in 1840 is considered now to be a subject of free discussion in all the newspapers of the land, because freedom of speech is greater or smaller according to the condition of mind of each age. I may add, as being much in favour of Mr. Charlier the following explanation : When he was convicted in the Assize Court of defamatory libel, the late Hon. Mr. Justice Wurtele asked Mr. Charlier, who was the actual author of the article which was complained of, adding should he divulge such name he would be given liberty. Mr. Charlier said : 'I cannot disclose the name ; I prefer to go to jail.' Then the late Mr. Justice Wurtele said : 'All right ; if you do not want to divulge the name of the actual author, I will pass sentence upon you.' It speaks strongly in favour of Charlier ; there are not many men among my compatriots or among the other citizens of this country who are ready to go to jail just for the sake of standing firm and keeping secret the name of a man who has written something in a newspaper. Charlier said : I accept the responsibility of all that has been published in my paper ; I have been found guilty, I suffer for it,—and then he was sentenced. There is not much to be said upon this. Instead of impugning his character we should praise him because there is so little courage in our day. And, Mr. Speaker, my statement is borne out by the great organ of the member for Jacques Cartier, 'Le Rappel.' When he was sounding the bugle to bring back all his followers, the lost recruits, he established that great newspaper, 'Le Rappel.'

Mr. MONK. I must take exception to what my hon. friend says ; I have no organ and never had any organ.

Mr. GERVAIS. At any rate in the number of 'Le Rappel,' dated Sunday, April 3, 1904, I find a beautiful article upon Mr. Monk headed in large capital letters 'Mr. Monk.'

Mr. F. D. Monk has just raised once more in parliament the most important question of the turnpike roads. He was courting a sure defeat when butting against the stubbornness of our narrow minded ministers, but it matters not as we do not expect the opposition members to win victory, but——

There is a long article in French in which it is said that Mr. Monk has raised once more the great and very new question of the abolition of the Montreal island toll gates. Then in the same article I find:

(Translation.)

The electors of the county of Jacques-Cartier are justly proud of their representative in the Commons. When electing him, they intended to entrust him with their own as well as with the country's interests. Mr. Monk did not deceive their expectations. Nobody else has in so short a time run such a distinguished and fruitful career. His self-devotion and his eagerness for work form a strange contrast with the laziness and selfishness of too many members from the province of Quebec.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can hardly see how this relates to the subject under discussion.

Mr. GERVAIS. I bow to the decision of the chair ; my attention was taken for a moment from the regular debate. I wish to quote an article from 'Le Rappel,' an

article relating to Mr. Charlier. When I said that Mr. Charlier went to jail for a compatriot who had written the article incriminated, I spoke the truth. Here is what 'Le Rappel' said about it on the same date :

(Translation.)

1. We must first state that the chief culprit in this case, that is the wretched and cowardly writer of that libellous article knew the proper time to hide himself. His name, which Mr. Charlier refused to mention, has not been disclosed before the court. The name, however, is known; it is whispered everywhere and it will soon, let us hope, be published abroad.

'Le Rappel' says : We have to remark, first of all, that Charlier is not the guilty party. We know who wrote the article. Charlier has been too frank and too true to his friends to divulge the name, but we hope before long the culprit will be brought before the court.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman think it is always a merit to shield the culprit?

Mr. GERVAIS. No, it is not always a merit, but it is not always a sign of demerit. Many men who have suffered on the scaffold have made England free. The hon. gentleman will admit that the men who imposed Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights, the men who made England free, went to the scaffold, almost every one of them.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not for other people's crimes.

Mr. GERVAIS. It is a question of fact. If you read the history of the great quo warranto writ you will find that the sacrifice of the men of those earlier days was for the advantage of their neighbours of this time.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has said that Mr. Charlier has been charged with blackmailing. That charge was tried once, there was a disagreement of the jury after one of the most ferocious trials, and then a nolle prosequi was entered because no conviction could be secured against him. I think in all fairness the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) should withdraw such a charge as he has brought before this House. I have nothing to say about the merits of the charges against Mr. Charlier. The jury has passed upon them. From the point of view of morality, after all nothing has been proved against Mr. Charlier's character. If you look at his competency, his capacity, his capability, everything has been proved in the most conclusive way. He is a Bachelor of Letters and Science of the University of France, and any one of my fellow-citizens who knows anything about education, university degrees and diplomas and sheep skins knows the value of a university degree granted by the University of France. There are not ten men in Canada holding such a diploma. There are not five men in Canada able to translate fluently ancient Greek, modern Greek, Portuguese, Spanish, Italian and English, and now when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) wants the Debates Committee to make further inquiries about the capacity and capability of this man to be a translator, I think he wants to joke and laugh at the members of this House.

In regard to the question of dishonesty—I repeat that nothing has been proved against Mr. Charlier. It is true he has been convicted for another's crime, for the crime of a gentleman who is highly considered and esteemed. It is true he has been convicted, but there is no disgrace in being convicted under such circumstances. We in the Debates Committee knew at the time of the drafting of the report all the circumstances of the case and the Debates Committee made their report after due knowledge having been conveyed to them and knowing all the circumstances of the case.

I say that the fourth report of the committee should stand as it has been affirmed and confirmed and concurred in by this House—in good faith on my behalf I pledge my word, openly, without any restriction or limitation, having communicated the report to whom the report was to be communicated. Under these circumstances I appeal to both sides of the House to support the Debates Committee, not to handicap their work, but to help them all through in order that their work may be made more efficient and more useful for the benefit of the public in general. I have been trying to do my duty as chairman of the Debates Committee. I have been trying to be fair, just and honest to both sides of this House, and I hope that my Debates Committee will be left unhandicapped, will be left free, being only the servant of the House of Commons. I ask that no internal economy commission policy should be framed to interfere with the good work of the Debates Committee. For the official reporters and official translators, for all time to come, should remain under the guidance and rule—the exclusive guidance and rule—of the House of Commons. We should not make the official reporters and official translators subservient to the dominant party, the tools and servants of the government. But for the benefit of everybody in the land, for the benefit of every member of this House, on the opposition side as well as on the government side, these officers should remain as they are, the servants only of the House of Commons as a whole. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the motion be rejected and that our report stand confirmed.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I think I owe it to the House to express the views which I have indivi-

dually formed with regard to the motion now under discussion. Some days ago, the Debates Committee made a report to this House which was adopted on the same day that it was presented. This was not exactly regular, for, in such cases, it is usually required that notice be given. However, as is often the case in the despatch of the business of the House, the strict technicality of the rule was not observed. Exception is taken to-day. When the motion for adoption of the report was made, no exception was taken, and the report was adopted accordingly. When attention was called to the matter, some days later, I believe, I took the ground that if there was a feeling that the motion had been carried as the result of surprise, the report should be sent back to the committee on reason therefor being shown. I have listened to the motion and speech of my hon. friend for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the speech of the chairman of the Debates Committee, my hon. friend from St. James, Montreal (Mr. Gervais). The motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, as I understand it, is to send the report back to the Committee of the House in order to examine into the qualifications of Mr. Charlier to see whether or not he is qualified for the position to which he has been promoted.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there not another question—as to the necessity for the appointment ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That has been considered by the committee, and, for my part, when the report of a committee recommends a certain course, I take the ground, that the report should be maintained unless some strong reason to the contrary is given. Now, the discussion has been confined simply to the qualification of Mr. Charlier ? If anything else has been dealt with, I have not apprehended it, and I have followed the debate closely. Mr. Charlier, I understand, has been an officer of this House for a number of years. I understand that he has been a proof-reader under the Debates Committee and has occupied that position for four or five years. I understand also that his qualifications as a translator are not questioned, on the contrary, I understand that his competency is more than admitted—that no man could be found more competent than he to translate from French into English or English into French, being familiar with both languages. But, I understand, a question is raised as to the moral qualifications of Mr. Charlier. Now, if it were proposed to take him for the first time into the employ of this House, if he were coming from abroad to be made an officer of the House, there would be some occasion to present this view. But I have to observe—and if I am wrong in this I want to be corrected by the members of the Debates Committee, because I do not know the facts—I understand that Mr. Charlier has been in the service of the House as proof-reader for about five years. Is that so, or is it not so ? If it is, it seems to me that the point raised by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is not a very strong one. Now, however, coming to the main facts which have been alleged by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, they have been reduced to two, and they should engage, for a moment, the attention of the House. It is contended that Mr. Charlier should not be given the position to which he has been promoted because he has been convicted of libel. I repeat, that position might well have been taken years ago when Mr. Charlier was first taken into the service of this House by the Debates Committee—for, as I understand, this offence was previous to that appointment. But I have to call the attention of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier and of the House to the fact that a conviction of libel does not carry with it any stigma ; the offence of libel is not one of those which carry with them any dishonour. On the contrary, sometimes it has been a merit to be convicted of libel, to denounce an abuse, to bring forward an accusation. I would remind my hon. friend that one of the best, most lovable and purest men of the nineteenth century, Cardinal Wiseman, was brought before the assizes on a charge of libel and convicted, and fined £500. But this was never a stigma upon the reputation of Cardinal Wiseman. I do not know the exact accusation of which Mr. Charlier was convicted, but I understand from the speech of my hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Gervais) that it is acknowledged that Mr. Charlier was not the writer of the article complained of for the publication of which he was convicted, but that he was the editor of the paper, and in manly fashion, took the course of submitting to conviction rather than give the name of his correspondent. I think that is much to his credit, and, in my judgment, a man who could do that is entitled to some consideration on the part of those who have to pass judgment on his conduct. Another point brought forward against Mr. Charlier is that there is a charge against him of blackmail. That is a very serious charge indeed, a very different charge from that of libel, for it carries with it a stigma. If any one of the servants of this House is under indictment for blackmail, I would certainly at least, give him a chance to clear his character. But I understand—and I knew nothing of this until to-day, and I take my information from the speech of the hon. member for St. James—that this charge of blackmail was brought against Mr. Charlier some years ago, that he stood his trial and that there was no verdict, and that after the trial had taken place and no verdict had been reached by the jury, a nolle

prosequi was entered and so there is no indictment against him. All this took place five or six years ago. Now, I submit to the common sense and judgment and fairness of the House: Is it fair that charges of this nature should be brought against the character of a man and be held against him, not on the question of his appointment, for he was appointed years ago, but on the question of his promotion to an office for which he is otherwise competent. I speak of him as competent though as to that I have no information of my own, but I understand the facts are not disputed and his competency is not questioned. Under such circumstances it seems to me the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) might withdraw his motion.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). The position created by the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is not quite clear. The difficulty arises from the fact that two years ago when the Debates Committee made a report, the government, instead of accepting it, privately prevented it from being discussed in the House. The report recommended an increase of salary to the translators, and the government, instead of accepting the report, reversed the entire previous practice, and brought the translators under the control of the Commission on Internal Economy. That was a rebuke to the Debates Committee, it was the first time the government had done such a thing. I was astonished myself, because I knew that the right hon. gentleman had always been in favour of adopting the reports of committees unless there was something in them radically bad. Well, two years ago this report was withdrawn. A few days afterwards the Commission on Internal Economy, under your presidency I imagine, Mr. Speaker, granted to the translators the increase of salary which had been proposed by the committee; but instead of remaining as they were before, employees of the House, they became employees of the government, and they are not to-day on the same footing as they were when they were appointed in 1880. I need not say to the House that I, as a member of that committee, felt offended, and was almost inclined to resign, because I thought that the usefulness of the committee was gone. This year we received from the reporters a long standing request for an increase of salary.

Mr. GERVAIS. Let me remark to my hon. friend, as I said a few minutes ago, that the debate on this phase of the question will come up later as a couple of translators will have to be appointed before long to secure a quick edition of the French 'Hansard.'

Mr. BERGERON. I started out by saying that the position was not quite clear, and I am trying to show the House why it is not. The Debates Committee passed a unanimous resolution recommending an increase of salary to the reporters, who have been getting the same salary for, I think, twenty years. This report was presented to the House, but has never been accepted, nor even discussed. About three weeks after this report had been made, another meeting of the Debates Committee took place. I was not present at that meeting, because the notice was given in the evening, we had been sitting here very late, and I did not get my notice until next morning, and the meeting was called for ten o'clock. But here is where I think the situation is somewhat confused. At that meeting, the recommendation which is now the subject of discussion, was made. The report was presented to the House at three o'clock and went through immediately. My right hon. friend will remember that he has always objected to that, he has taken the ground that the report should lie on the table for two or three days as a notice; and this is the reason, if I understand rightly, why the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is making his motion to send that report back to the committee to be reconsidered. Now my right hon. friend will remember further, that objection was then taken that the adoption of this report was contrary to the course which had been previously followed by the government. Now the government also said: Whenever you bring in a report involving expenditure of money for an increase of salaries, we have decided to take the ground that such expenditure must be initiated by the government. Therefore they have changed the policy that has been followed since 1879, because since 1879 the recommendations of the Debates Committee for increases of salaries have always been accepted by this House. Now the other day without any notice at all, a recommendation of the committee was made for a new salary. It is no use denying that it was a new salary; the Minister of Finance said he had been told there was no increase. Well, he was under a false impression, because it is an increase. Mr. Charlier was a proof-reader, and by that report he becomes a translator at a salary of $2,000 a year. We appointed a new man, and it seems to me the position has been created for no other purpose than to give it to this man. It is not a question whether Mr. Charlier is a good French translator or not, I believe he is a very good one; but he becomes translator, and another man is appointed to replace him. Now is there not here an inconsistency on the part of the government? Are we going to accept a report of the Debates Committee recommending a new salary of $1,500, and are we going to refuse the request of the reporters because it involves an expenditure of money? Certainly there is a contradiction. Now I am going to support the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier that the report be sent back

to the committee for reconsideration. My own opinion is that we do not need another translator. I have been told by the translators themselves that they do not need another man. The demand for another man does not come from them, but it comes from another source; and I hope before the session is over we will have an opportunity of discussing that question. There are translators enough. As I say, I am going to vote to send the report back to the committee. My opinion is that the majority of the committee will not sanction the appointment of a new translator, if I may judge from the conversations I have had with some of the members. I am going to vote for the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier in order that the question may be discussed again, because this is undoubtedly the creation of a new policy on the part of the government.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). As a member of the Debates Committee, and possibly the one instrumental in moving this appointment, I desire to explain the circumstances. At meeting after meeting of the committee my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) had been complaining of the French translation. Complaints have been rife from time immemorial about delay in the French translation. In order to expedite matters this appointment was recommended, and I felt it my duty, as representing the English speaking part of the committee, not to dissent from what was desired by the French speaking members of the committee. With the exception of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who was perfectly within his right, it was the opinion of the committee that this appointment should be made. Accordingly the motion was made, the appointment was carried out and we heard nothing about any objection of this kind. It was known that he had been reported upon most favourably by the King's Printer, and this is the first time that I have heard a word against him. We thought that we were doing a good service, that we were facilitating the French translation. We brought the matter before the House and I have heard nothing this morning which would influence me in the slightest against supporting the original proposition. Certainly no suit for libel would prevent me from supporting a man, because the very best men in newspaper work in the world, have been indicted for libel. I have been in that honourable position myself, Sir, and I have always succeeded in vindicating myself. I am told that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has also been in the same box; I was not aware of it.

There is another aspect of the case which has been presented by the hon. member for Beauharnois with which I heartily agree. The internal economy commission took out of the hands of the Debates Committee, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Beauharnois some time ago, the right to recommend an increase in the salaries of the 'Hansard' reporters. In other words, they said: We are willing to receive your recommendations, but we are not willing to give you the authority which has been delegated to the Debates Committee from time immemorial by the House. I do not know the details of the matter, but if that be the case, I think there has been a serious mistake made, and I am sure that it only needs to be brought to the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to have it rectified. The debates reporters and translators are the servants of the House and not the servants of the government. I am satisfied that when the right hon. the First Minister looks into the matter he will see that that is the proper view of the case. As far as I am concerned, I do not see that the House will be justified in referring this report back to the committee for reconsideration.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not want to take part in the discussion except on one single point. I am going to vote for the resolution becauseI think the report has been adopted under a misapprehension by the House. Under all the circumstances it went through very hurriedly. We had the assurance of the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) that there was no cost or charge involved. Well, it is plain that it is the creation of a new translator and that there is a charge involved.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has not the Debates Committee from time immemorial made similar recommendations and have they not been adopted?

Mr. FOSTER. I hear from gentlemen who are members of the Debates Committee that an additional translator is not necessary. I think, under these circumstances, that we had better send the report back to the Debates Committee and let them investigate the question. That is the reason why I propose to vote for the resolution.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Just a word as a member of the committee who was present at the meeting when this question was discussed. I have to say that I agree in the main with what the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has said. We did have notice of this meeting in question and some of the members attended the meeting. The matter was fully discussed and, as far as I am concerned, I do not profess to have any very great knowledge of the question under discussion, but I was impressed with the complaints which have been made from time to time and more particularly by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) as to the delays which occurred in getting out the French edition of the official report of the debates. It was the com-

plaints of the hon. member for Beauharnois that induced me to take a favourable view of the man named and of the recommendation for additional assistance in that regard. I beg to say that I supported, on the faith of the explanations which were made, the resolution moved by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton and which is now before the House. I may say too that the matter was fully discussed that morning in the committee. There was no evidence before the committee that no additional appointment was necessary. On the contrary there was abundant evidence before the committee that additional assistance was required and that, taken in connection with the evidence that we have had from time to time, for the last few months, convinced me that such an appointment was necessary. Therefore, in so far as I am concerned, I do not see any reason why this report should go back to the committee.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want the House to be under the impression that I wanted to secure the appointment of more translators. That is not the question at all. That has never been discussed in the House. When the report was placed before the House I said that the trouble was not due to the lack of translators, that if you had five hundred translators you would not get the French 'Hansard' sooner. It is due to another cause and it is not due to the fact that we have not enough translators.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) took identically the view which the other members of the committee took upon that occasion.

Mr. MONK. I just wish to say a few words in explanation. The suggestion of the right hon. the Prime Minster (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that this motion should be withdrawn has rather surprised me, because it is a motion which is not made without serious reflection. It is based upon the distinct statement made to this House by the right hon. the First Minister himself that the House had been surprised in this matter by not knowing that it was creating a new charge upon the revenue and that the report ought certainly to be reconsidered. To-day the right hon. gentleman suggests to me to withdraw a motion which I based upon that statement of his. I have already pointed out that the report was adopted on the day following that upon which it was presented. The motion was also based upon a statement made by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on behalf of the government that he had supported the motion for the adoption of the report on the understanding and the assurance given to him by the chairman of the committee (Mr. Gervais) that this report involved no additional charge upon the revenue. It seems to me that under these circumstances I was justified in making that motion for a reconsideration of the report and that there would be a failure to fulfil my duty if I withdraw it upon the statements which have been made here.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the chairman of the committee, in the very long speech which he saw fit to make to the House on this question, did not suggest that I had any motive in making this motion. I had none at all excepting that I did not believe that the appointment was properly and regularly made and I incline very much to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) that we do not require additional translators. What we require is an efficient staff and I am bound to say, from what I have seen since I have been a member of this House, that considering the way in which the members of the staff fulfil their duties, and the accuracy and the rapidity with which they make their translations, I do not think they are sufficiently paid. Taking that view, I think it is very absurd, when there is no demand no request, no allegation on their part that they are insufficiently manned, to crowd the staff of translators with new names, and it will be almost impossible, if that system is adopted, and when they do not ask for additional strength upon their staff, to give them the remuneration to which they are entitled for the important services which they render. I would like to say a word upon the question of the literary qualifications of Mr. Charlier. After hearing the statement of the hon. member for St. James I must, to a certain extent, correct the statement I made that I did not know Mr. Charlier. I do not know him, excepting that I do believe that upon one occasion that gentleman came to my office, as stated to the House by the hon. member for St. James, but I know nothing of him whatever. I also desire to say that as a general rule we accept too easily in this country newcomers and we give them government positions in the province of Quebec and also on the staff of the federal government without sufficient inquiry. Positions on the translators staff should, as far as possible, be reserved for our own people. We have competent men in this country, quite as able as Mr. Charlier, whatever may be his literary qualifications, and we should give the preference to our own people, rather than give way, too readily, as we do, to the blandishments of those newcomers who are cosmopolitan in their manner and who are able to insinuate themselves into the good graces of the Canadian people.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How long has this officer been on the 'Hansard' staff as proof-reader.

Mr. MONK. I do not know.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Five years.

Mr. GERVAIS. Mr. Charlier has been working on the translating staff for four years and he has proved a very efficient proof-reader. I have just read a certificate from Mr. Larose, the chief translator, stating that Mr. Charlier has already proved his efficiency as a translator.

Mr. MONK. I do not question that. I have heard of Mr. Charlier as a writer and the certificates given to the House sufficiently prove what I never had any doubt about, that he is efficient as a writer of the French language. But I base my motion on the statement made by two members of the government that if there had been any surprise that report would be reconsidered. I do not discuss the technical question whether a report adopted as this was can properly impose a new charge upon the revenue. I think myself that the imposition of any new charge must come from the government. If that principle had been adhered to in this case none of these difficulties would have arisen. Although I have not the acquaintance with Mr. Charlier that my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) seems to think, I feel that I have rendered him a considerable service inasmuch as I have led the Prime Minister to compare him to that most eminent divine Cardinal Wiseman. It is certainly a statement of importance and would benefit Mr. Charlier for the Prime Minister to say that in certain phases of his existence in this country, Mr. Charlier bears traces of resemblance to Cardinal Wiseman. That is not the way in which I understood it, nor are the circumstances in which Cardinal Wiseman found himself at all the same as those which arose in the case of Mr. Charlier. Mr. Charlier was very severly condemned by the courts for an abominable libel upon a most respectable clergyman of Montreal. It was not one of those cases of political libels or of libels where the imposition of a fine reflects no serious discredit upon the party condemned. This was a most unjustifiable and gross libel and it was for that reason the court condemned to jail the party accused and found guilty. As regards the blackmailing charge, that of course entirely distinguishes this case from the case of Cardinal Wiseman to which my right hon. friend has referred. Did I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) to assure the House that a 'nolle prosequi' had been filed in that case ?

Mr. GERVAIS. Nothing has been done since the first trial in 1903, in which there was a disagreement of the jury and a 'nolle prosequi' was entered before he was appointed as proof-reader. So I have been told.

Mr. MONK. That may to a certain extent mitigate the matter but we know the jury disagreed in that case and that 'nolle prosequis' are filed every day where the Crown does not find it possible to obtain sufficient proof to establish guilt. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that a 'nolle prosequi' had been entered ?

Mr. GERVAIS. I was so informed.

Mr. MONK. That may be the case, but it was a very grave accusation and the jury disagreed. I do believe that my motion ought to pass, not only for the reason that Mr. Charlier's appointment was irregularly made, but also for the reason given by my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) who is a member of that committee. We have an efficient staff ; there is no doubt that the system of making additional appointments to that staff when they are not asked for by the staff itself seriously interferes with the others getting that remuneration which they deserve. It is alleged by one of the members of the committee that no additional help is required on the translating staff, and I think this is the proper moment to go fully into that question.

House divided on motion of Mr. Monk.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lewis,
Ames,	Maclean (York, S.),
Barker,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Barr,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Beattie,	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Bennett,	Monk,
Bergeron,	Morin,
Blain,	Northrup,
Borden (Carleton),	Owen,
Boyce,	Paquet,
Brabazon,	Reid (Grenville),
Broder,	Roche (Marquette),
Christie,	Schaffner,
Cockshutt,	Sproule,
Crocket,	Stanfield,
Elson,	Staples,
Foster,	Tisdale,
Fowler,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ganong,	Ward,
Haggart,	Wilmot,
Henderson,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Herron,	Wright (Muskoka)—48.
Kemp,	
Lake,	
Lancaster,	
Lennox,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archambault,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Aylesworth,	Macpherson,
Beland,	McCarthy (Simcoe),
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McColl,
Bourbonnais,	McCool,
Boyer,	McIntyre (Perth),
Brown,	McIntyre (Strathcona),
Bureau,	McKenzie,
Burrows,	McLean (Huron),
Carney,	McLean (York, C.),
Caron,	McLennan,
Carvell,	Major,
Cash,	Marcile (Bagot),

Chisholm (Antigonish),	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Conmee,	Martin (Wellington),
Crawford,	Mayrand,
Cyr.	Meigs,
Delisle,	Michaud,
Desjardins,	Miller,
Dubeau,	Oliver,
Dugas,	Pardee,
Dyment,	Paterson,
Ethier,	Pickup,
Fielding,	Proulx.
Finlayson,	Pugsley,
Fisher,	Ratz,
Fortier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Galliher,	Rivet,
Gauvreau,	Roche (Halifax),
German,	Ross (Cape Breton),
Gervais,	Ross (Rimouski),
Girard,	Savoie,
Gladu,	Schell (Glengarry),
Graham,	Schell (Oxford),
Greenway,	Sinclair,
Harty,	Sloan,
Hughes (Victoria),	Smith (Nanaimo),
Jackson (Selkirk),	Smith (Oxford),
Johnston,	Stewart,
Kennedy,	Talbot,
Lachance,	Telford,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Templeman,
Lapointe,	Tobin,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turcotte,
Loggie,	Turgeon,
Lovell,	Verville,
	Wright (Renfrew),
	Zimmerman.—94.

Motion negatived.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

How much in customs dues, from 1900 to 1907, inclusively, each year taken separately, has been collected at the custom-house of Rimouski?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The customs duties collected at Rimouski during the years mentioned have been as follows:

Year ending June 30,	1900	$ 1,762 11
" " "	1901	626 18
" " "	1902	1,312 29
" " "	1903	7,524 45
" " "	1904	9,412 47
" " "	1905	16,365 23
" " "	1906	18,020 73
Nine months ending Mar. 31,	1907	10,737 14
Total		$65,760 60

ALL RED LINE—IRISH ROUTE.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. Is the government opposed, in connection with the All-Red Line, to the proposed Irish route and the port of Blacksod being used?

2. Has the government authorized the High Commissioner for Canada in London to state that they were opposed to the said Irish route and to the port of Blacksod being used in connection with the All-Red Line?

3. Has the government authorized any one to represent its views to the British cabinet committee in connection with the proposed All-Red Line route?

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

1. It is not the intention of the government either to oppose or to suggest any port in connection with the All-Red Line. This is a question which should be decided on purely business reasons and left altogether to the company which may undertake the service, the only condition to be insisted upon by the government being the service must be between the United Kingdom and Canada.

2. The government is not aware that the High Commissioner ever expressed any opinion on this subject otherwise than stated above.

3. Whilst the Prime Minister was in England last year he and the High Commissioner discussed the All-Red Line question with the British cabinet committee, and the Prime Minister has no doubt that Lord Strathcona has continued to do so.

NEW ICE-BREAKER.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Blain— asked:

What was the date of the signing of the contract for the building of a new ice-breaking steamer for the navigation of Northumberland straits with Messrs. Vickers, Sons & Maxim, Limited, of London, England, and when is the boat to be completed?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The contract has been sent to England to be signed by the contractors. The steamer is to be completed in ten months from the date of signing the contract.

DETROIT RIVER TUNNEL MATERIALS.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. Blain— asked:

1. What amount of materials of all kinds have been entered free of duty for the construction of the Detroit river tunnel?

2. What amount of duties have been paid to the government on the importation of materials of all kinds for the construction of said tunnel?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The total value of materials of all kinds entered free of duty for Detroit tunnel is $229,838.

2. Imported materials of all kinds for the construction of the Detroit river tunnel are free under tariff item 596.

FISHERY OFFICER AT PORT HOOD.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. Who is the fishery officer at Port Hood, in Inverness county?

2. Has the government ever been requested to remove him from office? If so, by whom?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. D. F. McLean.
2. No.

PORT HOOD HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. What is the width of the northern entrance to Port Hood harbour, in the county of Inverness, where the government proposes to close the same?
2. What is the estimated cost?
3. When did the government begin closing said entrance?
4. What engineers have, or have had charge of the work?
5. How often has the government's engineer visited the work since it was started?
6. What distance has already been closed and at what cost?
7. Does the government intend to complete the work by tender and contract? If so, when? If not, why?
8. Will the closing of said entrance obstruct navigation?
9. Has the government made any inquiry as to whether the construction of the work by slow stages, as heretofore, will divert the course of the tide currents, and cause the accumulation of sand to injuriously affect the anchorage in said harbour? If so, from whom and what information has the government received?
10. Has the government carried out all the recommendations of its engineers with respect to the work? If not, in what instances, and why?
11. Who is the foreman of construction work, and from whom does he receive his instruction?
12. Who is assistant foreman, and by whom was he recommended?
13. Is the government paying rent for land upon which part of the work has been constructed? If not, for what land has the government paid rent to one Isaiah Watts?
14. What plant has the government on said work, and what is the value thereof?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. 4,435 feet on line of work.
2. $215,000.
3. In July, 1903.
4. Mr. E. G. Millidge.
5. Twelve times.
6. (a) 1,297 feet. (b) $62,795.69.
7. Matter under consideration.
8. No.
9. No; the accumulation of sand will not injuriously affect the anchorage in said harbour.
10. The government has carried out the recommendations of the chief engineer.
11. (a) Jas. Macdonell. (b) From resident engineer.
12. Isaiah Watts. I am unable to state what recommendations were made, but I presume the appointment was made on the judgment of the minister after making all necessary inquiry as to his qualifications, this being the practice of the department.
13. No; land is rented from Isaiah Watts and John H. Murphy for use as a service ground for building and launching brush mattresses and repairing scows.
14. Two scows, four derricks, two anchors, chains, blocks, tools and some track, worth altogether about $1,000, and a donkey engine recently purchased for $400.

FINES FOR FISHING LOBSTERS, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Were any fines imposed for fishing lobsters after the season closed in 1907 in Prince county, Prince Edward Island?
2. If so, what are the names of those fined, if any, the amount of fine and the amount collected in each case?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. Name.	Fine imposed.	Fine collected.
Jerome Doucette..	$20	$20
Herbert McMicken..	20	20
Clark Brothers..	40	40
Philip Arsneaux..	30	30
John M. Rielly..	75	75
Michael Rielly	75	75
Wm. Rielly..	75	75
Peter McIsaac..	25	25
Fred. E. Allen..	10	10
Ozile Gallant..	10	10
Matthew Gallant..	5	5
Arsene Arsneault..	5	5
Daniel Arsneault..	5	5
John G. Arsneault..	10	10
Antoine Bernard..	10	10
Sylvane J. Gallant..	10	10
Joseph Arsneault..	10	10

RAILWAY COMMISSION COUNSEL, &c.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. What is the total amount of money expended by the government for counsel fees and other legal services rendered to the Board of Railway Commissioners, since the establishment of such board?
2. What is the amount already paid, and what is the total estimated expense for counsel fees and other legal services incurred or to be incurred by the government in respect of the express rates and charges now being investigated by the Railway Commission?
3. What is the amount already expended and the probable future expenditure for counsel fees and other legal services in connection with the telephone and telegraph investigation now before the Railway Commission regarding rates and charges?
4. Has the government considered the propriety and business advisability of appointing a permanent counsel or legal adviser to the Board of Railway Commissioners at a fair salary, who will devote his whole time to such purpose, and at all times be at the service of the commissioners and the public in connec-

tion with matters in which the public are interested, which from time to time come before the board?

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

1. $1,057.50.
2. $6,425.40. The government is not in a position to state what the probable expenditure will be for counsel fees and other legal services in connection with express, telephones and telegraph cases now before the Board of Railway Commissioners, regarding rates and charges.
3. Answer to this question embodied in number two.
4. The appointment of such counsel has not yet been decided upon.

SIZE OF LOBSTERS, ST. JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. What is the minimum length of lobster allowed by law to be caught in the waters of St. John county, New Brunswick?
2. What is the minimum length of lobsters allowed by law to be caught in the waters of Charlotte county, New Brunswick?
3. If there is a difference, what is the reason for it?
4. Does the department intend to equalize the size in both counties? If not, why not?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Ten and one-half inches.
2. Nine inches.
3. When the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry into the lobster fishery (1898) were being considered and the size limits in different geographical areas were being established, although the commission recommended a nine inch limit for the whole Bay of Fundy, the demands from those largely interested called for a ten and one-half inch limit for the upper portion of the Bay of Fundy, including St. John county.
4. The question of the lobster fishery regulations generally is under consideration.

COAL MINING IN SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. What companies or firms carrying on coal mining operations in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta made returns to the government during the last departmental year, as to the quantities of coal mined by them?
2. What was the total quantity of coal on which royalty was paid, and what was the amount of said royalty, during the same period?
3. What is the total area of coal lands held, having been acquired by purchase or lease, by the companies or firms referred to in paragraph one of this question?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Eureka Coal Mining Company; J. M Spangler and J. Lindner et al; Diamond Coal Company, Limited; Knee Hill Coal Company; Nichols and Bothamley; Gustave Zucht and Gustave Pachel; Pacific Coal Company; Walter Glenn and Raymond Preffer; Canada West Coal Company; William and B. K. Bullock and William Probert; West Canadian Collieries; International Coal and Coke Company; The Great West Coal Company of Canada, Limited; Peter Enzenauer, Amiel Steiner and Harley G. McCracken; Norman C. Butterfield and John A. Hislop.
2. Quantity mined 70,552 tons; Royalty paid $7,065.20.
3. 38,182·78 acres.

FEE ON FENCE POST PERMITS.

Mr. STAPLES—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

Has the government received a memorial from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities asking for the removal of the fee on permits for fence posts from 4 to 1 cent, being the same as charged for the farmer's fee; and also the reduction of the fee on lumber from $3 to $1.50 to settlers?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). No such memorial has been received by the government.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When is it expected that the Civil Service Bill, now on the Order Paper, will be introduced? I wish to make the same inquiry in respect to the Bill concerning the Manitoba boundaries. Is it the intention of the government to bring down any legislation this session respecting the Hudson's Bay Railway? What other legislation, if any, not yet introduced, do the government intend bringing down this session?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is the intention of the government to introduce some legislation regarding the Hudson Bay Railway, and, probably, some assistance to other railways. It is the intention of the government also to present the Bill with regard to the civil service and the Bill with regard to the Manitoba boundaries at as early a date as possible. I have already observed that the first duty of the House at this moment is to give Supplies to carry on the business of the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The introduction of the Civil Service Bill, so that members of the House could read it, would not interfere materially with Supply. However, that is

for the right hon. gentleman himself to judge.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) whether or not he has brought down the statements respecting contracts for dredging which I asked for a few days ago ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I laid them on the table.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) promised to give us a statement on Monday last, with respect to the number of troops who were going to attend at Quebec. Was that statement made ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I did not make it. Perhaps it will be better when when we go into Supply. I have some statement to give then.

SUPPLY—DUTY ON LUMBER.

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

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Some days ago I drew the attention of the House to the fact that the lumber industry of this country was very seriously depressed. I made the remark on that occasion that I would remind the government at a later date of the matter, and, possibly, if they failed to act, to see what could be done to induce them to take proper action. I would like to ask if the government have reached any conclusion as to coming to the relief of the lumber industry?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry to say I cannot give my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) any answer to-day upon that point.

WHALE FISHERY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). I desire to draw the attention of the government to a matter connected with the whale fishing industry of the province of British Columbia. In the Act respecting Fisheries and Fishing, it is provided that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries :

—may issue licenses to manufacture oil or other commercial product from whales and to employ boats or vessels in whale fishery, but no such license should issue until,—

(a) the minister has approved of the site of the factory which should not be within fifty miles of any other whale factory, or in such proximity to any inhabited place or places as in the opinion of the minister may cause danger or detriment to the public health.

I put a question on the Order Paper as to the licenses granted for the whale fishery in the province of British Columbia. In 'Hansard' of April 1, the question I asked and the answers thereto appear as follows :

1. To whom in British Columbia have whaling licenses been granted, (a) when were they granted, (b) for what waters, (c) for what term of years, (d) upon what terms and conditions, and (e) what moneys were received from such licenses in 1905, 1906 and 1907?

2. Are any moneys now due from such licenses? If so, from whom and how much?

3. What penalty was provided for not making use of privileges granted and what steps has the government taken to ascertain if the conditions have been complied with?

4. Can license be cancelled in case of non-user?

5. Have any applications for whaling licenses in British Columbia been made to and refused by the government? If so, from whom, for what waters, and why were they refused?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Pacific Whaling Company, May 5th, 1905, annual license ; Pacific Whaling Company, 11th of December, 1905, annual license; Pacific Whaling Company, 7th of December, 1906, annual license; Pacific Whaling Company, 7th of December, 1906, annual license; Dr. Francis Hall, 23rd of July, 1907, annual license, Pacific Whaling Company, 17th of September, 1907, annual license; George A. Huff, 7th of March, 1908, annual license.

(b) The licenses cover the operation of factories ashore and do not essay to cover water areas.

(c) Annual license.

(d) Under the terms and conditions of section 9 of the Fisheries Act, chapter 45 of revised statutes, 1906.

(e) 1905.. .. .. $1,000
1906.. 2,600
1907.. 3,800

2. No.

3. Unless factory is in operation within two years of granting first license, license will be cancelled. The supervision of the inspector of fisheries for the district.

4. Yes.

5. Yes, B. F. Pearson, of Halifax, Nootka Sound; C. H. Lugrin, of Victoria, Virago Sound, Rennell Sound and Tatsoo Harbour, Queen Charlotte islands; Andrew Halcross, of New Westminster, Maculay island; J. P. Livingstone, of Ottawa, Galiano island; George Mackie, of New Westminster, Aristazable island; Peter Birrell, Annieville, B.C., Sooke inlet; Alex. Ewen, of Lion island, Cape Beale; G. D. Brymer, of New Westminster, Skidegate; W. W. Forrester, of New Westminster, Takush harbour; Michael Hays, of New Westminster, Campbell island; E. A. Jakes, of Vancouver, Gulf of Georgia.

Applications not supported by fees and other necessary requirements.

J. O. Townsend, of Victoria, Campania island, Captain Magnesen, of Vancouver, Virago, Queen Charlotte islands.

Required distance did not obtain from nearest location licensed.

The law, as I have read it, distinctly states that the minister has power to grant

licenses for whale factories within fifty miles of any other factory. It seems that the minister assumed that he had power under this Act to limit the granting of licenses to within one hundred miles of any other factory. The clause which required regulations to be made under the Fisheries Act is section 54, as follows :

54. The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make regulations:
(a) for the better management and regulation of the sea-coast and inland fisheries;
(b) to prevent or remedy the obstruction and pollution of streams;
(c) to regulate and prevent fishing;
(d) to prohibit the destruction of fish; and,
(e) to forbid fishing except under authority of leases or licenses.

There is nothing in that clause to entitle the minister to change the distance to from 50 to 100 miles. as it is said he has done. Whether that authority was given to him under an order in council or by departmental regulation does not make very much difference, because I believe such authority cannot be given him under the law. He may make regulations as provided under section 54, but he cannot change the distance named in the law. The minister states in the answers I have given that a man named Townsend applied for a license and it was refused because the application was 'not supported by fees and other necessary requirements.' I wish to tell the minister that when Mr. Townsend applied for this license, he paid the ordinary year's rent as provided by the regulation, and he also sent to the department the ordinary plans and specifications required by the law. But Mr. Townsend did not receive any license, because the department saw fit to give a monopoly of this whale fishing business to a favoured group of people in the province of British Columbia, namely, the Pacific Whaling Company.

They have, I believe, five or six licenses to-day in the province of British Columbia for whale fishing, they have practically a monopoly of the business. I would like to know why, in face of this fact, the minister refused to grant a license at a distance of fifty miles, and to make regulations that will apply to one hundred miles, and why he refuses a license to Mr. Townsend on a mere pretext, and then grants licenses to the Pacific Whaling Company and to other persons? In December, 1906, at the request of a friend of Mr. Townsend, Mr. Townsend got an option under the regulations for a whale fishing site. That option was granted on the 11th December, and Mr. Townsend had six months to complete his arrangements. The arrangements were, I believe, that he should pay one year's rent, and sign plans and specifications. On the 3rd of June, 1907, previous to the expiration of the six months for which he had an option, Mr. Townsend sent to the department the first year's rent, together with plans and specifications. There was no intimation from the department that these plans and specifications were not satisfactory. It is, I believe, for the department to define the limits within which the factory is to be erected. All that the applicant for the license has to do is to file plans and specifications showing what his intentions are, showing that he intends to meet the requirements of the law and of the regulations under the Act. This, Mr. Townsend states that he did, and he asked the department to define the limits, he asked the minister to advise him when these limits were defined. Mr. Townsend placed this matter in the hands of his attorneys in Victoria, and instructed the department at Ottawa to send an answer to his attorneys, because Mr. Townsend was frequently away, being captain of a steamer plying around the coast, and he thought it would be more satisfactory if he had an agent so that there might be no delay, and he asked the department to send to his agents in Victoria the answer to the request he had made, and to acknowledge the receipt of the money. It seems that the government did not by letter acknowledge the receipt of the first year's rent, but they intimated to a gentleman in Ottawa who called on the department in his behalf, that the plans and specifications had been received. Of course I do not complain that an oral reply was not sufficient for Mr. Townsend. This matter went on for some time. Mr. Townsend's agent met the minister on the 22nd June, 1907, and Mr. Townsend's agent in Victoria was informed that there was some objection to Mr. Townsend receiving the license, because the department thought that he intended to traffic in the license, and they wished, before granting the license, to make some inquiries, but they would give a decision the following week. Mr. Townsend, I may say, is like a good many other men who go into enterprises of this character, he did not have himself all the money that he needed. It required something like $100,000 to go into an undertaking of this kind, and so Mr. Townsend interested some friends in Victoria and elsewhere in British Columbia, in the undertaking, and he got a subscription of $40,000 or $50,000 from certain gentlemen to back him up. He also secured the interest in this matter of a firm——

Mr. BRODEUR. Let me ask the hon. gentleman a question at this point. Will he be good enough to tell me whether Mr. Townsend did not represent certain Norwegian gentlemen ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I was coming to that. Mr. Townsend, as I say, had not the whole of the $100,000, he was not a rich man, though he was just as rich as most of the men who have gone into undertakings of this kind. It was necessary for him to in-

terest other people in it, and he canvassed for shareholders, and got subscriptions to the amount of $40,000 or $50,000 in the province of British Columbia. He also interested a firm of Norwegians who do business in London, England, and they were willing to put up the balance of the amount, something like $60,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Was not the majority of the capital then under the control of foreigners ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Certainly it was foreign capital, but what difference does that make ? This country is advertising in every country in Europe for immigrants to come here, we are advertising in Norway and Sweden for men to come out here to engage in industries. This Norwegian gentleman had seen in the Norwegian papers that if he put his money into enterprises of this kind he would receive a great profit. But when this matter was mentioned to the government, the red flag was raised, and they told Mr. Townsend that if Norwegians were going to back him up with $50,000, they would have nothing to do with it. Is not that the position in which the government stands in respect to this matter? That is what the minister objects to, because the Norwegian was willing to back Mr. Townsend up, the government would not grant him a license to engage in the whale fishing industry. But that is not the real reason. The real reason is because the minister wished to give this license to his friend, to a gentleman who had organized this Pacific Whaling Company in 1905. On the 5th of May, 1905, they got a license ; on the 11th of December, 1905, another license ; on the 7th of December, 1906, another license. Three days after Mr. Townsend made his application, on the 17th of September, 1907, they granted this same Pacific Whaling Company another license, and they also granted licenses to other gentlemen after they had refused one to Mr. Townsend, and while Mr. Townsend had fulfilled the requirements of the law. What business was it of the department that Mr. Townsend was securing the interest of other men in this enterprise ? He was not selling his interest, he was not trafficking in the business. There is not a particle of evidence in the possession of the government to show that Mr. Townsend had applied for this license in order to sell it to Norwegians, or to any other individual or company. He was acting in his own interest, and in the interest of the people in British Columbia whom he had interested in the enterprise. There was considerable correspondence between the department and Mr. Townsend, and Mr. Townsend's representatives in Victoria, Messrs. Barnard & Robertson. On the 22nd June, 1907, these gentlemen received a letter from their agents in Ottawa to the following effect :

When, therefore, the question of defining the limits under the Townsend option arose, it was impossible for the chief clerk to act unless he could have the special Whaling Company fix its limits at Banks Island and he at once telegraphed for such information as would enable him to properly consider the Townsend applicants and fix the proper limits for the same.

Here was an admission from the government that they would as soon as the Banks Island limits were defined grant the aplication of Mr. Townsend. He goes on further:

It then appearing to the department that Captain Townsend was not acting in his own interests but with the view of selling his rights to other people, which is entirely contrary to the practice of the department and the wishes of the minister, nothing could be done until the minister returned.

He goes on to say :

The minister is here to-day and the chief clerk of the Fisheries Branch, as well as the deputy minister have been going into the matter with him, and so far as we can learn the present position is that no action will be taken until the minister is clear upon the question of whether he is dealing with bona fide parties or speculators. At least this is the inference which we have drawn from our attendance to-day.

No intimation is given to Mr. Townsend in order that he may clear the matter up. Mr. Townsend was not aware that any great obstacles could be put in his way to prevent him from obtaining this license, the same as any other citizen of British Columbia or any other party, no matter whether he was a citizen of Canada or not, might obtain a license. Mr. Townsend's answer was this :

Ask the minister what assurance he requires as to financial ability to build and operate at once. Are prepared to thoroughly satisfy him as to this.

Here, on June 24, when the intimation was given to Mr. Townsend that these obstacles were to be put in the way he replied that he was willing to set aside these obstacles and to satisfy the department of his ability to build and operate this factory. He was able to secure the money and there was no reason why he should not receive his license. On June 24, the agents of Mr. Townsend wrote to Ottawa as follows :

We cannot understand this matter. First of all we inquired and are told that licenses have either been granted or promised covering the whole coast and that Townsend is one of the grantees.

They had been told that Mr. Townsend was one of the grantees and that the whole coast was covered by licenses.

Townsend also produced a letter to the effect that he is to get the license and has until June 11 to make good. We are perfectly well aware that Townsend himself has not the

means to build the plant. The department is also probably aware of this.

This intimation was made to the department by Mr. Townsend's agent in the city of Ottawa on June 24. He told them plainly that Mr. Townsend was not able to put himself within the requirements of the law without the assistance of others and still the department goes on granting licenses. The letter continues :

The department granted licenses to C. H. Lugrin and others who are also financially unable to carry out the terms of the Act personally. What does the department mean by granting licenses to these people if they are not to be allowed to take others in with them. We have people here who are able to finance the undertaking and are prepared to go ahead at once. We have wired that we will give any assurance that the minister requires and hope you will see the minister at once and find out what is necessary to satisfy him on this point.

The minister saw the agents of Mr. Townsend on June 26, and the agents write to Mr. Townsend's representatives in Victoria as follows :

We have seen the acting minister but he has very little to say except that there is a rival company making a strong effort to obtain this license.

Here is the secret of the whole business. After Mr. Townsend had been negotiating with them for six months, after he had got an option, after he was told that he was one of the grantees of the whole coast, the information was given that a rival company was applying for the same ground.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Who is the writer?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Mr. Townsend's agent in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What is his name ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The hon. gentleman knows the name ; I need not give it to him. The letter continues :

We have your telegram of the 24th instant, as follows: 'Ask minister what assurance he requires as to financial ability to build and operate at once. Are prepared to thoroughly satisfy him as to this,' and in reply telegraphed you this morning as follows: 'Minister and department have no definite answer, whale fishing license rival company making strong bid. Who are you acting for? '

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have no recollection of the conversation to which that letter refers. Will the hon. gentleman not give me the name ? I cannot remember.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Mr. McGivern. Another letter from Mr. Townsend's agent in Ottawa to his agent in Victoria, reads as follows :

Ottawa, Ontario, July 4, 1907.

We have seen the acting minister this morning and he has some messages in regard to the matter now before him and is awaiting some further information which is reported as coming from the west.

He states that protests were entered against the proposed action of Captain Townsend in transferring his license to a Norwegian Company, and this matter must be a matter of investigation before any definite answer can be given.

The minister will see that he made some investigation. He told Mr. Townsend's agent on July 12, that he had made some investigation. Mr. Townsend's agent wrote from Victoria to Ottawa on July 12, as follows :

We do not know that there is anything much that we can do in reply except that it appears to us that it is idle for the department to say that they expected Townsend or Kelly either, for that matter to finance the undertaking themselves when they granted them licenses.

Townsend is interesting capital, is to be a director of the company in which from $40,000 to $50,000 of the stock will be held in Victoria. He is doing nothing different to what Captain Balcom did when he got the licenses which were transferred to the Pacific Whaling Company, i.e., getting other people in with him to put up the money.

There is no doubt but that the factory will be commenced as soon as the license is granted and will be rushed to completion and be ready for business by the spring of next year. We are willing to give the department full assurance of this, but they evidently don't wish to be assured, as they refused to tell us what assurance they require. Under such circumstances the contention that the licenses are being asked for for speculative purposes is absurd in the extreme.

The fact of the matter is that the Pacific Whaling Company wished to hog the whole coast of British Columbia. They have now all licenses but two, viz., Townsend's and Kelly's and if they can prevent Townsend interesting other people than themselves in the rest, they will tie him up so that he must come to their terms.

Here is the probable reason why the government have refused to grant this license to Mr. Townsend. They had the assurance of Mr. Townsend, who is a respectable man, that he was not trafficking in his license, but because others objected to the granting of a license to Mr. Townsend the government refused to give it to him. Mr. Townsend wrote to the Hon. Mr. Templeman, acting minister, on the 1st of July, 1907, explaining the whole situation, and I think that explanation should have been sufficient to show the minister that Mr. Townsend was genuine in his application for his license and that he was just as much, if not more, entitled to it than this Whaling Company. He had spent a lot of money endeavouring to interest other people in the enterprise, he was a poor man, and finally he was turned down for no reason at all except the alleged reason—which Mr. Townsend says is untrue—that he was

trafficking in the license. He wrote to Mr. Templeman on the 1st of July, 1907, from Victoria, as follows:

Victoria, British Columbia, July 1, 1907.

Hon. William Templeman,
Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries,

Dear Sir,—On June 3, I mailed to the Department of Marine and Fisheries through Mr. Barnard the plans and specifications along with $800 for the first years' license for the whaling license allotted to me in the vicinity of Campania island and so far we have only an acknowledgment of the money. I have learned since then that great opposition has been made to the granting of the license to me by the Pacific Whaling Company on the ground that I am trafficking with the license, and because it may interfere with the Pacific Whaling Company at Banks island. Holding the option from the minister of the department for six months given to me, so that I could perfect my plans, I have worked hard and spent considerable money on it, working in good faith that if I succeeded in establishing a reliable company that there would be no trouble in getting the license. We have good, strong company and there will be from forty to fifty thousand dollars worth of shares available for subscription in Victoria, most of which is already spoken of. The trouble with the Pacific Whaling Company is this: They wish to control the whole sea coast of British Columbia, and they came near doing that now. Should they succeed in getting this license and one other, they will control the whole coast, and that will be a very large monopoly. The same men who are at the head of the whaling industry, have been largely interested in the sealing industry for years, and they have protested long and loud against the monopoly of the American Fur Company, and now they are doing their best to control the sea coast of British Columbia. As to trafficking with the license I could not handle it alone, but will have a large financial interest in the company and will be one of the directors. Captain Balcom alone did not supply the money for his undertaking. He sold stock wherever he could and was very glad to do so, and it came precious near falling through at that.

It can hardly be supposed that either Captain Balcom, Captain Kelly or myself could have built and equipped a factory with money supplied by ourselves. All I ask is, that I am granted the same privileges as have been accorded to Captain Balcom to form his company, interesting others as well as myself to enable me to hold the factory. I am prepared to furnish any reasonable assurance that you may ask that the factory will be built, and in operation within one year from this date, if the license is promptly issued, the cost to be not less than one hundred thousand dollars and if necessary, provided a cash guarantee to that effect.

I may say here, that the Pacific Whaling Company through one of its agents made me offer to buy my license and I refused to consider it, which largely accounts for the opposition they are making to my application. I am sure you will agree with me that this province is in need of all the industry it can get especially as large a one as this will be, as a large amount will be spent annually for

wages. I have no wish to say anything about the Pacific Whaling Company, but I do wish fair play, as I have money in this affair, that I can ill afford to lose, and according to the option given me by the minister I never imagined there would be any doubt about the license. I have met with every success in my financial arrangements, and only await for the license to be issued to commence work. We do not wish to tie the license up for two or three years, but wanted to commence work immediately. We have had a man up to the islands and have selected two places, Barnard Cove on Princess Royal island and Port Stephens on Pitt island, and we will be willing to accept either of these sites. I consider I am entitled to every consideration from your hands.

I think I have placed the matter fairly before you and all I want is fair play, having rested on the minister's assurance that the license would be granted if the terms of the option were adhered to.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) CAPT. JOHN O. TOWNSEND.

What more could the man do than to guarantee the government that the factory would be built at a cost of $100,000 and that all the requirements of the law would be met?

Mr. BRODEUR. I put this to my hon. friend: Two companies were applying for a license; one composed of foreign capital and the other of British subjects and Canadian capital. Would the hon. gentleman say that in that case the license should be granted to the foreign corporation and the foreign capital?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Prince Edward Island). I could answer that by saying that when the Minister of Marine wants to buy an engine he goes over to Erie, Pa., when he could just as well purchase it in Canada. When a man comes to Canada to engage in an honest industry and to help Canadian enterprise he should not be penalized and the minister should not say to him: I will not give it to you because you are a foreigner, but I will give it to my favourite company, the Pacific Whaling Company. True, this man was a Norwegian, but we have invited Norwegians to come to this country and when they bring capital here we should not prevent them from engaging in honest industry.

Mr. BRODEUR. I gave the preference to British subjects.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Prince Edward Island). If this man had been permitted to engage in this industry and to live in Canada, having brought his capital here, he would have become a British subject. He was backed by some of the richest men in London, England. You advertised for these people to come to Canada and then you send them back because you have your favourites. That is the reason and there is no other reason for refusing the license to this man. But what about giving the

preference to British subjects? When this government came to power in 1896, we had a Canadian company fully equipped to make our bank notes and stamps as they had done for many years, but the Burlands happened to be Conservatives and this government imported a company from the United States and gave the contract to these foreigners. If the minister thinks he can rely on that argument I can show him item after item of goods imported from the United States for the Intercolonial Railway when just as good goods made by Canadian citizens could be obtained in Canada.

I do not know whether Captain Townsend received an answer to that letter or not, as the record does not show, but he did not receive a license. After he had been told that this coast had been assigned to him, he was refused a license, and the ground was given to the Pacific Whaling Company. I think this was very unfair to Captain Townsend. I do not need to make any further remarks on this matter except to say that I think that there should be no favoritism in the administration of the law, but that every British subject should have equal rights under it, and any one who comes to this country for the purpose of settling and spending his money here should receive just as much consideration as a few favourites of the government.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Would my hon. friend say, for my own information, whether he is founding his charges upon statements made to him by Captain Townsend or Bernard and Robertson? Who is his authority for the statements he has made?

Mr. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.) I have read the letter from Captain Townsend to the minister.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is not the question. Is my hon. friend bringing this question before the House at the instance of Captain Townsend?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Does that make any difference to the department? If that is all the excuse the minister has for his conduct in this case, it is not very good.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. I must first thank my hon. friend for having been kind enough to advise me that he was going to bring up this question. I must thank him also for having postponed it until I had time to look into the papers and review the facts which have been brought to the attention of the department. I was absent when the decision was rendered by the then acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, but I concur entirely and strongly in the views which he expressed in favour of the decision. The facts are the following. We have a law on the statute-book providing for the issue of licenses for whaling at points not less than fifty miles apart. As my hon. friend has referred to that point, I may perhaps be permitted to read the provision of the law—section 9 of chapter 45, the Fisheries Act, which says :

> No one shall at any time engage in the manufacture from whales of oil or any other commercial product, and no vessel or boat shall be employed in the whale fishery, except under license from the minister.
>
> The minister may issue licenses to manufacture oil or other commercial product from whales or to employ boats or vessels in whale fishery, but no such license shall issue until the minister has approved of the site of the factory, which shall not be within fifty miles of any other whale factory.

My hon. friend seems to take exception to the position taken by the department to the effect that no whale factory should be established, not merely within fifty miles, but within one hundred miles of any other whale factory. I may tell my hon. friend immediately why we came to that decision. Our law is copied from that of Newfoundland, and I am sorry to find that the Newfoundland whale fisheries, which at one time were a very prosperous industry, are now dying out if they are not entirely dead, and the reason for that is that too large a number of whale fishing licenses were issued. After having discussed the question with the officers of the department who had made a special study of it, we decided that we should not issue any license for a whale factory less than one hundred miles from the site of another whale factory. I may say that all the licenses on the British Columbia coast were so advised during the discussion of the Bill that was before parliament in the session of 1904. Several applications had been received from British Columbia for licenses. These applications stood in abeyance until the Bill should become law, and the parties interested were so advised. After the Bill was passed, a copy of it was sent to each of them. No application was received for a certain time except from the Pacific Whaling Company. That company, if I remember rightly, started two factories on the west coast of Vancouver Island in 1905, and it was the only applicant for a license up to that time.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. They got the whole west coast of the island.

Mr. BRODEUR. They have only two licenses, which were issued for the western coast of Vancouver Island. No more than that number could be issued for that coast.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What is the length of the coast?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember exactly. The company got two licenses for the western coast of the island. I think one is at Parker's Sound and the other at Esperanzo Inlet. Mr. Townsend applied for a license at a place which was less than fifty miles from either of these places, and

of course under the law we could not grant him a license. I am stating these facts because I want to show to my hon. friend and to impress upon the House the kindness with which the department dealt with Mr. Townsend; and my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue put a very proper question when he asked my hon. friend (Mr. A. A. McLean) whether he was speaking on the advice of Captain Townsend or not; because I understand that Captain Townsend knows all the circumstances, and would not blame the department for the stand it has taken on this matter.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. His letter which I read does not indicate that.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but will my hon. friend tell us where he got information or a letter from Captain Townsend complaining of the action of the government and asking him to bring this question before the House ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I read the letter to the House addressed by Captain Townsend to the minister in which he complained of the treatment accorded him by the government in the matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. After the decision was rendered ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Not exactly after, because there was really no decision then.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before the decision was rendered. If my hon. friend had asked for the documents he would have found that we have treated Captain Townsend in the fairest way and that there was no intent, direct or indirect, to hurt him in any way. Going on with the facts I was relating, in the fall of 1906, some time after I entered the department, there were several applications still standing, and the Pacific Whaling Company asked for two or three more licenses. Before issuing those licenses I had a letter addressed to all applicants who had put in their applications some one, two or three years before, asking them whether they intended to proceed with their application, because I did not want, for my part, to give all the coast to one company, although this company was a Canadian company. I shall read that letter in order that the House may see the fairness with which these applicants, including Captain Townsend, were treated. The letter reads :

October 1, 1906.

Sir,—With reference to your application for whale factory licenses on the Pacific coast at —I may say that various and conflicting applications have been filed for such licenses, in the light of which, under the terms of the Act—4 Edward VII, chapter 13—copy inclosed, the minister is unable, owing to the tentative character of the several applications, to decide as to the issue of such licenses.

In order, therefore, that all applications may be properly before the minister, and so entitled to consideration, it is essential that within a month from the date of this letter, all those who have already applied at any time and under any conditions, for such licenses, and who intend to follow up such applications must—

Now we give in this letter the requirements of the law:

1. File the necessary assurance that the factory when completed will be capable of converting any whale captured into commercial products within 24 hours of the landing thereof, and that the business will be conducted in such a manner, etc., etc.

2. File plans and specifications of the machinery to be used.

3. Forward to this department the fee of $800.

I go further in this letter and draw the attention of those applicants to the fact that the intention of the department was to restrict the issuing of those licenses within 100 mile limits. Here is the part of the letter dealing with that part of the question :

Owing to the experience in the industry in Newfoundland waters, and in view of strong representations to the minister as to the probable decline of the new industry in Canadian waters, under similar conditions, he has decided that both on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts no further licenses for whale factories will be granted nearer to each other than 100 miles instead of 50 as contemplated by the Act.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. GOURDEAU,
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I do not think my hon. friend will take exception to the position then taken by the department. It is of the utmost importance that our fishing industry should be preserved in this country and the only way of preserving this industry is by issuing proper regulations in order to prevent the operation of the fisheries. The whale fishery was in the same position. I thought, and the advise of the officers of the department was to the same effect, that it was necessary that we should be more careful and cautious than they were in Newfoundland and prevent the industry from being absolutely destroyed.

Mr. LENNOX. Was the change from 50 miles to 100 miles made by order in council or by departmental regulation?

Mr. BRODEUR. By regulation of the department, and it was of course binding upon all the applicants. It was intended simply not to have too many whale factories established in this country in order to preserve the fisheries, relying upon the experience in Newfoundland waters.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any regulation which limits the catch ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. In the law there is a provision, however, that they must use only one boat, that is the only restriction in

that respect. It is not to be expected they could catch more than about one whale a day in good weather. I was saying to the House that later on, in December, 1906, the Pacific Whaling Company applied for more licenses and I thought that an opportunity should be given to the applicants who showed some desire to carry out their works to do so, and that we should show them that their applications for licenses would be carefully considered. I refused then to issue any licenses to the Pacific Whaling Company until I had ascertained what Captain Townsend was ready to do, and I gave him six months for that purpose. He made his application which was put in within the six months. I was away at the time but the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) was then acting as Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We got information that Captain Townsend was not acting for himself but was acting for a foreign company with foreign capital and foreign labour.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Will the minister state from whom he received that information ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, and I understand my hon. friend will not deny it, because I understand him to say that a man named Larsen, who was a foreigner I understand from Norway, was applying.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I did not state exactly that. I stated that Mr. Larsen represented a firm of London financiers and that he was a Norwegian and was putting money in it, only a portion of the total.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will my hon. friend state here—because I consider it is important and he must be aware of it—that this company on behalf of which Captain Townsend applied for a license was not a company composed in the majority of foreign capital with foreign labour and foreign vessels ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not think there is anything at all on the record or that the government has any information that foreign vessels were going to enter this industry.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am asking my hon. friend whether he will give us this information. But I have some information here on the file. First, we have a telegram here from Captain Balcom in which he states :

Townsend as it is known as he stated to me himself is negotiating to sell out his license if he should get it, to a Norwegian concern.

I think that is some evidence.

The Norwegians as you know have the right to bring into Canada their vessels free of duty while I had to pay duty having my Norwegian built steamers brought into Canada under English flags and they can without being liable to prosecute bring in alien contract labour signed on as crew of their vessels at rates of wages so far below current wages here as to demoralize rates of wages in the industry to the serious injury of all workmen engaged in it this will give foreigners a great advantage over our company and the ninety-four Canadian shareholders of our company feel indignant about such possibilities and hope that speculators like Townsend who simply will sell out Canadian resources to foreigners will not be given a preference over Canadians who have been the pioneers in this new industry on this coast, and have spent large amounts of money to prove that this industry can successfully be conducted on this coast and have spent large sums for acquiring the process which complies strictly with the Canadian Whaling Act and who have been the first applicants for Banks Island district, and who have made the complete application demanded by law.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is it not a fact that Capt. Balcom sold his license to the Pacific Whaling Company ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes—that is the Canadian company; ninety per cent of its capital is British Columbia capital, while the majority of the capital of the other company is foreign capital, the vessels it was going to use were foreign vessels which would come here without being obliged to pay duty, and it would employ foreign labour which would seriously demoralize the labour market on the British Columbia coast. I have also to point out a communication from Messrs. Drury & Hall, two prominent citizens of British Columbia, who sent the following telegram to the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) :

We earnestly beg your utmost influence prevent license being granted Norwegian Company operating foreign bottoms whaling off British Columbia coast. This resource should be conserved for benefit of Canadians and Canada.

Besides that I would call attention to a letter we received from the attorneys, Messrs. Barnard & Robertson, to H. B. McGiverin, of which perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. A. A. McLean) would not give us information. The letter is dated, Victoria, June 3, 1907, and says :

We have to advise you that our clients have entered into an agreement with Captain Townsend providing for the acquisition of the whaling license granted to him.

So, it would seem from this letter that those interested in the whaling license was not Capt. Townsend, but some clients of Messrs. Barnard & Robertson, that is the foreign company which my hon. friend has mentioned. I think there is not the least doubt that foreign capital, foreign labour, foreign vessels to be engaged in the whale fishing in this country is to the detriment of our own people, our own shipping and our own capital. The Minister of Inland Revenue, in view of the situation, decided—and decided properly; I strongly support the

decision he has rendered—to protect our Canadian people rather than the foreigners. I am surprised that my hon. friend (Mr. A. A. McLean) comes here and attacks the department for having tried to protect Canadian labour against foreign labour, Canadian shipping against foreign shipping, Canadian capital against foreign capital. That is the position the department has taken, and I stand by it, I leave the case in the hands of the House, confident that the House will declare that the department has taken the course which should command the approval of the country.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). The minister is very eloquent over the question of foreign labour and capital. He was not quite so strong on the foreign question when he was getting in the foreigner Falconer here to reorganize the accounts of his department. At that time, it was entirely immaterial, and the minister was quite oblivious for a long time until the opposition enlightened him as to the conditions surrounding that transaction.

Now, what I gather from the transaction is this : It is not so much a question of the foreigner, as it is of giving a peculiar and very unjustifiable monopoly to the Pacific Whaling Company, who have, by some means, got the ear of the department of the government, to the extent even (so far as I can see) of repealing a statute which this parliament saw fit to pass. That is the extraordinary position that the Minister of Marine admits. We have a statute, section 9 of the Fisheries Act, which defines the terms upon which licenses shall be granted and defines the policy laid down by parliament as to the regulation of whale fishing. This section says what the minister shall do and what he shall not do. And, among other things, it provides that licenses shall be granted for the establishment of whaling factories at distances not less than fifty miles apart along the coast. That is as I understand it—I have not looked at the statute. Now, what does the minister purport to do? To repeal this statute which parliament made. Forsooth, because some person wants to come in between the 100-mile-distant stations of the Pacific Whaling Company, the minister promulgates a regulation—it is not even done by order in council,—which purports to repeal the statute which parliament had passed and says that licenses shall be granted to establish factories at distances of not less than 100 miles. This is a very extraordinary position to take. We have had many extraordinary developments under this administration, but none, I think, more extraordinary or more defiant of the law than this. I venture to say to the minister, with a great deal of confidence—notwithstanding that he is a very prominent and able lawyer—that, on consideration he will have to come to the conclusion that he has absolutely no power to do anything of the kind, but that when parliament passes a statute defining the conditions upon which licenses shall be granted, then, upon those conditions and those only can licenses be granted. And when the minister sees fit to send a letter, for which he takes credit, to Capt. Townsend, not only saying that if they want a license they must follow up their application within a certain time—which may be all right, but when he gives the various parties notice that no licenses shall be granted to establish a factory within 100 miles of any other factory, he undertakes to say what was not in contemplation by parliament and he professes to lay down a law which is not the law of Canada. More than that, he does a very unfair thing, because he warns off these men—just as we had a case of warning off by another minister. I say he warns off these men by giving them to understand that they have no chance under the conditions he lays down. This is matter of very serious complaint not only by Capt. Townsend, but by this parliament. For, when we pass a law, no minister has a right to vary that law; only parliament can do that.

I have said, the minister was very eloquent on the question of foreign labour and foreign capital, and so on. I do not know whether I caught the name correctly, but the minister read to us a statement of Capt. Barker, or some such name, against Capt. Townsend, in which Capt. Townsend is characterized as a speculator and so on. The minister will get mountains of evidence of that kind if it suits his mind. You merely want the statement of the rival of a man running in the same race, and if the minister is prepared to decide upon that kind of evidence, he will get any amount of it at all times. But I submit that is no evidence at all. On the other hand, there is no evidence that Capt. Townsend was a speculator, or that he should not receive better treatment than the government gave him, and that his application should be ignored while at least three additional licenses were granted to the Pacific Whaling Company. The minister should have regarded his application in a more favourable light. In Canada we are seeking to induce foreigners, from Norway and Sweden, as well as other European countries, to come here and settle. Some of them bring in capital and others do not. Surely it should not be an obstacle to a man getting a license that his capital comes from Norway. The anxiety of the minister to exclude foreign capital from Canada, to prevent Norwegians coming to settle in Canada and adding to our wealth, is in direct contravention of the policy of his government in respect to immigration, and I think the administration deserves censure for their attitude in this matter.

Mr. BLACK. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lennox), if he has any evidence to show that the Norwegians who have engaged in the coasting trade of Canada have ever invested any capital in Canada?

Mr. LENNOX. I am not at all concerned about the abstract question, but I am concerned with the matter which has been brought before the House. There is evidence given by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. A. McLean), that there was a bona fide application, not only to invest money, but to engage in an enterprise that would be profitable to Canada, and by a class of men who would be a distinct acquisition to the industrial life of Canada if they had been allowed to get the license.

Mr. BRODEUR. Let me tell the hon. gentleman and the House, in addition to what I have already said, that the fishery regulations provide that the licenses shall only be given to British subjects. Of course we have to follow the same rule in this case.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Mr. Townsend was a British subject.

Mr. BRODEUR. But he was acting for foreigners.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Only to the extent of $60,000. There is no evidence before the House that Norwegians were taking their vessels out to engage in this industry, nothing but the word of Captain Balcom who represents the Pacific Whaling Company.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). Having had something to do with the issue of this license to the Pacific Whaling Company, I may say a few words on the question. Referring to the remarks of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), he said that the minister had practically changed the law by fixing the distance between whaling factories one hundred miles instead of fifty. Section 9, clause 2, regarding whale fishing, reads :

> The minister may issue licenses to manufacture oil or other commercial products from whales and to employ boats or vessels in whale fishery, but no such license shall issue until,—
> (a) The minister has approved of the site of the factory, which shall not be within fifty miles of any other whale factory, or in such proximity to any inhabited place or places as in the opinion of the minister, may cause danger or detriment to the public health.

I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that under the clause the minister may issue licenses at his own discretion, or he may, by order in council, or by regulation established by himself, determine that no two licenses shall come within one hundred miles of each other. The minister, according to the advice he received from his officers, and having in view the depletion of the whale fishery on the Atlantic coast, particularly around Newfoundland, decided that for the present, at all events, and until he knew how this industry was going to succeed in the Pacific ocean, decided not to place them closer on the Pacific coast than one hundred miles. I think therefore that the charge of the hon. member for Simcoe that the minister was violating the Act. is unfounded. The hon. gentleman also said that there was a monopoly given to the Pacific Whaling Company. This also is inaccurate, inasmuch as there have been two other whaling licenses granted. They are now in the hands of the parties to whom they were issued, one in March of this year to Mr. George H. Huff, of Alberni, on Vancouver Island ; and one in July, 1907, to Dr. Francis Walter Hall, at Rose Harbour, Queen Charlotte island. Here we have two licenses issued to parties other than the Pacific Whaling Company, which licenses by the way, have not yet been used, though one company I am advised has been formed. I presume it means to secure the capital to build a factory. Now if our Norwegian friends who had so much capital to invest in this business, were very anxious to engage in the industry, why did they not form a company in alliance with Dr. Hall, of the city of Victoria, and utilize his license and start the industry ? They can do the same in respect of the whaling license given to Mr. Geo. A. Huff, on the southern end of Queen Charlotte island, and start a whale industry if they so desire. These gentlemen are probably looking for capital and for experienced men who understand the catching and preparation of whales for commercial purposes.

Now some remarks were also made about the bona fides of the applicants. The application of Captain Townsend was bona fide. He is a well known citizen of Victoria, and captain of one of the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers on the west coast of Vancouver island. His application as made was bona fide. He could have organized a company to start the industry, just as Captain Balcom did before him. Captain Townsend had made several applications, but as they interfered with the others. he withdrew them. Finally he placed before the department an application for a license in the vicinity of Campania island off the north coast of the mainland and not far from the Queen Charlotte islands. The Pacific Whaling Company had, a year or six months before that, put in an application for a whaling license on Banks island, both islands being within thirty or forty miles of each other—probably less. Captain Balcom put in an application for a license for Banks' island on October 20, 1906, and Captain Townsend put in his application for Campania island on June 3, 1907. Before six months elapsed Captain Townsend made his application good under the Act. He put

up $800 and he gave assurances in writing to the minister that the machinery would be provided that would dispose of a whale in twenty-four hours.

Mr. FOSTER. He complied with the conditions of the Act ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He complied with the conditions. Captain Balcom did the same thing in respect to his Bank island application. The whaling industry was started in British Columbia in 1904. Captain Balcom is the pioneer of the industry. He was a sealing captain from Nova Scotia who had been engaged for many years in catching seals in Behring sea. When that industry began to go down he turned his attention to whaling. He investigated the possibilities of whaling. He travelled through the east, investigated the conditions in Newfounland, studied all he could about it, applied for the first license, got up a local company and secured capital in the city of Victoria. He invested $150,000 in his first whaling factory at Sechart immediately north of Barclay Sound on the west coast of Vancouver island. His first efforts very nearly resulted in failure. He struggled hard for nearly a year. He found that, with the mechanical and chemical process he had introduced, it was impossible to extract all the oil out of the whale and his venture was very nearly a failure. It was at that time that applications for licenses came in from a great many other people. Captain Townsend is not the only man who has failed to receive a license. There have been half a dozen others. The Pacific Whaling Company, after the first year's operations, very nearly became a failure because of their inability to manufacture the whale oil and fertilizer so that the products would be commercially profitable. They looked around and they found a gentleman named Rismuller, a German, who had a process of his own, the value of which was in the chemicals used as well as in the machinery. The Pacific Whaling Company made a contract with Dr. Rismuller. I do not know whether a certain sum of money was paid or whether a large interest was given in the industry, but I know that it cost the Pacific Whaling Company a very large consideration to get Dr. Rismuller to go into the industry so that his process could be adopted. Dr. Rismuller went into it and the Pacific Whaling Company was a success from that time on. They have been making money since. Now, this is the position : Captain Sprott Balcom was the pioneer of the industry. Ninety per cent of the capital invested in the Pacific Whaling Company is owned by Victoria people. Captain Balcom, in his first efforts, bought a sealing steamer in Norway. A sealing steamer is not an ordinary steamer. It is constructed in such a way as to be adapted to the modern requirements for catching whales. He changed the flag and brought the steamer into Victoria. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) insisted on his paying the duty on it although Captain Balcom thought that as it was a new industry he should be relieved of the duty. But, the Minister of Customs would not relent and this company when it was struggling against many difficultes, had to pay to the government about $7,000 upon that steamer. That was the position when my attention was called to the matter in the department. Let me say that Captain Townsend is not a party to this discussion. Barnard & Robertson, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) knows, is a good Conservative firm in Victoria. Mr. Barnard is president of the Conservative Association of British Columbia and he very probably sent down here some letters, all of which are on file, to the leader of the opposition who has passed them on to the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I., (Mr. Mc.Lean) and that hon. gentleman has thought to make a charge against this government of partiality in awarding this license to the Pacific Whaling Company as against Captain Townsend. I said, in a letter to Captain Townsend, that I would investigate the facts on the ground. When I went to British Columbia last fall I learned that Captain Townsend had little or no capital of his own. Very probably he had some friends who might have subscribed if he had organized the company. I found that there were Norwegian gentlemen on the ground waiting to get that license. Very probably they would have organized a company if they got it. I am not saying anything against Captain Townsend associating himself with Norwegian capitalists or whaling men; he had a right to do so. But that company could have brought a Norwegian steamer into British Columbia to engage in the whaling industry without paying any duty on her. At that time it was possible to do so under the Act, but since then the Act has been changed and it is not possible now.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there anything in the papers to substantiate that ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No. I learned this on the ground. It was pointed out by Captain Balcom, managing director of the Pacific Whaling Company. That was the danger. It could have been done and Captain Balcom had paid $7,000 duty on his steamer. Captain Balcom had at that time under way his second station under the three first licenses and had purchased a second steamer.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does Captain Balcom come in ? We have heard of his early sacrifices and troubles, but where does he

come in now ? Does he belong to the Pacific Company ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Certainly; he is the managing director of the Pacific Whaling Company. I do not know how Mr. Balcom transferred his license to the company, but I know he organized the company and secured the capital. There are over eighty residents of Victoria who are stockholders in the Pacific Whaling Company, of which Captain Balcom is the managing director, and D. Rismuller is the practical man in charge of the practical work at the factories. They have made a great success of the enterprise. The Pacific Whaling Company is absolutely a Canadian undertaking. Captain Townsend proposed to organize a Norwegian Company, and for myself I do not care whether the capital was to come from Norway or not, but there was the danger that they would bring their vessel in without paying duty and that she would be manned by Norwegians. I may say that the expert high-priced harpooners in the Pacific Whaling Company to-day are Norwegians. Captain Balcom, representing the Pacific Whaling Company, applied for Banks island before Captain Townsend applied for the island contiguous to it. The Pacific Whaling Company had made good the year before. We knew that their plant was satisfactory and we knew they had been successful in business and that they had the capital to carry it on. Putting all these things together and after having several interviews with Captain Townsend, I decided that the license should go to the Pacific Whaling Company for Banks island, which being within 100 miles of the island for which Captain Townsend had applied, necessarily under the rule precluded the application of Captain Townsend being granted. I want to say to the House and to my hon. friend (Mr. McLean) who has been primed for this occasion, not by Captain Townsend, but by Barnard and Robertson, a legal firm of Victoria, I want to say that if Captain Townsend was their client, they are acting contrary to his wishes.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Do you know that ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Do you know that your statement is a fact, or is it only surmise ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I repeat that the hon. member is not acting under instructions from Captain Townsend.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). How do you know that?

Mr. LENNOX. The minister stated that this law firm was acting contrary to the instructions of their client. Does he know that ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I say they are not acting under instructions from Captain Townsend, who although not a consenting party to the final disposal of this license, saw the reasonableness and fairness of it. Knowing Captain Townsend as I do, I am safe in saying that my hon. friend (Mr. McLean) in bringing this matter before the House was not acting upon the suggestion of Captain Townsend, who was the principal in the whole transaction.

Mr. FOSTER. That is only a supposition.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Quite true, it is only a supposition, but it is a natural one. It was on my instructions the deputy minister gave the license to the Pacific Whaling Company, and I wrote him from Victoria the following letter :

Victoria, British Columbia,
September 6, 1907.

Lieutenant Colonel Gourdeau,
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ontario.

My dear Colonel,—I to-day wired you as follows: 'In the matter of whaling license issue to the Pacific Steam Whaling Company at Banks island, if they have complied with conditions.'

I have examined into the case, and I believe on every ground that will be the best thing to do. It will be best in the public interest generally. This company is a purely Canadian enterprise while the rival applicant would be foreign when constituted. The Pacific Company also has demonstrated by successful operation of other stations that it is possessed of the practical knowledge necessary to carry on the business, while its machinery and system of working is superior to that of any other company.

Under this decision to grant a license to the Pacific Company the application of Captain Townsend cannot be granted. His deposit should, therefore, be returned to him and he should be informed that the application of the Pacific Company has been favoured for the reasons above stated, and especially because the plant and machinery of the Pacific Company meets the requirements of the department while those of Captain Townsend do not.

The last words 'while those of Captain Townsend do not' might possibly have been omitted, inasmuch as Captain Townsend had no plant or machinery, although he stated to the department that he would provide such plant and machinery as would meet with the approval of the department. I believe I gave this decision in the best interest of all concerned. I repeat that Captain Townsend did not express himself as dissatisfied when the decision was arrived at and therefore there can be no grievance, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLean) cannot find any condemnation of the department on the action taken.

Mr. FOSTER. How many licenses has the Pacific Whaling Company ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Five.

Mr. FOSTER. Covering what extent of coast line ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. They are obliged to be 100 miles apart. They have three factories now running and they contemplate a fourth. They have the license at Banks island in the north and one on Fitzhugh sound. As I have mentioned there are two other licenses issued and not utilized to-day. I understand that there are others who are making applications for licenses. There is an application for the Queen Charlotte islands. There is one license granted at the south end of Queen Charlotte islands and there is an application for one at the north end.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the whole coast line taken up ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not think the coast line of British Columbia is taken up yet. For these licenses they have to pay $800 for the first year, $1,000 for the second year, and $1,200 for the third year, and this being the second year for Banks island license, this company is paying $1,000 for that license whether they use it or not. If the licenses are not utilized within a given time the minister has power to cancel them so that the public interest is well protected.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot make out from what the minister has said as to whether the number of licenses granted now really pre-empts the whole coast.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I said that it certainly did not take up the whole coast.

Mr. FOSTER. It must come pretty close to it. You have five of them, besides two granted which are not in use, all belonging to the Pacific Company, I understand. That makes seven licenses, which would take up 700 miles.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are the Queen Charlotte islands and the eastern coast of the Island of Vancouver.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I might inform my hon. friend that seven licenses might be placed around the island of Vancouver alone, as it is 300 miles long.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the limit that they shall not be within 100 miles of each other, or is the coast line measured?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think the measurement is by water.

Mr. FOSTER. What I wanted to ask the minister was this. Does he argue for a monopoly because the Pacific Whaling Company is a Canadian company and has put in its money?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not argue anything of the kind. If the application of the Pacific Whaling Company for Banks island had not been in months before the other, and if they had not complied with all the conditions equally with Captain Townsend, if they had not made good under the law, there is no question that the license would have gone to Captain Townsend, which shows that I had no desire to create any monopoly.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Why did you say to Captain Townsend that you were going to give him a license and afterwards rescind that by reason of the fact that he was engaging foreign capital?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was simply because information had reached the department that it was foreign capital after the date of the letter of October, 1906.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it intended to discourage the introduction of foreign capital?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but the great disadvantage in this case was this. The vessels it was proposed to use in the business were vessels to be brought from Norway, and we are obliged to admit free of duty Norwegian vessels which come here to engage in the coasting trade.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not intend to speak in this debate, but I would not think it wise to adopt a policy which would discourage the introduction into this country of capital from abroad, because if there is one thing that Canada needs more than another it is the introduction of capital from abroad in any of our industrial activities.

Mr. BRODEUR. But in this case there is a clause in our regulations providing that licenses shall be issued only to British subjects.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That may be a very proper provision, but I understand that Captain Townsend is a British subject ; and so far as shipping is concerned, any objection on that score must be an objection to the customs law, and not a special objection to the project that was on foot at the instance of Captain Townsend. However, the matter has been debated, and I do not desire to delay the House with any consideration of that. I rose merely for the purpose of uttering a protest against the obvious attempt of the Minister of Inland Revenue to cast some slur or discredit upon Messrs. Barnard and Robertson. Eventually he stated that the matter to which he alluded was a conjecture or surmise in his own mind more than a matter of positive knowledge, as far as these gentlemen are concerned.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I drew an inference, as you do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think I am in the habit of drawing inferences to the discredit of any gentleman who is not

in this House to defend himself. If I have ever done so, I have done it inadvertently. I do not think the hon. gentleman can point to any instance; if he can, let him do it now.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What discredit?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman's remarks meant anything, they meant that for political purposes these gentlemen were disregarding their duty to their client.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I said that Captain Townsend was their client and not the Norwegian representative. I said they were acting contrary to the wishes of their client, because I knew the wishes of Captain Townsend in this matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The wishes of Captain Townsend or the wishes of the Norwegian representative or any one else did not make the slightest difference. This was a matter touching the policy of the government, and such matters are not to be controlled according to the desire of Captain Townsend or this Norwegian gentleman or any one else. It is a matter of public interest, not a matter of private interest, that is being discussed on this occasion. That is a sufficient answer to what the hon. gentleman has alleged just now and during his speech. I think it is a matter of regret that a minister of the Crown should make a statement of that kind founded on mere conjecture. He covers it of course with an 'if'; he says if such and such was the case these gentlemen apparently were disregarding their duty to their client and using their position for political purposes. So far as I know these gentlemen, and I know something of them, they are men who stand well in their profession, and their reputation in the community in which they are known is fully equal to that of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and it does not become him as a minister of the Crown to endeavour to cast any such aspersion upon them as he endeavoured to do this afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. It might be said that the minister's statement was not an inference; it was a presumption.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the motion carries, I would like to say that I understand that the militia estimates are to be considered in Supply. I had intended to discuss these estimates somewhat fully in the House, as to administration and as to policy; but at this hour I thought I would propose to the House, particularly to my hon. friends opposite, whether the real discussion might not be taken up at some future date, and the House go into committee now to pass if possible one or two urgent items. I would suggest, for instance, that the large vote on page 37. $1,300,000, which is not immediately required, might be allowed to stand over, and that upon that item the whole question of the militia might be discussed at some future time. As to the principal militia items, four of them are urgent—pay and allowances, that is, for the permanent force, which is at present without pay; annual drill, which to be of any use must be voted at once and voted in full, because most of the camps will come on in the next few weeks; salaries and wages, which are required monthly; and the Dominion arsenal. I would like to call attention to the item of annual drill.

Mr. FOSTER. And transport?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The annual drill involves the transport.

Mr. FOSTER. Then really the urgent item is annual drill.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How long will it take to tell about the annual drill?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My officers are here, we have 55 minutes and perhaps I could explain it in that time. If not it would be necessary that the item I mention on page 37 would be open to full discussion.

Mr. FOWLER. We could even discuss the annual drill upon that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Militia—annual drill, $1,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The understanding is that we will take up item 74 about which the minister will make any such statement as seems to him necessary. So far as the more general statement to which he alluded is concerned, the proposal is that it shall be reserved until some future occasion on some item.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. The amount spent upon the annual drill last year, ending March 31, was $1,085,000. It is not proposed to spend any more on annual drill this year than last year. We intend to make our arrangements in such a way as to keep within that limit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the increase of $155,000 due to the same reason that was given the other evening by the Minister of Railways and Canals, namely that what were formerly supplementary estimates are now included in the main estimates?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it true that there is a good deal of money owing to some of the militia men for last year? I heard a complaint of that the other day.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, there is not a dollar.

Mr. BERGERON. That is extraordinary. A militiaman told me that there was some owing from last year. I told him we had voted $200,000 this year on account of some balance that remained over from last year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am informed that every single corps has been paid up to the last cent.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say so. I shall send the 'Hansard' to the party concerned to-morrow.

Mr. FOWLER. How many troops do you propose to have at annual drill this year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The same number as last year. The total number is 45,000 and there will be about 30,000 in camp, the balance will be drilled at headquarters in the cities.

Mr. FOWLER. That is the full strength?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Will you count the trip of those who go to the tercentenary as equivalent to the annual drill?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, that will be so with the rural militia. The city corps will receive their full 12 days' pay which they will use as they choose, but they will not be paid for the four days at Quebec. Of course all their transportation and subsistence will be paid, but the actual time at Quebec will not be paid. They will be given the money for the 12 days' drill. They will drill locally and will go to Quebec free of any further charge except their transportation and subsistence.

Mr. FOWLER. How about the rural militia?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is intended to take one company from each rural regiment. That company will not go to camp but will go to Quebec and will be paid for going to Quebec the number of days that the trip occupies, probably it will be the full 12 days but it will not exceed that.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think I agree with that idea. It seems to me that you should have the annual drill before the tercentary and then make your selection. I suppose the idea of making the selection is to have the very best company, and the best way to find out which is the best company is by observation during the annual drill. You have no other way of testing them, as I understand, in the rural regiments because the company that perhaps made the best showing last year would not make the best showing this year owing to the numerous changes that take place, particularly in infantry regiments, from year to year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In many cases the drill will take place first, but the matter of selection will be left entirely to the regiments.

Mr. FOWLER. But you say the men who go to Quebec will not go to camp.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend should not tie me up too close. What will happen will be this: Suppose a regiment is 350 strong, and that we intend to send, and I believe it is intended to send, a company of the strength of 45 to Quebec. In that particular regiment the commanding officer will be instructed that he can only take 305 men to camp but we shall not tell him that he may not take to Quebec some of those who go to camp. We cannot afford to pay any more, otherwise we would not be able to send these men to Quebec at all without an extra vote.

Mr. FOWLER. Then I think you had better take the extra vote. That does not seem to me to be the right way to do this thing. Drill the different regiments and then select the very best company from each regiment to take to Quebec. If you require an extra vote for that I am satisfied that the House would be willing to give an extra vote. We want to make a respectable showing at Quebec. I regret that you do not intend to mobilize the entire militia there as at first proposed. I believe that would have proved a splendid test of the strength of the military machine of this country. I think it is an unfortunate thing that the department has decided not to do it. I do not know the causes that have led up to that decision, and, perhaps I may be wrongfully finding fault. But, so far as it appears on the surface, I must say that this seems to be a bad decision. For, as I have said, this was an opportunity to test the machinery of the department. Now, it is a pretty expensive machinery, as the minister himself will admit, and the expense of it has been greatly increased within the last few years. The only justification for that expense would be that it has given us a machine that will accomplish the purpose for which it was designed; and we have no way of judging whether the machine is a perfect machine as far as human machinery can be made perfect—or not, except by some such test as this. The mere fact of creating a certain bureau and giving the members of it high sounding names—generals, full colonels and so on—does not make that a perfect machine. The only way the government have of knowing whether this machine would do what it is designed for or not, would be by such a test as mobilizing the troops for Quebec. I regret very much that, for some reason, the department has seen fit to change its plans, and, instead of taking 30,000 or 40,000 troops to take only—is it 5,000?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Twelve thousand.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, that is not so bad. But still it seems to be a mistake for the minister to change his position.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I made a statement in the House as to the reasons for the decisions arrived at, and I do not wish to repeat it except to say that it was found to be absolutely impossible, with the means we have to mobilize 32,000 or 33,000 troops for Quebec at that time.

Mr. FOWLER. Why ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because the people who would require accommodatin on the trains going and coming could not be carried if we were to mobilize so many troops. More than that, the Battlefields Commission expressly limited us at the outset to a certain number of days—we must be through with our mobilization before a certain day, and we could not begin the returning of our troops to their homes until after a certain other day. This was all gone into very carefully, and it was found to be absolutely impossible to mobilize so many. We might have mobilized more than 12,000 but we could not do anything like 30,000 properly and with due regard to the comfort of the men. As to how we came to decide upon 12,000, I would say to my hon. friend what I said in the House the other day, I think ; the Militia Department has received from the president —as I think he is called—of the Battlefields Commission a copy of a resolution passed unanimously by that body asking for 12,000 troops. It is upon that request that we are proceeding ; and I think it is fair to assume that these gentlemen are the best judges as to the number of men likely to be comfortably accommodated both on the trains and in Quebec itself.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the proportion of rural and urban ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not quite know yet, but to-morrow I think the general order will be issued. There will be something like equal numbers, probably rather more urban than rural. Now, as to the other point presented by my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), he may be perfectly certain that each rural battalion represented—and I hope they all will be ; they will all be offered a chance—will have the very best company that can be produced from the battalion. The hon. gentleman is familiar enough with the rural militia to know that a sense of pride will stimulate them to make the best choice, and the department, I can assure him, will co-operate with them in bringing about that desirable end.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, but if you do not drill the regiment before the Tercentenary how are you going to know ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have been drilling troops in this country for the last forty years, and the captains and colonels know where the men are, and, for an occasion like this, there will be no serious difficulty.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention to select them individually from the whole of the regiment ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend knows that that is done every year. There is no permanency, no continuity, but every year the men who go into camp are selected about a week before. We are not going to prevent that now.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister mean, selected from the general mass of the population ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Those that have been in camp for years.

Mr. FOWLER. But, for the purpose of sending a company to Quebec, are you going to take the whole of Company A, for instance, or are you going to select individuals from the different companies and make a composite company ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is a matter I am leaving in the hands of Brigadier General Otter, an old hand, who is arranging the details with the different colonels. We want to get the best results, and I do not propose to interfere. I have every confidence that Brigadier General Otter will do it in the best possible way, and I think we should give him the liberty necessary to bring about the best results.

Mr. FOWLER. But does not the minister think it about time the general community knew what line he proposes to take ? We are getting very close to the time when these people must go.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No doubt that is what will be done—it will be a composite company.

Mr. FOWLER. If it were known soon what is to be done, it might have some effect upon the men going into camp—it might be an extra inducement for men who have been well drilled to go into camp for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. Some companies were drilling expecting to be sent to Quebec—whatever the source of their information, that was their understanding. But since then, I understand, they have stopped drilling. It seems to me a matter of great importance that the men should know at as early a date as possible whether they are going or not. As to selection between the city and rural corps, I think there

ought to be a fair opportunity given to the rural corps to share in this celebration. Many of them have been disappointed because of the rumours in circulation lately that they are not to be taken. I know from letters that I have received that they are much disappointed, and very anxious to know how selection is to be made so that it may be known who are to go. It is getting very close to the time, and it seems to me that the Minister of Militia, with the council or whoever makes the arrangements, should reach a decision at the earliest possible moment.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It will be out to-morrow.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would the minister tell us what officer of the general staff is in charge of the transport?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Brigadier General Macdonald is in charge for the Quarter Master General, but Brigadier General Otter will have charge of the whole mobilization and will command this force at Quebec.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The point I want to get at is whether the Department of Militia and the Department of Railways, and the government generally, are satisfied with the capacity of our Canadian railways to mobilize a force of this size. I have been reading some of the statements made on behalf of the railways and it seems they are rather disappointed. In fact, it does not seem to be so big a proposition as they make it out to be; or, rather, it may show that their ability and capacity and equipment for handling a thing of this kind are not what they should be, and, from the national point of view, it might be worth some inquiring whether our railways are up to the mark of mobilizing our forces. To put the question in another way, any one attempting to invade this country would select a holiday, when the capacity of the railways was tested to the utmost, and there would be no means of moving our troops. That is a very important question, and I hope the minister will give it some attention. He should see that the railways of this country have an equipment enabling them to mobilize the troops under any conditions.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend says. That is a very important point, and it has not escaped the consideration of the militia authorities. It is however only fair to the railways to say that if it were necessary to mobilize a considerable force at Quebec under stress of war or threatened trouble, there would not be much difficulty in doing so. But to undertake to bring to Quebec over 30,000 men, with a proper equipment of horses and artillery, while perhaps 100,000 people are to be brought into Quebec and away from it at almost the same moment, is an entirely different proposition. It is something however that is not likely to happen. In time of trouble, under the Militia Act, pasesd a few years ago, the department can take possession of all the railways, and control them absolutely. In such a case the conditions would be entirely different from those which will prevail at the time of the tercentenary which is shortly to take place.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister said he had not decided as to the proportion of rural and urban militia that would be taken to Quebec.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not quite that. I have not made up the figures. We have decided that one company of infantry from each rural battalion shall go to Quebec, or shall be offered the chance, and we have decided that half of the cavalry force shall go, and they are a rural force, and I think a certain amount of field artillery and garrison artillery. But the figures have not been made up yet.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of transporting 12,000 men?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the whole thing will cost, on the basis we have arranged, about $180,000; that includes food as well as transport.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister says he proposes to take one company from each rural battalion. Now there is considerable feeling in the country that the rural forces are not being fairly dealt with, that partiality is being shown to the urban forces. I do not say the department is doing that, but it is just as well that the point should be called to the minister's attention. I have a letter from the captain of a regiment calling my attention to this matter, and I will read it to let the minister know the opinion that prevails among some, at least, of the country militia. The letter is dated Bradford, May 25, 1908:

As a member of the rural corps of the militia of Canada, I would like to see fair play handed out to all, as I think we have been unfairly dealt with in being denied the honour of going to Quebec.

We learn now that is not the case.

The city and permanent corps are only allowed to go, therefore calling out all of the rural corps that have played so important a part in the history of Canada. I need not tell you that the rural militia are the backbone of the country, and it will be a sad day if the rural corps are told to stand aside and make room for the city corps at Quebec.

The Minister of Militia need not tell the people that the railway companies are to blame in the matter, for as a matter of fact the transportation was arranged until the commanding officers of the city corps interviewed the government. We had orders to go

to Quebec fifty per cent strong some time ago, and soldier-like were making arrangements to go without complaint, not like the city corps for they began to howl. . . I am sorry to trouble you so, but as a member of the 36th regiment I want to see my men get fair play, and I am sure so do you, and in standing up for this regiment which is partly in your constituency, you will have the hearty support, not only of the young men who are in it now, but also of the parents and friends of numbers who have been members of the militia in their day.

Kindly take this matter up in the House, and I will await results.

I am, yours very truly,
GEORGE W. STODDART,
Captain 36th Regiment.

Mr. H. Lennox,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

I therefore urge upon the minister to give the rural corps the fullest consideration. I may say, speaking of the militia generally, that there is a strong desire to go to Quebec, a very laudable desire; so I hope the minister, if he errs at all, will err on the side of enlarging the force he proposed to send.

Mr. HENDERSON. Having come into contact recently with military men, I have to say that there is considerable anxiety among them as to where they stand to-day. They seem to be entirely at a loss to know whether they are going into camp at all, not to speak of going to Quebec. I think the sooner the minister makes a definite announcement on this point the better, so as to settle the matter in the minds of the officers and men throughout the country. I know they are waiting anxiously, and there is a great deal of uncertainty as to what they are going to be called on to do. There is another point on which the men are uncertain. At present everybody is looking for some consideration for their time, and there is a feeling that it will be difficult to get men to go to camp unless reasonable compensation is paid. I do not know what the intention of the minister is, but I think he should not treat the men unfairly in this regard. I think fair compensation should be given them for the time they will spend in the military camps. I trust the minister will make a declaration to-night that may go broadcast to the country, and let every captain of a company know where he is when he asks men to join his company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister is aware that I have urged upon him, publicly and privately, that as many of the rural corps as possible should go to camp. I was not in when he opened his remarks, and did not hear his reason for not taking to Quebec the rural corps to as full an extent as the city corps. I wish to recall the review before the Duke of York in the city of Toronto. The crack regiments of Toronto, Hamilton and almost every other city in Ontario were there. The minister himself will admit that they took second place to several of the rural corps and one rural corps especially with respect to marching, drill, neatness or in every other way that any one could compare them. There were at least three rural corps from the province of Ontario that surpassed the city corps in everything except the fit of the uniforms and I am free to say that the 43rd Regiment of Ottawa was, in the universal opinion, the best drilled regiment and, like all other city corps they were neatly dressed, but in so far as military movements were concerned the rural corps held their own with the best of them, and some of the rural corps surpassed the city regiments. I would like to know why the rural corps should not be recognized in connection with this Quebec review. Why should not the minister adopt the old plan and take a half regiment from each locality to the city of Quebec? I will give him fair warning that he will not have any military camps of the rural corps if they do not go to Quebec. I do not blame them. The men will not turn out to spend a few days in camp and see their comrades, with no greater claim to recognition, taken to Quebec. I am satisfied that the country would endorse the minister and that the transport could easily be arranged. Follow out the original plan, place 27,000 or 30,000 of the boys on the Plains of Abraham in July and the transport can be arranged. The transport can be arranged and I am satisfied that the House and the country will readily stand the cost. All the men want is to have their transport and ration allowance. I am satisfied that they will not ask for drill pay as the city corps are.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The city corps will perform their annual drill in the fall and spring and get their pay for it in consideration of which they will go to Quebec. The rural corps will perform their drill and will go to Quebec and all they ask for is their transport and ration allowance.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The city corps will do their drill without any consideration at all.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Pardon me. They will get their annual pay for doing their drill in fall and spring, and they will go to Quebec and get their transport and rations but they will also have their pay.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. They are entitled to it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Certainly, but the rural corps will go them one better, if they get their rations and transport they will go to Quebec. If the minister does not take them he will not have successful annual camps. Why make this invidious distinction as against the rural corps? I am satisfied that the House and the

country will back the minister up in taking the rural corps down there. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), an ardent friend of the volunteer system, I am sure, will join hands with the Minister of Militia in seeking to have this corps represented at Quebec. The transport matter is easily arranged. I will undertake to pick out half a dozen young fellows in the province of Ontario who would lay down a plan in half a day. The troops could be mobilized there without interfering with the ordinary passenger traffic. The militia will find that the rural corps will go if he will consent to give them their transport and rations. The city corps have made a deal that they will go under similar conditions but they will get their annual pay. Why should the rural corps be discriminated against?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) speaks about the pay. The rate paid will be the rate prescribed by law. It cannot be anything else. I will do him the justice to say that on several occasions before the pay was increased he participated in the demand that was made for an increase. Subsequently provision was made for efficiency pay of fifty cents for each militiaman; so much for the first year for efficiency, and so much for the second year over and above the regular pay of fifty cents per day per man. We cannot go beyond that. If a man goes to Quebec who has had three camps he will get a dollar a day and I presume that should be satisfactory. As to the observations of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). he must have forgotten that we are restricted to 12,000 men.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because the commission desires us to send 12,000 and no more.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the commission superior to parliament? The commission is the creation of parliament.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I know, but we have not the means of transportation. We have from 27,000 to 30,000 rural militia so that we could not possibly take even half of them and we must give due consideration to the city militia. The problem is a difficult one.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why should the city corps be singled out? They are no better drilled.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I suppose they are entitled to representation?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, but not to full representation in view of the fact that the representation of the country corps is but one out of eight.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They will not get full representation. They will all be represented. The two regiments in the city of Quebec, of course, will be taken in full. In reference to the plan upon which we are proceeding I think I had better say a word. In the first place we want an effective demonstration, we want the best show, because that is all it is, that can possibly be made there and we want the best review that has ever taken place in Canada. This will be the largest military review that has ever taken place of purely Canadian troops in Canada. There will be two thousand more men there than at the review at Toronto in 1901 to which my hon. friend referred.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister saw that review in Toronto and he told me himself that three rural corps were equal to any, and that one was superior to some.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am very fond of the rural corps. I have been a member of a battalion for forty years. Secondly, the representative character of this force must be looked at. I want to see representatives from every military district and every corps in so far as it can possibly be done. Due regard must also be had to economy. We have no right to waste money unnecessarily and therefore we should take those troops in the city of Quebec which will not involve any cost to the country and which are available. We should take our cavalry and artillery from the nearest point to Quebec, and it is proposed to hold one of the cavalry camps close to Quebec so that the cavalry can be utilized in the city. It will be composed of the eastern townships cavalry. These are the considerations which have guided us in the plan we have made in the carrying out of this review. From the west there will be two hundred soldiers made up of a composite corps from the whole of the Northwest including British Columbia. We propose in addition to bring the Royal Military College Cadets to the number of sixty. There will be from 800 to 1,000 horses including cavalry and horse artillery. There will be 1,400 officers, non-commissioned officers and men (about one-half) of the permanent force. There will be in all about 10,000 of the active militia; sixty Royal Military College Cadets and two hundred men from the west.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the Army and and Navy Veterans.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am afraid my hon. friend will be disappointed.

Mr. FOWLER. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) as to the effect of the latest idea of the department with regard to taking troops to the review at Quebec. I think better of the militiamen of this country than to believe they would cease to belong to the

force simply because they did not get a chance to go to Quebec. No doubt every man in the militia would like to go to Quebec, but if that be impossible I do not think Jones will leave the militia simply because Smith goes to Quebec and he cannot. That is not the spirit which animates the militia force in the county whence I come. My natural sympathies would be in favour of the rural corps because I come from a rural constituency, but at the same time it is only natural to suppose that the city corps would be better drilled because they drill more and if they are of equal intelligence with the men of the rural corps they should be better drilled. The minister first announced that he would send to Quebec 50 per cent of the whole militia and I regret he is not doing so.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So am I.

Mr. FOWLER. If it is going to be a grand sight to see 12,000 troops it would be infinitely grander to see 30,000 from the standpoint of the pageant alone, and it would test our military system in a way that taking 12,000 troops would not. It seems to me the excuse of the railway companies is a flimsy excuse and that they ought to be compelled to take these men to Quebec. You could arrange to take them there a day or two before. I do not believe that the men want to be paid for the time they are going to Quebec. I believe they would be very glad to go if they got their transportation, and their rations and their accommodation. A great many people are going there and paying their way to go and the military would be able to see the pageant even though they take part in it.

Mr. BARR. I agree with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that there should be no discrimination between the rural corps and the city corps. I believe that the rural corps are just as well drilled as the city corps even though they do not get so much drill. When they go to camp they go to learn drill and to learn something of the art of war, and we know they make better soldiers as a rule than the men of the city corps. I do not think there has been any valid reason given by the Minister of Militia why the rural battalions should not be well represented in Quebec and I hope he will reconsider his decision in that respect. How many of the rural corps will go to Quebec now ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. One company from each regiment.

Mr. BARR. Who will decide which company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The colonel of the regiment.

Mr. BARR. The colonel of the regiment has his favourites and I think it would be a fairer way for the men to draw lots.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to express my dissent from the view put forward by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) that we should send the whole militia to Quebec, and I dissent on the ground that the expense of such a course would be enormous. The hon. gentleman seems to have ignored that point altogether.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me?

Mr. SINCLAIR. You will have an opportunity to speak later.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the hon. gentleman refuse me the courtesy of correcting him when he is misrepresenting me?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have no intention of misrepresenting the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. I will answer you later on.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) stated more than once that he was in favour of taking 30,000 of the militia to Quebec which is practically the whole of the militia of Canada. I cannot sit here without protesting against such an extravagant expenditure of money which in my opinion would amount to more than half a million dollars. I wish to point out to the House and to the people who pay the taxes that the hon. gentleman from Albert (Mr. Fowler) is willing to spend half a million in this way. He lectures us on economy but he is willing to spend half a million dollars on a mere military display which will only last a few days.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman from Guysborough with his usual inability to grasp the sense of a statement and his usual unfairness in presenting his own views, has misrepresented what I said. When the Minister of Militia first discussed this matter in the House he said it was the intention to take 50 per cent of the militia force to Quebec and it was with that proposition I dealt this afternoon. We were discussing only 50 per cent of the militia, and I did not advocate taking the whole militia of Canada to Quebec.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the hon. gentleman permit me ?

Mr. FOWLER. No, I wont, just take your seat. I will treat the hon. member for Guysborough with exactly the same courtesy that he accords to me and to other members of the House. I did not make any such statement ; but the hon. gentleman desired to make a political point against me, and he stated that it would cost half a million to take these troops to Quebec and keep them there for two or

three days. The hon. gentleman is not able to figure very well, or he would not have made that statement. If these troops went to Quebec, they would have no annual drill, as the minister stated before, so that it would not add one cent to the cost. My friend of limited understanding from Guysborough expresses very much solicitude and regret at this particular item on behalf of the dear taxpayer; but he sits there calmly and votes millions to be wasted in little twopenny-half-penny public works that are only temporary, that go out almost with the next tide, in the province of Nova Scotia. He is willing to vote hundreds of thousands to pay his illustrious friends of the North Atlantic Trading Company for bringing in many cases improper immigrants to this country; and yet he holds up his hands in holy horror because a few dollars are to be spent to enable the rural militia to take part in this great demonstration that is to take place at Quebec. This is the hon. gentleman's idea of economy. If the electors of Guysborough were within the sound of the hon. gentleman's voice when he was giving utterances to these noble, patriotic and inspiring sentiments, I think his vote would be a very small one at the next election; but I venture to say that the hon. gentleman does not talk in that manner when he goes into the county of Guysborough. When his friend Mr. Benjamin Franklin Pearson divided with his friends a little nestegg of $28,000 for which this country received nothing at all, the hon. member for Guysborough swallowed it as a baby would new milk; and yet day after day, night after night—because he is very regular in his attendance in the sessions of this House—he has sat in his place and voted for the expenditure of these huge sums for purchases which certainly do not inure to the benefit of the people of this country as a whole, but only to the benefit of a few favourite individuals.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Talk it out.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for Hamilton says, talk it out; but if the hon. member had put a muzzle on the hon. member for Guysborough, so much time perhaps would not have been taken up, and the item would have been through before. I am surprised that the Minister of Finance does not keep a better check on these irresponsible members than he does. Now I think this item had better pass.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I desire to ask the minister what proportion of the city corps and the rural corps is to go?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not the figures, but I think there is something like an equal balance. There will be certain city regiments, and for the balance of the city regiments one company from each and one company from each rural corps.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would the minister tell us what Toronto regiments are to go?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I could not say positively. I have an idea, but I think it undesirable to make the announcement at present. It will all be out in a day or two. I think two of the Toronto regiments are going—the Queen's Own and the 48th.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why not the others?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps they are but these have been mentioned to me.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I again want to impress on the minister that there should be a fair division as between the city corps and the rural corps. Unless the matter is arranged on an absolutely fair and square basis, he will find that there will be very great dissatisfaction on the part of the men who are left out, especially those of the rural corps.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the discussion can go on to-morrow on this same item if we carry it now?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The same discussion can go on upon another item.

Some resolutions reported.

House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

INDEX

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1907-1908.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn ; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Conside ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques- Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ADAMSON, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1732 (i) ; in Com., 4996 (iii) ; on Senate Amts., 10511 (iv).

Northern Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 7) 1°*, 231 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8583 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, of, &c., Com. of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2276 (ii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4401 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955 ; Section of House of Commons Act (read) 5955 (iii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1843 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 80) 1° m., 1671 (i) ; 2° m., 5228 (iii).

—— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7890 (iv), 11753 (vi) ; in Com., 11812, 11840, (amt.) 11846, 11927 (vi) ; in Com., 12939 (vii) ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13254 (vii).

Immigration Agent A. G. McDonald, Payments *re* Placing of Immigrants (M. for cor.*) 4773 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12402 (vii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7231 ; on M. for 3°, 7222 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9498 (v).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11998 (vi).

Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9969 ; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians, Ont and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213 ; (tidal services) 3215 ; (wrecks) 3202 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, customs) 7163 ; (Halifax, military) 7144 ; (Shelburne) 7177 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7680 ; (Kincardine) 7699 ; (Kingston gun shed) 7701 ; (London military) 7708 ; (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 1498 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 12092 (vii) ; (Point Edward) 5713 ; (Stanley island pier) 5722 (iii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10544 (vi).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).

Albert Development Co., Control of Coal Lands (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

All-Red Line, Mr. White's Duties in England (Ques.) 694 (i).

Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature (Ques.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Census Map, Publishing of (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re* (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 8380 (v).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5469 (iii).

—— Agency of M. McKenzie and J. H. Moss, Applications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Name and Address of Agents *re* Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).

Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3434 (ii).

Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v.)

—— Royalty Fees, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 3232, 3480 (ii).

—— Purchase Price, &c., on Section 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

—— sold, or assigned, &c., since March, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

—— Sale of through J. W. Bettes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6242 (iv).

—— sold by P. E. Lessard (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— Sale by McGivern & Hayden (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

—— in Section 13, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B. —*Con.*

Coal Mining Privileges in Sections 11, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).

Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c. (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Customs Frauds, in Montreal, Complaints *re* Compromises (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers (M. for ret.) 1132; (reply) 1196; Amt. neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).

Documents, Original, Examination of by Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 3853 (ii).

—— Production to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775, 1806 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11817; (amt.) 11821 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11137; in Com., 11189, 11423 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 10761 (vi).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1408 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying benefit of Minimum Tariff, &c. (M. for ret.) 851 (i).

—— Correction of Question *re* Sir Charles Tupper's Expenses, 1424 (i).

—— Favoured Nation Clause; and Foreign Powers, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

—— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

Fishing Privileges granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

—— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c. (Ques.) 6398 (iv).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

G. T. P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G. T. P. Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c. (Ques.) 516 (i).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ques.) 238 (i).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Homesteading in Section 18, Extension *re* Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 8381 (v).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c. (Ques.) 364, 568 (i).

Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).

Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).

Land Grants to Rys., Selection, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4766 (iii).

See 'Rys.', &c.

Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

McGuire, ex-chief Justice, Superannuation of, &c. (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).

Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).

Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi).

Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 3481 (ii).

Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ques.) 9271 (v).

——— Amounts and Names of Cos. (Ques.) 9271 (v).

Railway Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

See 'Lands.'

Ry. Subsidies in Land, Areas for 1892-6 (Ques.) 8613 (v).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4662 (iii).

See 'Documents.'

Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ques.) 4763 (iii).

——— (M.) for Papers, 5210 (iii).

St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ques.) 238 (i).

Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Sessional Paper No. 207 *re* Fishing Leases (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9538 (v).
Dom. Lands (surveys) 9996 (v).
Marine (ice breakers) 1895 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dominion arsenal) 7434; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7424; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station B) 7419; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Nicolet) 7428; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11693 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686; (Madawaska) 11696 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. Lake Ainslie) 11228; (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Margaree) 11229; (Middle River) 11229; (New Glasgow) 11257; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Parker's Cove) 11258; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Porter's lake) 11260; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268; (Pugwash) 11280; (Round Hill) 11281; (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).

Taché, J. C., Emplmt. in Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 8180 (iv).

Timber Berths, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2269 (ii).

Timber Berths, 1046, &c., Original Applications (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

——— No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ques.) 364 (i).

——— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).

——— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Timber Lands, Sale or Lease subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3580 (ii).

Timber Leases, *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8711 (v).

Timber Licenses in Man. and N. W. Ters., Renewals, &c., Total Areas, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N. W. T. during 1896-7 (Ques.) 2396 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of Ques. of Priv., *re* Mr. Turriff's Charges, 2309 (ii).

Timber Permits to Settlers *re* cutting, in Twp. 39, Range 11 (Ques.) 11495 (vi).

Water-power Privileges in Alberta, &c., Sale or Leases (Ques.) 8378 (v).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10535 (vi).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *Lambton, East.*

Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).

Address, The, 335, 366; (amt.) 380; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 103) 505 (i).

Advertisement for Tenders, for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4735 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum (Ques.) 5656 (iii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5205 (iii).

—— Payments *re* Temagami District, 5787 (iii).

—— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

Bayfield, &c., Ret., Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).
See 'Docks,' &c.

Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204 (iii).

Budget, The, 6046; (M.) to adjn. deb., 6054; rsmd., 6062 (iii).

Campaign Literature, sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6164, 6196 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Action of Govt., Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

—— Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896 (Ques.) 2167 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

—— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette,' 13081 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5124 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11371 (vi).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9168 (v).

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1, 1908 (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Officers at Niagara, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).
See 'Bayfield,' 'Grand Bend.'

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, 1878 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8645 (v); in Com., 12971 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Dowling, Mr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

—— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).
See 'German.

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4585 (iii).

Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3605, 3637 (ii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c., (Ques.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

German Development Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
See 'Dowling.'

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 689 (i).

Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896-1908 (Ques.) 6402 (iv).

Geological Survey Yacht, Use of (Ques.) 11231 (vi).

Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur (Ques.) 8892 (v).

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

—— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

G. T. R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12062 (vii).

G. T. P., Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

—— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9025 (v).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10375 (vi).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B., &c. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. for Sup., 11022 (vi).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13127 (vii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

—— Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Concrete Pipe, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

—— on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4428 (iii).

Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re* (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

'Lady Evelyn' Str., Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).

See 'Rimouski.'

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).

Mail Matters, Fradulent, Weighing, Inspection of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 2214 (ii).

Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

See 'Lady Evelyn.'

Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).

Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Montreal Post Office, Extra Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9113 (v).

Newspapers, Postal Arrangements, &c.(Ques.) 6460 (iv).

North East Harobur Wharf, Total Length (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10850 (vi).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between U.S. and Canada, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 3885 (ii).

—— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

—— (remarks) 3040 (ii).

Postal Note Business, Commission, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 9279 (v).

Postal Rates on N. S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy (Ques.) 352 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

—— (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7257 (iv).

—— Improvements in, &c. (Ques.) 8891 (v).

—— Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

See 'Rimouski.'

Postal Service Printing, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Postal Service Return, Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10705 (vi).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height of Span (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4969 (iii).

—— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).

Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).

See 'Documents.'

Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of Str. 'Lady Evelyn,' &c. (Ques.) 7727 (iv).

See 'Lady Evelyn.'

Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 8612 (v).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction (Ques.) 8890 (v).

See 'Bayfield,' &c.

Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8891 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3786 (ii); in Com., 12622 (vii).

South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c. (Ques.) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for five years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 671 (i); (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi); (census, &c.) 674 (i); (exhibitions) 10577 (vi); (fumigating stations) 12879; (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12894 (vii); (seed branch) 5560 (iii); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623; Mines (salaries) 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 651 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227 (v).

Geological Survey (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Indians—Generally (destitute, &c.) 5762 (iii); Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12748

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039; (aids to navigation) 5040, 5774; (Thunder Bay Ice-breaker) 5041 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson bay patrol) 4030, 4133 (ii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5749 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942; (wrecks) 3149, 3209 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9094; (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10875 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886, 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7135 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 7711; (North Bay) 7712, 7812; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Sarnia) 7829 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (lighting) 11011 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lévis) 7295 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8586; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John) 12020 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways (extra clerks) 10343 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii), (supplies) 10193 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10375 (vi).

AVERY, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5123 (iii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymnt. as Returning Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7251 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2489, 2662 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*

Accountants, Emplymt. and Payment by Dept. of Justice (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Admiralty Jurisdiction Act Amt. (B. 122) prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°* of Bill, 4867 (iii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See* '*Tobacco.*'

B. C., Appeal Court (B. 165) prop. Res. 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1° m., 8466 (v); 2°*, in Com., 10863 (vi).

——— M. to withdraw Res., 7992 (iv).

Badgley Island, Trespass of T. H. Jackman, Claims *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ans.) 842 (i).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. (B. 142) 1° m., 6054 (iii); in Com., 6520 (iv).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P.O. Addresses (Ans) 9715 (v).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3467 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12909 (vii).

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Interpretation of Criminal Code (remarks) 9027 (v).

——— Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ans.) 10016

C. P. R. Taxation Cases, on Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Cigarette and Tobacco Restraint Bill: *See* '*Tobacco.*'

Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ans.) 2545 (ii).

——— Payments to *re* Travelling Expenses &c. (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Residence *re* District (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).

See '*Marine.*'

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgage) Amt. (B. 212) 1° m., 12919; on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

See '*Ry. Act.*'

Dominion Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 1° m., 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835 (iv), 11755; in Com., 11796, 11827 (vi), 12919; 3° m., 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13238; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 13255; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— (B. 115) Adjnd. debate, 11707 (vi).

Doukhobors, Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7624 (iv).

Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Accepting Appmt. (Ans.) 4768, 5084 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5486 (iii).

Essex County Junior Judgeship, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 4576 (iii); in Com., 8401 (v).

Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, Apptmt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., &c., 899 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).
——— Qualifications *re* Apptmt. (Ans) 2390 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 1861 (i).
Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel for Purchase of Sussex St. Property (Ans.) 3478 (ii).
——— Payments *re* Legal Services, &c., (Ans.) 2979 (ii).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary, (Ans.) 510 (i).
Govt. Officials as Political Partisans at Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).
See 'St. Vincent de Paul.'
G. T. P., Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).
——— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).
——— Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).
——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).
Japanese Immigration Acts, Disallowance of (Ans.) 6642 (iv).
Judges Salaries in Man. and Ont. (B. 206) prop. Res., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1° m., 12554; in Com., 13048 (vii).
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar (Ans.) 842 (i).
Juvenile Delinquents (B. 190) 1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399 (vii).
Kun, Agnes B., Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).
——— Letter laid on Table, 9710 (v).
Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ans.) 1935 (i).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).
——— for Govt. in P.E.I., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4764 (iii).
Lord's Day Act Violations at Ottawa, *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).
MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services (Ans.) 696 (i).
McGuire, ex-Chief Justice, Superannuation of (Ans.) 10514 (vi).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in giving Judgments (Ans.) 2594 (ii).
Man. Appeal Act: *See* 'Winding-up Act.'
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).
——— Counsel Fees (Ans.) 8838 (v).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Letter of Instruction to Mr. Watson laid on Table, 7621 (iv).
See 'Civil Service.'
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Opinions of Dept. of Justice, on M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 12553 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11990 (vi).
Northwest Territories Act Amt. (B. 210) 1° m., 12650; 2° m., in Com., 13051 (vii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ans.) 516 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2825 (ii).
——— Ret. (remarks) 9579 (v), 13081 (vii).
See 'Blunden.'
Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. (B. 166) 1°*, 8604 (v); 2° m., 10690; in Com., 10691 (vi).
Prisoners released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Queebc Superior Court, Apptmt. of additional Judge (Ans.) 1288 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 28) M. to wthdrw., 3579 (ii).
Railway Act (Commission, Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4966 (iii).
Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 11590; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) moved in Com., 11632 (vi).
Ry. Act (mortgages) Amt. (B. 204) 1° m., 12549; 2°*, in Com., 13046 (vii).
See 'Criminal Code.'
Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition, &c. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. in Justice Dept. (Ans.) 1347 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Officers and Municipal Elections (Ans.) 2791 (ii).
——— Holidays for Officials (Ans.) 2792 (ii).
Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re* (Ans.) 6401 (iv).
——— Disallowance of (Ans.) 6644 (iv).
School Statutes, *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6858 (iv).
Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (remarks) 1112 (i).
Sudbury Court Judges, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 12413 (vii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 121) 1° m., 4826; 2°*, in Com., 5497 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Justice (Dominion Police) 5509; (Exchequer Court) 5505; (printing, &c.) 5508 (iii); Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii); (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii).

Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii); Generally (maintenance) 5515 (iii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint (B. 173) 1° m., 9021 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Winding-up Act (Man. Appeals) Amt. (B. 102) 1° m., 3477; 2°* in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

——— (B. 144) 1° m., 6142 (iii); 2°* in Com., 6523 (iv).

Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ans.) 10301 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law and Instructions to N.W.M.P. (Ans.) 565 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 841 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S. *East Hamilton.*

Address, The, 519, (amt.) 530, Neg. (Y. 50; N. 96) 552 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4712 (iii).

Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Bank of Hamilton incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1207 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4387 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1470 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5888 (iii).

Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).

Coal Lands, O.C., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal (M. for copies*) 4246 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1162 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1793 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com.., 11837, 11851; (amt.) 11865 (vi).

Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907 (M. for copies*) 555 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor. quoted by Min., Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7775 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8133 (iv).

G. T. P., Eastern Limit Mountain Section, Establishment of (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12361 (vii).

——— and National Trans. Ry., Disputed Questions (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

——— Protests *re* Land Acquisitions (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

——— Ry. Sections B and F, Contracts, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3706, 3743 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Contract, Claims of M. J. Haney, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042, 3690 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.C., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11995 (vi).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5056 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Burning of Papers, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4072 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Incomplete Return (remarks) 5726 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3138 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1441 (i).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c., Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7148 (iv).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in debate on Address, 519 (i).

——— Commission's Report (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13293 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3780 (ii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5833 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5682 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4072 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7716 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1477; (Museum) 1492 (i); Harbours and Rivers —N.B. (St. John) 12019 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. (amt.) 921 (i).

BARR, Mr. J. *Dufferin.*

Address, The, 276 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4525 (iii).

See 'National.'

Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10359 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6208 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5100 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361 (vi).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11831 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute, Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5012 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co's. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13209 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3611, 3647 (ii).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) in Com., 13568 (vii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10501 (vi).

Inland Revenue Seizures, 1906-7 in Cornwall, Toronto, Ottawa, &c. (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii), 4247 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7236 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9491 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Office Specialty Co., Fittings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4696 (iii); in Com., 10858 (vi).

BARR, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi); in Com., 12624 (vii).

Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4978 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).

——— (wires, &c.) Amt. (B. 43) 1° m., 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Ry. Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Application to Board (Ques.) 1109 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3768 (ii); in Com., 12608 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 12893 (vii); (seed branch) 5504 (iii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8876 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9450 (v).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Immigration (agents) 9869 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4082, 4151 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 10297 (v).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5511 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10881 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8520; (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10958 (vi); Ont. (Dom. renewals) 7483; (Glencoe) 7488; (Guelph armoury) 7682 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1481 (i); Sask. (Battleford) 8577 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 12097 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11088 (vi).

Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks (Ques.) 690 (i).

See 'Railways,' &c.

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2198 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6489 (iv).

Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks (remarks) 7322 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12600 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (provisions) 12151 (vii); Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10895; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 161) 1° m., 7307 (iv).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 4356, 4372 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4171 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S., and other Countries (Ques.) 1510 (i).

Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution (ques. of priv.) 3486 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2579 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Distribution to Members (remarks) 605 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3552 (ii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4808 (iii).

Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Rehm, Fred. and Frank Patent Relief (B. 110) 1°*, 3896 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*

Adams, Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5798 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

Architects on Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4143 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ques.) 4244, 5083 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 190 (i).

Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6641 (iv).

Chicoutimi Dredging, Tenders *re*, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11397 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5623 (iii).

—— Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7599 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1048

See 'Travelling.'

Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 2382 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1151 (i).

—— Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1425 (i).

——Production in Committees, 1427 (i).

—— taken from Pub. Accounts Com. (remarks) 2305, 2308 (ii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Surrender of Title (remarks) 3850 (ii).

—— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

—— Protests *re* Sale (remarks) 10918 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11830, 11859 (vi), 12995; on M. for 3°, 13247 (vii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*, Inquiry for, 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).

—— Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com., 5924 (ii).

—— Renewal without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dredging at Fort William, Amounts paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 8839 (v).

See 'Boone,' &c.

Dredging at Midland, &c., Tenders *re*, Advertisements for (remarks) 7195 (iv).

—— O.C. *re* Renewal, &c., 6741 (iv).

See 'Midland.'

Dredging in Quebec Harbours, 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Dredges registered in Canada, &c. (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4677 (iii); in Com., 10767 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

—— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).
See 'Birnie,' &c.

Foresters Order, Charges in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3614 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i)

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980

—— Report from Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).
See 'Birnie.'

'Golspie' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).

G.T.Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res 2254 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12676 (vii).

Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.) 5791 (iii).

Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

—— Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i).

Inspector of Public Works, Apptmts. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).

I. C. R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4423 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 640, 1037 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

—— Investigation, Defalcations of Mr. Roy, &c. (remarks) 10741 (vi).

—— Investigations, Evidence (remarks) *re* Printing, 10916 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'

Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 566 (i).

Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).

Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbours, Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ques.) 8181 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay,' &c.

Office Specialty Co. and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 3039 (ii), 4244 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
See 'Eclipse.'

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10335 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse-power (Ques.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

—— Incorrect Answer (remarks) 5566 (iii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

—— Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).
See 'Dredging,' &c.

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7259 (iv).

Pound-net Licenses, Granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration re M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1383 (i).

—— on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

—— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3082 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Public Works Estimates, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5924 (iii).

Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., Notice of Amt., 3751 (ii).

Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4667 (iii).

See 'Documents.'

St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 11700 (vi).

——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Sorel Public Works, Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

———Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).

——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).

——— Irregularities *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— Ref. to Judge Cassels (remarks) 7938 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

'Speedy' Str., Purchase, Services, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ques.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10584, 10615 (vi).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12224; Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi); Welland (Port Colborne) 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 980; Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612; (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 1459 (i), 5699 (iii); Public Works (salaries) 639 (i), 5699 (iii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing 13323; (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4756 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3989 (ii); (patrol boats) 4750; (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii).

Marine (hospitals) 5782 (iii).

Militia (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1079 (i), 5766 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2952; (obstructions) 3211; (removal of obstructions) 3156; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221; (wrecks) 3151, 3205 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5512 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8878 (v); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Chilliwack) 13338; (Cranbrook) 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10865; (Fernie) 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10872 (vi), 10339 (vii); (Victoria immigration) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (Selkirk) 8550 (v); (Souris) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10959 (vi); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Grand Falls) 13328 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Antigonish) 7122; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7162; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Parrsboro') 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfeville) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Dom., renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7489 (iv); (Mitchell) 13332; (North Bay) 13332; (Park Hill) 13332; (Peterborough) 13332; (Port Arthur) 13332; (Sarnia) 13333; (Seaforth) 13332; (Simcoe) 13333; (Sudbury) 13333; (Tilsonburg) 13333; (Uxbridge) 13333; (Walkerville) 13333; (Waterloo) 13333 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (Mint) 1458; (Museum) 1489 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329; (Grand Mère) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329; (Lachute) 13329 (vii); (Lévis) 7296 (iv), 13329; (Magog) 13329; (Megantic) 13330; (Plessissville) 13330; (Point St. Charles) 13330; (Roberval) 13330; (St. Thérèse) 13330; (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Battleford) 8577; (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8585 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moosejaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601; (Saskatoon) 8603 (v), 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13352; Que. and Ont. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Lower Newcastle) 11695; (St. John) 12013 (vi); (St. John improvements) 5708 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207; (Baddeck) 11219; (Barachois) 11224; (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224; (Big Lorraine) 11224; (Breton Cove) 11224; (Charlos Cove) 11225; Church Point) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11225; (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Port Hood) 11277; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Pugwash wharf) 11280; (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Georgian Bay survey) 13326; (Lakefield) 13350; (Meaford) 12103; (Michipicoten) 13350; (Midland and Tiffin) 12103 (vii); (Point Edward) 5714 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144; (Port Colborne) 12146; (Rainy River) 12136; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Tiffin dredging) 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à la Barbe) 12028; (Batiscan) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Cap St. Ignace) 12030; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lake Megantic) 12033; (Lake St. Francis) 12033; (Lake St. John) 12033; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Lotbinière) 12033; (Malbaie) 12034; (Matane) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Ouelle Rivière) 12037; (Piché Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12038; (Rivière du Lièvre) 12037; (Rivière du Loup) 12036; (Rivière Maskinonge) 12037; (St. Alphonse) 12041; (Ste. Anne de Monts) 12041; (St. Francis) 12041; (St. Louis) 12040; (St. Maurice) 12041; (Saguenay) 12040; (Yamaska dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12145 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii).

Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payment to Jos. Riopelle (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

Tenders, Advertisements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7478 (iv).

Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co. (Ques.) 8892 (v).
See 'Dredging.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).
See 'Documents.'

Travelling Expenses of Minister at Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii)
See 'Colonial.'

Trent Valley Canal, Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).
See 'Holland.'

Vautelet, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 8893 (v).
See 'Dredging, &c.'

Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 6236 (iv).

——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2888 (ii).

Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 11500 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4722 (iii).

Architects on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7125 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10921 (vi).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre and Robert Syndicate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

——— Water-power, Copy of New Lease (remarks) 946 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Inquiry for Copy, 1740 (i).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques) 2392 (ii).

——— Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 7212 (iv).

Budget, The, 5357 (iii).

Campaign Literature (French) distributed in Prov. of Que. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6162, 6173, 6203 (iii); in Com., 6426 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12867 (vii).

Canadian Newspapers, Drawback *re* American Surtax (Ques.) 5203 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842, 12848 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6870 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10717, 10727; in Com. on Res., 11360 (vi); in Com., 12177 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Translation into French (remarks) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Clerks of Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
See 'Intercolonial.'
Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 12650 (vii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3492 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. *re* Salaries (remarks) *re* Conc., 12504 (vii).
——— (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10245 (v).
——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
See 'Hansard.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).
Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1180 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1849 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 80 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 1682 (i).
——— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4573 (iii); on M. for 2°, 8681 (v); in Com., 11824, 11831, 11857 (vi), 13010 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5013 (iii).
Dredging in Ont. and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2896 (ii).
See 'Riviere la Graisse.'
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).
Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement of (Ques.) 6399 (iv).
Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6223 (iv).
BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
French Canadian Ministers, Attack *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4200 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1223 (i); in Com., 3582, 3636 (ii).
——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).
See 'Can. and France.'
French Translation of Govt. Statutes, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
Gaudette, Victor, Employmt. by Govt., Payments to (Ques.) 515 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3634 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
——— Rep. of (remarks) 12836 (vii).
G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9128 (v).
See 'Debates.'
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents, &c. (Ques.) 6922 (iv).
Ingonish Island Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8618 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 835 (i).
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 13225, 13511 (vii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R., Employees Provident Fund Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4577; in Com., 4995 (iii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Change of Name to Govt. Rys., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6246 (iv).
——— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ques.) 11936 (vi).
——— Sunday Cars, Instructions *re* (Ques.) 10734 (vi).
——— Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Employmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6400 (iv).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 968 (i).
Judges of Man. and Ont., Salaries (B. 206) (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13048 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

'Le Soleil, Par. *re* Voting by French Members, Ques. of Priv., 7992 (iv).

Letter Carriers, Contract for Boots, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

MacIlreith, Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7327 (iv).

——— Investigation by Minister, &c. (remarks) 6636 (iv).

——— Mr. Perron's Duties (Ques.) 10743 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).

——— Proceedings, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

——— Translation of Evidence (remarks) 11204 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3026 (ii).

Matane River Fishing, Complaints (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7252 (iv).

Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

——— Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 7197 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

New York Central Ry., Complaints *re* Discrimination (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).

Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Notre Dame du Portage, Expenditure *re* Wharf (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Order Papers, French and English Editions (remarks) 6853 (iv).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

——— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

——— Issue of Pass to travel on I.C.R. Express (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 8610 (v).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2854 (ii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl. Intention *re* (Ques.) 356 (i).

——— (remarks) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

——— Committee of Inquiry (Ques.) 3899 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Apptmt. to Com., 10689 (vi).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7933 (iv).

Priv., Ques. of, Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Pamphlet by Jesuit Priest, 10427 (vi).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ques.) 8616 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3142 (ii).

Quebec Judges, Additional, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).

——— Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).

——— Apptmt. to Superior Court (remarks) 11825 (vi).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Ques. of Priv., Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader,' 8604 (v).

Railway Act (commission, ass't chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10638; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11608 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).

——— on 1st Rep., 13510 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3319 (ii), 13081 (vii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

——— inquiry for ret., 2896, 3689 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 686 (i).

Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds, &c. (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

——— Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Correction of Mr. S. Hughes Speech, Ques. of Priv., 9126 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9332 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

——— Expenditure and Collections, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

——— Expenditure by Public Works (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).

——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1130 (i).

St. Helen's Island Sale (remarks) in Com. on B. 218, 13417 (vii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 895, 1121 (i).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Sabourin, Maj., Cor. between Lt.-Col. Malette and Dept. (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Province, on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6862 (iv).

Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8296 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 6988, 7099, 7938 (iv).

Soulanges Canal, Floods at Valleyfield (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

——— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3756 (ii).

Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 671; (census and statistics) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (exhibitions) 10601 (vi), 12889; (live stock) 12896 (vii); (Year-Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Generally—(additional remuneration) 13174 (vii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical branch) 10318 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

Canals—Soulanges (floods, &c.) 10339 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5674, 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12208; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 637; Inland Revenue (salaries) 646 (i); Marine and Fisheries (Ass't Dep. Min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977, 1014 (i); Militia (salaries) 8872 (v); Mines, 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); (salaries) 8872 (v); Public Works (salaries) 643 (i), 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9262 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Surveys (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).

Immigration (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Justice—Administration of. Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5775 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4200 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1907 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10287 (v).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Cotton strikers) 13156; (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8863; (salaries) 8863 (v).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii); (wrecks) 3187, 3201 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10876; (Victoria immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10892; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7111; (Bridgewater) 7136; (Halifax customs) 7155; (Halifax quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii);

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl. buildings) 13478; (heating) 13340 (vii); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7286; (Dundee) 7286; (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lachute) 7293; (Lévis) 7294; (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Edmonton) 13336; (Moosejaw) 13337; (Saskatoon) 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 13339 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers N.S. (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (gratuities) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon) 13178 (vii).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Cape Beale) 5732 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10383 (vi); I.C.R. (Halifax accommodation) 5549 (iii); (supplies) 10336; Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10330; (extra clerks) 10345; (statistical branch) 10328; Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry. on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 917 (i).

Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Officials, Passes, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

Valleyfield, Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

——— Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c. (rearks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

——— (remarks) 7996 (iv).

——— Post Office Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).

——— Regiment Organization, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2519, 2679 (ii).

T. Lindsay Co., Amount of Goods purchased, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (v).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).

Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks, 13066 (vii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii)

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6915 (iv).

Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ques.) 11232 (vi).

Presbyterian Church Widows' and Orphans' Fund (B. 23) 1°*, 430 (i) ; in Com. 2788 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.. *Hants.*

Canada Temperance Act. Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 10717 (vi).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 5251 (iii).

Coasting Privileges, Prop. Res., on Order being called, 2795 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of (prop. res.) 2562 (ii).

French Translation of Govt. Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3184 (ii).

Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S. (Ques.) 8894 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (remarks) 10277 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup. 4717 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855 (ii)

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5382, 5408 (iii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10944 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4502 (iii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5945 (iii).

Bole Drug Co., Supplies furnished to Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).

Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector on Welland Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions, &c. (Ques.) 7501 (iv).

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10356 (vi).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2768 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10752 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 5087; on M. to resume debate, 5251 (iii).

——— Resolution of W.C.T.U. of Brampton (read) 7278 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11347; in Com., 11368, 11655 (vi), 12166, 12183 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5638 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members on M. for Sup., 1871 (i).

——— Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Documents, Instructions to Minister of Marine (remarks) 7810 (iv).
See 'Pub. Accts,' &c.

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ques.) 1126 (i).

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834; (amt.) 11835 (vi); 12943 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act. Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11523, 11181 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O. Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6777 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ques.) 3239 (ii).

——— Amounts paid to (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).

——— Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Pay (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Fire Extinguishers, &c., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7666 (iv).

——— Cor. on File, Custody of Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

Fraser, Mr. A. W., Payments to, for Legal Services (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

Fruit (apples) Inspection, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt. (Ques.) 355 (i).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P., Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Accidents on Construction, Reports *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6655 (iv).

——— Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8748 (v).

Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4544 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensation, paid, &c. (remarks) 13085 (vii).

House of Commons Accountants, &c., Increase *re* Salaries under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2454 (ii).

Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5997 (iii).

'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) 7389 (iv).

——— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).

——— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892, 7228; (M.) to ref. to Com., 7226 (iv).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5718 (iii).

Milford Haven Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13503 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5003; on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5059 (iii).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10849 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4106 (ii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies purchased, &c. (M for ret.) 7937 (iv).

Petroleum Bounty B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).

Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 8175 (iv).

Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ques.) 183 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement and previously (Ques.) 315 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation (prop. res.) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
—— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4952 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps, Letter (read) 8694 (v).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).
Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).
Rolla L. Crain Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 3239 (ii).
—— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Ross, Mr. D., Resignation as Member (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 98) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4580 (iii).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6918 (iv).
—— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
—— Item *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ques.) 11937 (vi).
—— Total Cost (Ques.) 11019 (vi).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Incomplete Answer (remarks) 12551, 12661 (vii).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5445 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3785, 3818 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).
Speakers Expenses in House of Commons, Comparison, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on Amt. (Mr. Fielding) to prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5826; (amt.) to Amt., 5847, Neg. (Y., 46; N., 90) 5877 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Act, Payments under (Ques.) 7989 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (seed branch) 5504 (iii).
Canals—Carillon (dams) 12768 (vii); (statistical branch) 10323 (vi); Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5668; Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 624, 634; Public Works (salaries) 640 (i).
Excise (provisional allowances) 819; (travelling expenses) 816 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13166 (vii).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12739 (vii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5041, 5774 (iii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii).
BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).
Marine (hospitals) 5783 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1901 (i); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3997 (ii); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4753; (patrol boats) 4749; (Sorel property) 4752 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5746 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5784 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).
N.W.M. Police (pensions) 8871 (v).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522; (maintenance) 5510 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 10864; (Cumberland) 10865; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887; (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10954; (Winnipeg military) 10973 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112, 7118; (Bridgewater) 7137; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7144; (Halifax Military) 7143 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7457; (Dom., renewals) 7468; (Glencoe) 7486 (iv); (Kingston) 10909 (vi); (Leamington) 7816 (iv); (Markham) 13331 (vii); (North Bay) 7813; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7827; (Simcoe) 7830 (iv); (Walkerville) 13334 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700 (iii); (rents, &c.) 10985; (repairs, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7280; (Cookshire) 7281; (Grosse Isle) 7289 (iv); (Knowlton) 13329 (vii); (Magog) 7306; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7425 (iv); (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal Post Office) 7411; (Montreal station C) 7422; (Nicolet) 7429; (Quebec citadel) 7430; (Que. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11220; (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Parker's cove) 11258; (Parrsboro) 11259; (Port Hastings) 11267; (Port Hood) 11269; (Portuguese cove) 11279; (Round Hill) 11285; (Tancook island) 11231 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12091; (Brighton) 12133; (Port Credit) 12101; (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11106 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10191 (v); (rolling stock) 5553 (iii), 12257 (vii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Tenders, Advertisements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7475 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10699 (vi).

See 'Cigarette.'

Travelling Expenses of Min. to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3997 (ii).

U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c. (Ques.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 5800, 5802 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5476 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

Wheat, Frozen, Shipping from Man. and N.W. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 825 (i).

Woollen Industry, Legislation *re* Relief (remarks) 12772 (vii).

BOLE, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of, Inquiry *re* (prop. res.) 3853 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7939 (iv).

Drug Contracts with Govt., Ques. of Priv., 5562 (iii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds (read) on Debate on Dom. Elections B. 115, 7942 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3993 (ii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. (B. 19) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 2787 (ii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings N.S.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4399, 4498 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions from Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Canadian Patriotic Funds (B. 216) in Com., 13320 (vii).

Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec (Ans.) 9273 (v).

Cold Storage Co., Connection with: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction (Ans.) 1111 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Eastman Rifle Match, Investigation *re* Accident (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 1293 (i).

——— Transfer to Canada (Ans.) 1288, 1293 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Garrison Commons, Date of Sale, &c (Ans.) 354 (i).

See 'Ordnance,' &c.

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).

Govt. Business (remarks) 12504 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, &c. (Ans.) 10015 (v).

——— Replacement of, by Imp. Troops (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip to (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Insurance Commission's Rept., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 9337, 9461 (v).

Kentville Rifle Range, ref. to in Budget debate, 5290 (iii).

Lancaster Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe (Ans.) 10014 (v).

——— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6645 (iv).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Militia—Board of Officers, Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Camps, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

——— (stmnt.) 9835 (v).

Militia Dept., Attack *re* Boots furnished, Ques. of Priv., 10739 (vi).

——— and Civil Service Commissioner's Report, Statement in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).

——— at Quebec, Working Hours for Masons (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

——— Report (presented) 4494 (iii).

——— Threats *re*, &c. (remarks) 13584 (vii).

Militia, Apptmts. as Generals, Number and Qualifications (Ans.) 5086 (iii).

Militia Food Supplies, on Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Memorandum of General Lake (M.) *re* placing on Table, 12770 (vii).

Militia Pay, Arrears, Reasons for, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Militia Permanent Corps, Apptmt. of Commission *re* Pay (Ans.) 1293 (i).

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (remarks) 352 (i).

Militia Stores, Inspection of (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

——Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).

Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6406 (iv).

Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10890 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).
See 'St. John.'

Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).

Ordnance Lands—Toronto—Sale (B. 218) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

Petawawa Camp, Training of Troops, &c. (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co. (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3072 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4894 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps (remarks) 8695 (v).

—— City Corps, &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

—— Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).

—— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8855 (v).

—— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ans.) 7992 (iv).

—— Representation of Veterans (remarks) 7998 (iv).

—— Transportation of Troops (remarks) 8384 (v).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11406 (vi).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2025 (ii).

Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co. (Ans.) 1123 (i).

Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Purchase Price (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

R.M.C., Investigation into conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

—— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ans.) 5786 (iii).

—— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O.C., &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv), 8176, 8442 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Consignment to N.W.M. Police, Where manufactured (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

—— Contract *re* Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).

—— memorandum *re* agreement (read) 13553 (vii).

—— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 8174 (iv).

—— Cor. with Imp. Govt., Rep. in British War Office, Disappearance from Library of House, Ques. of Priv., 4961 (iii).

—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Extension of Cove Fields Lands, &c. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).

—— Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8953 (v).

—— Interchangeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

—— Number delivered as per Contract, Cost per Rifle (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

—— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).

—— Number reported Unfit for Use (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

—— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

—— Provisions for Bayonets, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i).

—— Tests in England, Reps., &c., Ques. of Priv., 8167 (iv).

—— Tests, Rep. of Col. Gaudet (Ans.) 9714 (v).

—— Total Number in Use in Canada (Ans.) 5786 (iii).
See 'Dom. Arsenal.'

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ans.) 5788 (iii).

St. Helen's Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B 218, 13418 (vii)

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Annual Drill, Delay in Payments to (Ans.) 847 (i).

St. John Cold Storage, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii).
See 'N.B.'

Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ans.) 9273 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).

——— Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ans.) 1110 (i).

——— Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3769, 3819 (ii).

Sub-target Machines ordered, Dates, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 171 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 8871 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4136 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13540; (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (gratuities) 13177; (pay and allowances) 12147; (properties) 12148; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (Quebec reviews) 13176; (rifle and artillery grants) 12152; (Ross rifle contract) 13543; (R. M. College) 12152, 13177; (salaries and wages) 12147; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg, military) 10970; (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi); (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7693; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10908 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7703; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Quebec cliffs) 12148 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5207, 5258 (iii).

——— Number ordered, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 569 (i).

Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Valleyfield Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from, by Govt. (Ans.) 356 (i).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, Ont.*

Address, The, 23 (i).

——— on M. to consider (remarks) *re* Questions, 8 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth, in Com. on Res., 4846 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4717 (iii).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

All-Red Line, Omission of (remarks) on the Address, 28 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12432, (amt.) 12439; neg. (Y. 48; N. 108) 12499 (vii).

Anglo-American Treaty with G.B., Information *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Information *re* Presenting, 8516 (v).

——— Tel. *re* (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Appeal Court of B.C., B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 8466 (v); in Com., 10863 (vi).

Architectural Institute of Canada on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).

Asiatic Labour in B.C.: Ques. of Privilege, 6526 (iv).

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10934 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389; in Com., 4400 (iii).

See 'Que. Tercentenary,' &c.

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (remarks) 2883 (ii).

——— Correction *re*, 4669 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13571 (vii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3470 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5943 (iii).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13313 (vii).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re* (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Buildings, Cost of Construction (remarks) 12661 (vii).

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 431 (i).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).

See 'Govt. Business.'

Cabinet Changes (remarks) on the Address, 24 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) on the Address, 26 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Res., 6201 (iii); in Com., 6414 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13058 (vii).

Canada and U.S. Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

——— Boundaries Treaty (remarks) 7834 (iv).

See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494; on M. for 2°, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 202 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12847 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept (remarks) 6059 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Cable *re* Removal by G. B. (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use of by Political Agents (remarks) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10747, 11021 (vi).

Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).

See 'Asiatic,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10719, 10724; on M. for 2°, 11338; in Com. on Res., 11355; in Com., 11364, 11561, 11640 (vi), 12164; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Correction in Hansard *re* Increases, 11494 (vi).

——— Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolutions *re* (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Rep., Inquiry for, 317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5623 (iii).

——— Policy of the Govt. *re*, on M. to Adjn. House, 5882 (iii).

——— Delay in Printing, &c., Investigations *re*, on M. to Adjn., 6143 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers (Amt.) on M. for Sup., 7506; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).

See 'Marine and Fisheries,' &c.

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com of Sup., 9193 (v).

Colchester Election (remarks) on the Address, 39 (i).

Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor, &c. *re* Govtl. Action (Ques.) 174 (i).

Committees, Sel. Standing (remarks) on M (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).

——— Organization &c. (remarks) 507, 560 (i).

——— Sitting concurrently with House, on M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12203 (vii).

——— Information *re* Break, 11121, 11406 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendts., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9282 (v).

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Defalcations at Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Kennedy) 9460 (v).

Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10134 (v).

See 'Supply.'

Customs Inspectors, Suggestion of Civil Service Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).

Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9549 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order *re* Reading, &c., 8462 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Debates, Official Reps., Conc. in without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c. (Ques.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing in 1908 (Ques.) 315 (i).

Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials, (M. for O. Cs., &c.*) 5477 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 3849 (ii).

——— Name of Govt. Agent (Ques.) 5084 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5087 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1140 (i), 1617, (amt.); Production of, 1622; agreed to, 1667 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1801 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. deb. 1844 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7859 (iv), 8423 (v); in Com., 11798, 11828; (amt.) 11922 (vi), 12956; on M. for 3°, 13232 (vii), on M. for 3° (amt.) 13251; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 231; in Com., 754, 949 (i); Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127, 11153 (vi); in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11510, 11948; Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi); on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, 12395 (vii).

See 'Lands,' &c.

Doukhobors, Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. Board of Trade (read) 7620 (iv).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7628 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O. C., on Inquiry for, 6854 (iv).

——— O.C., *re* Rule *re* Producing (remarks) 6927 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 9773, 10259 (v).

Drill Halls Ret., Inquiry for, 5659 (iii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Apptmt. Inquiry for, 4963 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii); in Com., 10763 (vi).

Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation (remarks) 1861 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13261; in Com. on Res., 13279; in Com., 13419 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485 (iii).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Esquimault Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance (M. for copies) 1128 (i).

Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry *re* Further, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Conc., 5920 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt.B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13459 (vii).

Financial Stringency, &c. (remarks) on the Address, 35 (i).

See 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Boundaries Treaty between U.S. and Can., Information *re* (remarks) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1712 (i).

Fishing Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Fishing Licenses: *See* 'Whale,' &c.

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1393 (i), 3514 (ii); in Com., 3582, 3642 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* Discussion, 3754 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Canadian Tariff &c. (remarks) 13534 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i).

——— on Preparation of Statement *re* Duty Units (remarks) 943 (i).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 28 (i).

French SS. Subsidy: *See* 'Can. and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10555 (vi).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayments of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

——— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

Govt. Business, Introduction of Govt. Bills (remarks) 10258 (v), 11826 (vi).

Govt. Business (remarks) 10403, 10511 (vi), 12163 (vii).

——— Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Legislation &c. (remarks) 7721 (iv), 10303, 11123 (vi).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections in N.B., on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6280 (iv).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain,' &c.

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2226 (ii); in Com., 12070 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co.: *See* 'Major's Hill Park.'

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9463 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Cost of Construction (Statement) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Reply to Min. of Rys., 12682 (vii).

——— Cost inclusive of Terminals, &c., (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).

——— Total Cost, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 10393, 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).

G.T.P. Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ques.) 5563 (iii).

G.T.P., Engineering Staff, Resignation of Mr. Hodgins (Ques.) 366, 516 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

——— Charges *re* Classifications, &c. (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

G.T.P., La Tuque Branch, Flooding by Water (remarks) 8607 (v).

——— Mountain Division, Incomplete Rel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).

——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

——— Supplies via American Routes (remarks) 9027 (v).

See 'Indian,' &c.

Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of (remarks) 431

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).

——— Discontent *re* Pay, Par. in Press, 5659 (iii).

See 'Esquimalt.'

Halifax Immigration Frauds, Dismissal of Mr. J. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).

——— Charges *re* (remarks) 9334 (v).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3710 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to ref. back to Ry. Com., 3229 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

See "Chinese," &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Hindus in B.C., Deportation from B.C., &c. (remarks) 5338 (iii).

House of Commons Act (members) Amt. (B. 66) 1° m., 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Rules and Hours for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 590 (i).

See 'Rules.'

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued &c. (remarks) 606 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 769 (i).

——— B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6431 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7066 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1328 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).

Immigration Irregularities at Halifax, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii), 6465 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

——— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

——— Statement *re* (remarks) 4963 (iii).

See 'Halifax,' &c.

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13129 (vii).

Indian Reserves, Land Grant to G.T.P. Ry. Co. in B.C., O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6471 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

——— Civic Elections at Halifax, Interference of Employees (remarks) 6845 (iv).

——— Employes in Prov. of Quebec, Interference in Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2885 (ii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

——— Truro Sewerage Frontage, (M. for cor.*) 5800 (iii).

See 'Govt. Rys., &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Irrigation Act, Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i); on M. to withdraw, 2974 (ii).
—— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese in B.C., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration (remarks) on the Address, 32 (i).
—— Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
—— Cor. *re* Limitation, &c., Inquiry for, 94 (i).
—— Debate in Japanese Diet, Rep. *re* (remarks) 4737 (iii).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
—— Parliamentary Control of, 2025, (amt.) 2043 (ii). Neg. (Y. 45; N. 100) 2158 (ii).
—— Statement by Postmaster General (remarks) 1424 (i).
—— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602, 1614 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs. Cor. Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 854 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1928 (i.)
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. &c. sent to by Govt. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).
Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 12551; in Com., 13050 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12399 (vii).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Woods, Disposal of, &c. (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept. and Res. of Town Council of Sydney (read) 9334 (v).
—— Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526 (vi).
See 'Dom. Lands,' &c.
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Life Saving Stations, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Literature distributed through Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9103 (v).
Loans to Govt., Temporary, &c., Outstanding, Rates of Interest, (Ques.) 235 (i).
—— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 314 (i).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou, Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Major's Hill Park, and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425, 1585 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
—— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i), 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12790 (vii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12569 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Affidavits quoted by member (remarks) 7949 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Ass't. Judge in Exchequer Court (remarks) 11311 (vi).
—— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (iv).
—— Apptmt. of Counsel for Civil Service Commissioners, on M. for Sup., 7322 (iv).
—— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. Hse., 8458 (v).
—— Delays, &c., on M. for Sup., 9725 (v).
—— Deputy Minister, Resignation, Acceptance of (remarks) 7621, 7938, 7995, 8088 (iv).
—— Evidence *re* (remarks) 8516 (v).
—— Evidence presented day by day to Hse. (remarks) 8293 (v).
—— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
—— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).
—— Officials, Suspension *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii), 6846 (iv).
—— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
—— Proceedings, Public, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3029 (ii); in Com., 3034 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227; in Com., 7242 (iv).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinion of Justice Dept. (M. for copies*) 5477 (iii).
—— Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).
Militia Camps, Holding of, &c. (remarks) 9779, 9835 (v).
'Montcalm' Str., Collision, Investigation *re* (remarks) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9478 (v).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13498 (vii).
See 'Que.,' &c.
N.T. Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9420 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3670 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co's. B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid *re* Immigration (remarks) on M. for Sup., 770 (i).

Northwest Territories Act Amt. B. 210 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13052 (vii).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co's. B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10856 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 12550; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co's. B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6229 (iv).

Pakenham Mail Bags, Destruction of, &c. (remarks) 1425 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12625 (vii).

Peace Union, Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13582 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3168 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).

P.E.I. Public Works Expenditure, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12628 (vii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4654 (iii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10692 (vi).

Private Bills, Discrepancy in Fees between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10122 (v).

Provincial Subsidies, Increased Payments, &c.(Ques.) 173 (i).

Public Acounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3080 (ii).

——— Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1442 (i).

——— Sittings concurrently with House (remarks) 9504 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2941, 3405 (ii).

Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Public Works Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661, 5730 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c. (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).

Quebec Bridge Disaster (remarks) on the Address, 30 (i).

——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).

——— Printing of (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion (Ques.) 5566 (iii).

——— Par. in Toronto Globe *re* Change of Site (remarks) 7931 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13417; in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co's. B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec Tercentenary, Number of Troops, &., (remarks) 10259 (v).

Questions, Precedence of &c. (remarks) 350 (i).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) on Par. in 'Globe,' 2383 (ii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

——— (compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5246 (iii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3397 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

——— on ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate, 577 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii); in Com., 8511 (v), 10636; on Amt. (Mr Monk) to M. for 3°, 11606; on M. for 3°,11614; (amt.) 11619; Amt. neg. (Y. 40, N. 74) 11631 (vi).

Ry. Mortgages: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., Applications and Constructions, 13478 (vii).

——— Inquiry for, 12771 (vii).

——— Applications for, Memorandum *re* (remarks) in Com., 13304, 13315 (vii).

Returns delayed, &c. (remarks) 13082 (vii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Returns delayed, on Inquiry for, 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).

——— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto Globe, 4660 (ii).
See 'Documents,' &c.

Ross Rifle Co., Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 9073 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9331 (v).

——— Report from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Rules of the House, Proposed Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2985 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3011 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) 5548 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. MCraney) in Com., 8564, 9069, 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Agreement with Govt. *re* Sale of Homestead Lands, Letter (read) 9127 (v).

——— Information *re* (remaks) 9280 (v).

——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10102 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1382 (i).

——— Extension of Time of Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5417; (amt.) 5460 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii), 12595; in Com., 13048; (amt.) 12612; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Stanstead By-election, Disappearance of Papers (remarks) 8087 (iv).

——— on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).

——— on M. for Com., 8888 (v).

Sub-target Machines, on M. to ref. papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on prop Res. (Mr. Foster) 5820 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5831 (iii).

Supply B. 220 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13579 (vii).

Supply—Conc., 5499 (iii).

——— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5919 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Supply—Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9909 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10034 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10025
See 'Dom. Elections B. 115,' &c.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 672; (census, &c.) 674 (i); (dairying) 10397 (vi); (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304 (vi).

Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536 (v); Miscellaneous (cruisers) 9578 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9441 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10062 (v); (salaries) 10040 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9878 (v); (deportations) 9882 (v); (literature, &c.) 9948 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 10286 (v); (rifle ranges) 12505 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3147, 3185 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9103 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military)10973 ; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8568 (v); Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11112; Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378 (vi); (construction) 12238 (vii); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5550 (iii); (Windsor Branch) 10145 (v).

Railways — Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 10342 (vi); (inspections, &c.) 10341 (vi); (legal expenses) 10363 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Technical Schools, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

Telegraph and Telephones and Man. Boundaries, Legislation, Inquiry for, 3042 (ii).

Telephones and Telegraphs, Control by Ry. Commission (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).
See 'Ry. Act Amt.'

Timber Berths, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) Ques. of Order *re* reading Evidence before Pub. Accounts, 11308 (vi).

Timber Licenses, Inquiry for Ret., 1739 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2527 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. and Rv. Commission Reps., Printing of, &c. (remarks) 7 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Under-Secretaries of State (remarks) on the Address, 25 (i).
U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals (remarks) 5338 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 178,on M. for 2°, 12508 (vii).
Whale Fishing Licenses granted in B.C., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10284 (v).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).
Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2182 (ii).
Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10532 (vi).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9636 (v).
Yukon Moral Reform, Inquiry for Dr. Shearer's letter, 10303, 11122 (vi).
Yukon Placer Mining Act. Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8488 (v),10519 (vi).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *Algoma West.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c. (Ques.) 892 (i).
Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians, Pet. (read) in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).
Archives Dept., Index Cards, Quantity purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 6057 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjourn House, 5906 (iii).
—— (remarks) on Presentation, 5644 (iii).
Coal Lands in N.W.T., Lease granted, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Charges against Postmaster Kilpatrick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. on Election Bill, 11913 (vi).
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).
Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).
Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).
—— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7949 (iv); 11739; in Com., 11818, 11905; (amt.) 11931 (vi); in Com., 12926; on M. for 3° (amt.) 13230; neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).
Fort William or Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T.P. Ry. Co. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).
G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale, B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12077 (vii).
G.T.P., Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ques) 12775 (vii).
—— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, Firms, &c. (Ques.) 10738, 10790 (vi).
—— Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).
—— Ties purchased in U.S., &c. (remarks) 1443 (i).
—— Transportation of Supplies, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Rebuilding (Ques.) 7210 (iv).
Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; (amt.) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).
—— (remarks) *re* Telegram of Mr. Sifton, 13528 (vii).
—— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ques.) 2396 (ii).
I.C.R. Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c. *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).
—— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ques.) 9269 (v).
Manitoulin & North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Reps. *re* &c. (Ques.) 893 (i).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).
Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 6054 (iii).
Ontario, North, Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ques) 697 (i).
Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing for England, Acting Minister of Marine, &c. (Ques.) 7732 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3125 (ii).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3085 (ii).
Public Buildings and Works, Initiated since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).
Ques. of Priv., Stmnt. of hon. member for Thunder Bay *re* Misleading House, 7995 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 11610 (vi).
Ry. Act Amt., (remarks) 12194 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 2384 (ii).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

'Sault Express,' Amounts paid for Advertising, &c. (Ques.) 696 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853, 1129 (i).

Sault St. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 898 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13470 (vii).

See 'G.T.P.' &c.

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6635 (iv).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount of Expenditure (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

See 'Walker.'

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5872 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 635 (i); Labour Dept. (salaries) 12156 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4015 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 1072 (i); (life-saving stations) 2972; (wrecks) 3152, 3195 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1474; (Museum) 1498 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (legal costs) 5557; (Pictou) 5559 (iii).

Timber Berths, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale to Owners, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

——— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3318 (ii).

Timber Berths, Original Documents, &c. (M. for ret.) 2983 (ii).

See 'Indian Lands.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on M. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ques.) 3842

——— Payment by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

See 'Steel.'

Yukon Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

'Challenge' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

Dorval, Dredging at Yacht Club Wharf (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6240 (iv).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c. (Ques.) 6639 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3461 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c. (M. for reports*) 6239 (iv).

BRABAZON, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*

Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1997 (i).

——— Final Report of Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

Immigrants, Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Toronto Centre.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers (remarks) 11121 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11669 (vi).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1797 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11815, 11843; (amt.) 11820 (vi); in Com., 12920; on M. for 3°, 13234 (vii).

French Treaty, going into Effect (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ques.) 9712 (v).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res, 13303 (vi).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3705, 3720 (ii).

Japanese Immigration, Parliamentary Control, &c., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2056 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605, 1663 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7354 (iv).

BRISTOL, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. (B. 82) in Com., 4997, 5052; (amt.) 5056 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1442 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1454, 1470 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8807 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8700 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 11309 (vi).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ques.) 8616 (v).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9679 (v).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

Budget, The, 5980 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault (remarks) 13142 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1825 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11140 (vi).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6905 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10591 (vi); Canals, Welland (electric lighting) 12205 (vii); Public Works, Miscellaneous (telegraph branch) 11098 (vi).

Technical Students, Employment on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3297 (ii).

BRODER, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Williamsburg Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12205 (vii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P., (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*

'Arctic,' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June 1904, to June, 1907 (Ans.) 185 (i).

———Trip in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup. 4012 (ii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ans.) 3849 (ii).

Beauchemin, A., Employment at Sorel (Ans.) 5167 (iii).

See 'Sorel,' &c.

Becancour River Dredging, Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 7213 (iv).

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1733 (i).

——— Expenses of Sir C. H. Tupper (explanation) 4669 (iii).

Bellechasse Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).

——— Ret., Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3241 (ii).

Bernier, Capt., Islands flagged *re* Arctic Expedition (Ans.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 987 (i).

See 'Fishing,' &c.

Briar Island Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ans.) 9266 (v).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).

B.C. Fishing, Licenses issued to Packers Associations (Ans.) 8173 (iv).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Travelling Expenses from June 30th, 1906 (Ans.) 1347 (i).

See 'Marine,' 'Travelling,' &c.

Bronte Harbour Wharfage, Dues collected (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

Campbellton Harbor, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ans.) 8612 (v).

Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6161, 6173, 6198; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 6402 (iv).

See 'Franco,' &c.

Canada Shipping Act, Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3420 (ii).

——— (B. 183) 1°*, 10119 (v); in Com., 12851, 13052 (vii).

Canso Medical Officer, Successor to Dr. Brine (Ans.) 1736 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing (Ans.) 681 (i).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

'Castle' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6641 (iv)

Champlain, Str., Emplymt. by Political Agents, (explanation) 9280 (v).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5890 (iii).

——— Statement *re* Marine Dept., 5620 (iii).

——— Translation (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 999, 1040 (i).

See 'Travelling.'

'Coquitlam,' Str., Compensation *re* Seizure (Ans.) 2589 (ii).

Cowie, F.W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services (Ans.) 1736 (i).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ans.) 8184 (iv).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso (Ans.) 5651,5779, 5790 (iii), 8179 (iv).

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ans.) 1117 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of Cor. 1128 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Falconer, K., Payments to for Services (Ans.) 8890 (v).

——— Payment of Balance of Account (Ans.) 10516 (vi).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4000 (ii).

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7640 (iv).

——— (personal explanation) 7663 (iv).

——— Production of Original File (remarks) 9281 (v).

——— Quotations from, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7765 (iv).

——— on Inquiry for Original Papers, 8912 (v).

Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations with Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 6849 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1723 (i).

Fisheries Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c.; (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Fisheries between Dom. and Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 2395, 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

——— Negotiations with Provs., Instructions to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

——— Protection Service, Amounts expended since 1885 (Ans.) 1118 (i).

Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2390 (ii).

Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Fish Hatchery at Selkirk, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Name &c. (Ans.) 1684 (i).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Granted to Japanese (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Fishing Privileges, Lesser Slave Lake, Lease &c. (Ans.) 6398 (iv).

Fish Island, Name of Present Lightkeeper (Ans.) 6058 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ans.) 3427 (ii).

France and Canada SS Subsidy, (prop. res.) 3493 (ii).

See 'Can. and France.'

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 927 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1384 (i); in Com., 3609, 3636 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4335 (iii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 8383 (v).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 515, 1120 (i).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).

——— on Rep. of Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).

See 'Birnie, &c.

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6282 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10731 (vi).

——— Maintenance and Supplies, in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

——— Pay of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 10736 (vi).

——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

See 'Cowie,' &c.

Hackett, Capt., Tug *re* Lime Kiln Crossing, Remuneration, &c., (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Halliday Bros., Lighthouses, Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4543 (iii).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 358 (i).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1128 (i).

Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Progress *re* Construction (Ans.) 1734 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8618 (v).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6477 (iv).

I.C.R. Employes and Provincial Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9778 (v).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

——— Purchase Price, Staff, &c. (Ans.) 3434 (ii).

Life-Saving Boats in B.C., Purchase of &c. (Ans.) 684 (i).

Life Saving Stations, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).

Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3837 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Charter of Steamers, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9477 (v).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Issue of Licenses, *re* (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishery Regulations, Pet. from Fishermen's Union N.S. (Ans.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ans.) 10256 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland County (Ans.) 9473 (v).

——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Lobster Fishing Licenses in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., 5475 (iii).

Lobster Fishing at Pictou, on Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c. (Ans.) 10257 (v).

Lobsters, Undersized, Caught at Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Lockery & McCombel, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Louisburg, Bait Freezer, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

——— Harbour Dues for 1906, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business (Ans.) 513 (i).

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Operation of, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Marconi System, Regulation *re* Rates, &c. (Ans.) 174 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Dep. Minister, Resignation and Acceptance (remarks) 7938 (iv).

——— Letter *re* (read) 8088 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Ret. *re* Mr. Falconer's Accounts, laid on Table, 4223 (iii).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 510 (i).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3939 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7325 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (i).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy (remarks) 10741 (vi).

——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8452 (v).

——— Deputy Minister, Suspended Officers, Date of Apptmt, &c. (Ans.) 6982 (iv).

——— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6636 (iv).

——— Investigation, Public &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6846 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refund, &c. (Ans.) 8889 (v).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St. (Ans.) 13062 (vii).

Marine and Militia Stationery Supplies, Purchase *re* Book-keeping (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Copy laid on Table, 11404 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3022; in Com., 3034 (ii).

Meaford Harbour, (B. 158) 1° m., 7195 (iv); in Com., 8510 (v).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Montcalm, Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (re-vestigation *re* (remarks) 8087, 8171 (iv).

——— Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Contract *re* Cement (Ans.) 7199, 7499 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c. (Ans.) 8888 (v).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3456 (ii).

Motion, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).

Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ans.) 1119 (i).

Naval Stations in Canada, Maintenance of, Arrangements with G. B. *re* (Ans.) 1118 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ans.) 5651 (iii).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ans.) 1120 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3980 (ii).

'Petrel' Str., Amounts paid for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).

Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 10255 (v).

Prefontaine, Hon. Mr., Date of Sailing for England, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 984 (i).

P.E.I. Cable Service, &c. (remarks) 8516 (v).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c (Ans.) 360 (i).

——— Life-Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 358 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ans.) 895 (i).

——— Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 8444 (v).

——— Progress *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i), 5796 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

——— Signing of Contract (Ans.) 10254 (v).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

——— 'Str. Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i), 6160 (iii).

——— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Withdrawl of Str., &c. (remarks) 1207 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).

Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10663 (vi).

Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority for (Ans) 12776 (vii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2025, 2886, 3318 (ii).

——— Delayed (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Rideau Canal, Buoys, &c., Contract *re* Lighting (Ans.) 8613 (v).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Russian Govt., Compensation to B.C. Schooners (Ans.) 683 (i).

St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis (Ans.) 3230 (ii).

——— Expenditure and Collections (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Ste Anne de Sorel, Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).

St. Lawrence Route, Wrecks, Collisions, &c. (Ans.) 10739 (vi).

St. Louis, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).

St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses in B.C., Number, Condition, &c. (Ans.) 5652, 5998 (iii).

——— Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).

——— Payments *re* (Ans.) 5651 (iii).

Salmon Net Fishing, Priviliges in Restigouche River (Ans.) 13518 (vii).

Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

Shad Hatchery at Windsor, N.S. (Ans.) 8894 (v).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).

Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt of, &c. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).

Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons registered (Ans.) 2790 (ii).

See 'Canadian Shipping Act,' &c.

Signal Dues at Halifax (B. 152) 1°m., 6457 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).

Sorel Pay Lists, Alleged Padding, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7938 (iv).

——— Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).

——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).

——— Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).

——— Papers laid on Table, 5477 (iii).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 7099 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet laid on Table, 8170 (iv).

——— Rep. *re* Irregularities (remarks) 5408 (iii).

Sorel Shipyards, Mr. Desbarats, Connection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).

Soulanges County Wharfage Dues, Amount received, &c. (Ans.) 9277 (v).

Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).

——— Cor. laid on Table, 4825 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

——— (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ans.) 687 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).

Steamboat Inspection Report (presented) 3896 (ii).

Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Payments to *re* Auditing, Dept. of Marine (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Submarine Signal at Negro Point, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5202 (iii).

Summerside Harbour and Str. Stanley (remarks) 6160 (iii).

Supplies purchased for Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5829 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977 (i).

Fisheries (dogfish works) 13325 (vii); (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii); (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 9853 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039 (iii); (aids to navigation) 5040, 5773 (iii); (lighthouses) 12262 (vii); (lightkeepers) 13323 (vii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (maintenance, &c.) 5039 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (pilotage pensions, &c.) 5046 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (repairs) 5039 (iii); (salaries) 4755, 5039 (iii); (signal service) 5045 (iii); (Thunder Bay icebreaker) 5041 (iii); (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dockyard) 5039 (iii); (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (hospitals) 5782 (iii); Hudson Bay Patrolling) 3985 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1885 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); 12262 (vii); (Patrol Boats in Hudson Bay) 4747 (iii) (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1078 (i), 5763 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942, 2952; (life-saving awards) 2972 (ii); (masters and mates) 2969 (ii); (naval schools) 3153 3222 (ii); (obstructions) 3211 (ii); (tidal service) 3215 (ii); (winter mail service) 3217 (ii); (wrecks) 3147, 3184, 3195, (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii); (St. Lawrence channel) 5035 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11082 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Peribonka) 12036 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3294

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 915 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 922 (i).

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans) 4586 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River (Ans.) 9476 (v).

Trap Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Travelling Expenses of Minister, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4122 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i), 3985 (ii).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs to, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid) 9775 (v).

'Vigilant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ans.) 683 (i).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ans.) 3230, 3843 (ii).

——— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ans.) 3843 (ii).

Washington Fisheries Commissioners, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1732 (i).

Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Fraud (remarks) 6848 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6121 (iii).

Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Signals (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Granting of Licenses, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A McLean) 10269 (v).

——— Moneys due, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 5996 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., Amount of Revenue collected (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure, on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ans.) 683 (i).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*

Pontiac Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 155) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 195) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

BUREAU, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sales of Articles, &c. (Ans.) 238 (i).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

BUREAU, Hon. J.—*Con.*

Judges, Supreme Court, Quebec Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ans.) 358 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Report (presented) 185 (i).

'Le Soleil,' *re* Voting of French Members, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7994 (iv).

Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ans.) 357 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 10396 (v); Justice (Exchequer Court) 5506; (salaries) 5505 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Arctic cruise) 4012 (ii); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii); (maintenance) 5509 (iii).

BURROWS, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8357 (v).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11172, 11445, 11526; (amt.) 11943 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10822 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12812 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12568 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii); Public Works— Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr Lake) 2378 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).

——— Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8734 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (v).

CALDWELL, Mr. T. B., *Lanark, N.*

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5446 (iii).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S., *Middlesex, W.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82, on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5062 (iii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 3° m., 1929 (i).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 430 (i).

CARNEY, Mr. M., *Halifax.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 764 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4160 (ii).

CARON, Mr. J. B. T., *Ottawa.*

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11344 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2005 (i).

Northern Empire Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 86) 1°*, 2160 (ii).

Royal Mint of Canada, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* (M. for copy*) 5210 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, (N.B.)*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8401 (v); in Com., 13021 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6798 (iv).

Fraser Lumber Co.'s (B. 8) 1°*, 231 (i).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10990 (vi).

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep., 12293 (vii).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

N.B. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1108 (ii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9929 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5441 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12619 (vii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.— *Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi); N. S. (Shelburne) 7177 (iv); Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John surveys) 13348 (vii); (St. John tidal waters) 12005 (vi); N.S. (Port Hood) 11276 (vi); Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12112 (vii).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (amt.) 11964 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5014 (iii).

——— Manner of Living, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6334 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3314 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 26) 1°*, 430 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12580 (vii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *Huron, E.*

Address, The, 263 (i).

Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ques.) 686 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6214 (iii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2573 (ii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1651 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11945, 11953 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).

Fishing Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559, 697 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. 2896 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1238 (i).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10564 (vi).

Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Registers of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6834 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

McGee, Hon. Thomas D'Arcy, Monument *re* (remarks) 6288 (iv).

Mint Building, Ventilation of, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9945 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii); in Com., 12623 (vii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 7937 (iv).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 6458 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. McLean) to conc., 13353 (vii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 5998 (iii).

Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 351 (i).

S.A. SS. Subsidy, Amount to Elder-Dempster Co. (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 622 (i); Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4184 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*

Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1702 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4630 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11695 (vi).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P., *Ontario, S.*

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B. (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importations from U.S., from 1904-7 (Ques.) 6238 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7266 (iv).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S. (remarks) 13537 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12895 (vii); (seeds) 12893 (vii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *Essex, S.*

Address, The, 254 (i).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4385 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5120 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11825, 11859; (amt.) 11881 (vi).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226, 3621, 3692, 3737 (ii), 4224 (iii); 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6474 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Patent Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12627 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1440 (i).

——— 3rd Rep. (M. to conc.) 2159 (ii).

——— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3131 (ii).

Tobacco, Protection *re* Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 913 (i).

Walker, Andrew, Relief (B. 124) 1°*, 5336 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6126 (iii).

Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 3834 (ii).

Windsor Pump and Foundry Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 72) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8494 (v).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S., *Kent, W.*

Address, The, 194 (i).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6465 (iv).
See 'Militia.'

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

——— (Ques.) 895 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Brome County Employees, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Budget, The, 6527 (iv).

Canned Foods, &c., Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— Cor. *re* Regulations, &c. (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ques.) 11495 (vi).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8894 (v), 9266 (v).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10515 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12164 (vii).

Colchester Point, Essex Pier, Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

——— Material imported, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

——— Material entered free of Customs Duties (Ques.) 10254 (v).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10417 (vi).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs Dept. at Windsor (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Documents, Original, Ques. of Priv., 6010 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5031 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).

Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Falconer, Payments to *re* Auditing Accounts of Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4178 (ii).

Floods at Chatham, Damage &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4742 (iii).

Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

Hackett Dock, Purchase of, at Amherstburg (Ques.) 7730 (iv).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ques.) 9280 (v).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13092 (vii).

Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Cause, &c. (Ques.) 5796 (iii).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation of (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Immigration Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).

Immigration Agents, Special Prizes, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Immigration Officers in Kent County, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 3172 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3041 (ii), 4223 (iii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management (remarks) on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11066 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr Templeman) in Com., 6470 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration *re* (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Lady Evelyn' (Ques.) 5799 (iii).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Meats and Canned Food Inspectors, Number appointed, Names, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in debate on Address, 196 (i).

Meat Inspection Act Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Purchase of Blankets, Return *re* (remarks) 5914 (iii).

See 'Blankets.'

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 793 (i).

Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs, Windsor (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Perdue, Dr M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 173 (i).

Piggeries at Experimental Farm (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11405 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

Ruscomb River Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 12894 (vii); (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (seeds) 12892 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12732 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (Thunder Bay icebreaker) 5042 (iii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (naval schools) 3154 (ii); (obstructions) 3212 (ii); (wrecks) 3188 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8524 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 7479 (iv); (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Guelph armoury) 7678 (iv); (Kingston R. M. C.) 7704 (iv); (Leamington) 7705 (iv); (Markham) 7712 (iv); (North Bay) 7712 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Station C.) 7420 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8599 (v); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11273 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11073 (vi).

Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition (remarks) 12657 (vii).

Thames River Wharf, Damages to (remarks) 7506 (iv).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 908 (i).

Wallace, Michael J, Emplymt in Customs at Windsor (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

Waugh, James, Refund to Govt. *re* Immigration Agent (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6138 (iii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Cor. Accounts, &c. (M. for copies*) 1129 (i).

Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Expiration of Franchise (Ques.) 1940 (i).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*

Address, The, 123, (amt.) 147 (i); Amt. Neg. (Y. 95: N. 56) 274 (i).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12448 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10940 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4391; in Com., 4400 (iii).

Bell Memorial Association, Grant, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).

Brantford Srike, Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ques.) 10016 (v).

Budget, The, 5314 (iii).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).

Butter Imports, Quantity, Countries of Origin, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6176 (iii).

Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).

Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at DeCew Falls, &c. (Ques.) 897 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Customs Dept. and Civil Service Rep. *re* on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).

Customs Seizure for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

——— Customs Dept., Criticism, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10428 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10825 (vi).

Dominion Power Co.'s Bill, Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1237 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3556 (ii); in Com., 3617 (ii), 3640 (ii).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park. Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2240 (ii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6661 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12725 (vii).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6451 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, &c. (prop. res.) 1295 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6998 (iv).

Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2074 (ii).

Newspaper Rates, List of Publications (M. for copy*) 1295 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8857 (v).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchean, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4238 (ii)

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (seed branch) 5501 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 625 (i).

Indians—(destitute, relief) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891 (vi); Ont. (Brantford) 7455 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2873 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5097 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721 (vi); in Com., 11386 (vi); 12167 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7982 (iv), 7998 (iv), 11727 (vi); in Com., 11802 (vi), 11833 (vi), 12958 (vii); on M. for 3°, 13235 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5030 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6803 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6659 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12678 (vii).

——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3702 (ii), 3719 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry. (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Financial Review, 13467 (vii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12561 (vii).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

Niagara, St. Catherines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5064 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4914 (iii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4971 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4054, 4132 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt (Mr. Lake) 2345 (ii).

COPP, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby*

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 1108 (i); in Com., 4231 (ii); on Senate Amts., 5785 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 5412, 5519 (iii).

Townsend, Arthur James, Relief (B. 196) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*

Address, The, 316 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8076, 8089 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Ry Co.'s (B. 151) 1°*, 6287 (iv).

——— on Order for Com., 7141 (iv); in Com., 7667, 8125 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8741, 9377, 9461 (v).

Grazing Land leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9132 (v).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6382 (iv)

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1, 1896 (Ques) 13512 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3381 (ii).

Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c. (Ques.) 4242 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1364 (i).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5523 (iii)

Public Works--Buildings--Man. (Dauphin) 8521 (iii); (Neepawa) 8537 (v).

Timber Berths, Awarded between June 1904 and July 15th, 1896, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

——— Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2676 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York (N.B.)*

Blackhall, Mrs., Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6878 (iv).

Civil Service Act. Amt B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11558 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1861 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13028 (vii)

Elections in N.B., Federal Govt. Patronage, on M. for Sup., 3043 (ii)

Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St John, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9464 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12710 (vii).

——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Immigration in N.B., Co-operation with N.B. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).

I.C.R., Claim Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

——— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).

——— Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 2558 (ii).

——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12403 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).

Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12796 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ques.) 8892 (v).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Post Office Services Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4916 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10639 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9830 (v).

St. Mary's Indian Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 12889 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 621 (i); Mines (salaries) 647 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Immigration (deportations) 9886 (v).

Indians—N.B. (agents salaries) 13170 (vii); (salaries) 12736 (vii); (schools) 13170 (vii).

Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 8537 (v); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fredericton) 13328 (vii); (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, water service) 7187; (St. John) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7119; (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv) (Halifax customs) 7156 (iv); (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Westville) 7179; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7679 (iv); (Kingston artillery park) 7701 (iv); (Kingston, hospital)

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

7702 (iv); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704 (iv); (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7438 (iv); (Dundee) 7287 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Knowlton) 7291 (iv); (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta (Battleford) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 8581 (v); (Humboldt) 8584 (v); (Moosejaw) 13337 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11684 (iv); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Campbellton 13344 (vii); (Caraquet wharf) 11685 (vi); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi); 13344 (vii); (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (v); (St. John river) 11698 (vi); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12008 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11216 (vi); (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384 (vi); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 12758 (vii); (claims dept.) 10176 (v); (double tracking) 12250 (vii); (Fredericton improvements) 12758 (vii); Halifax accommodation) 12227 (vii); (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (locomotives) 10156 (v); (machinery) 12257 (vii); (Moncton car shops) 12251 (vii), 12256 (vii); (Pictou accommodation) 12230 (vi); (Sackville) 12235 (vii); (salaries) 10147 (v); (supplies) 10191 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10389 (vi).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ques.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith's Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2794 (ii).

——— Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2886 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10534 (vi).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John (City).*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3862 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12469 (vii).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to, in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11990 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6173 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W. —*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12852 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11983 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4686 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1722 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1236 (i); on M. for 1°, 3494 (ii); in Com., 3593 (ii), 3637

Franco-Canadian Treaty, and Favoured Nation Clause (Ques.) 514 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res, 2222 (ii); in Com., 12081 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 10015 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).

Imports from France, Value for five years, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).

I.C.R., Claims *re* Damages, Settled and Unsettled, &c. (Ques.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

——— Employees, Names and Number taken in Jan. and Feb. in N.B. (Ques). 5793 (iii).

——— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

——— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 5800 (iii).

——— Number employed in N.B. for Jan. Feb., &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241.

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12795 (vii), 12829 (vii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9494 (v).

Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

New Brunswick Cold Storage Co., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

——— Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9313 (v).

See 'Trueman.'

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

N.B. Credit, Amount &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. Patronage (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3050 (ii).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10032 (v).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12624 (vii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 10692 (vi).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4958 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10648 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in House of Com., on M. for Sup., 9780 (v).

——— Ques. of Priv., 9891 (v).

Rifle Range, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Ry. Mail Supt., Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1561 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com on Res,, 3787 (ii); in Com., 12596 (vii).

Sussex Military Camp (remarks) 9836 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10569 (vi); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries, &c.) 639 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9541; Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9229 (v).

Fisheries (dogfish reduction works) 13325; (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9972 (v).

Indians—N.B. (schools) 13172 (vii).

Labour Dept.—(Gazette) 12261 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040 (iii); (lifeboats) 13323; (lighthouses) 12262; (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (salaries) 5039 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Cumberland) 12263.

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).

Marine—Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii); Dom. arsenal) 12155; (gratuities) 13177; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (R. M. College) 12152; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3221 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1082 (i); (ice-breakers) 2961; (life-saving awards) 2973; (masters and mates) 2969; (Naval Schools) 3153, 3223; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3194, 3196 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors, N.B.) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (St. John) 13329 (vii); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston militia stores) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. (additions) 1487; (mint) 1451, 1483; (museum) 1497 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John harbour) 12012 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11218; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11226; (Round Hill) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11100; Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10186 (v); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (Halifax accommodation) 12229 (vii); (legal services) 10190 (v); St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii); (salaries) 10154 (v).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9344 (v).

See 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

Uniforms, Official, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Money Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1738 (i).

DEMERS, Mr. J., *St. John's and Iberville.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3576 (ii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, Quantity imported from G. B. for 1904-5-6-7 (Ques.) 1506 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

DESJARDINS, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*

Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ques) 6980 (iv).

Peat Industry, Employment of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12487 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1177 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8143 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2012 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com of Sup., 662 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4922 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4056 (ii); Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1098 (i).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 77) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3573 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 679 (i).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— (M. for copies) 899 (i).

DUGAS, Mr. F. O., *Montcalm.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8282 (iv); in Com., 11863 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt., B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

Tobacco, Foreign, Refund, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).

DYMENT, Mr. A. E., *Algoma East.*

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 5913 (iii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 5913 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9070 (v).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2195 (ii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *Middlesex, E.*

Address, The, 304 (i).

Binder Twine, Purchasers Names and P. O. Addresses (Ques.) 9715 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6209 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5098 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5011 (iii).

Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).

Opium, Amount received *re* Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Ry. Semaphores, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Salmon Fishing Licences, B.C., Payments *re* (Ques.) 5951 (iii).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c. (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671, 8553 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2893 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6267 (iv).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, (prop res.) 2435 (ii).
——— Passes issued to P. S. Archibald, (Ques.) 2387 (ii).
N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3058 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch, B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12629 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2743 (ii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor, I. C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10154 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi).
Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Railways—I. C. R. (inspecting auditor) 10154 (v); (double tracking) 12237 (vii); (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, Ques. of Order, in Com. of Sup., 9242 (v).
William, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Architectural Institute of Can., Refund of Fees (M.) 11234 (vi), 11404 (vi).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3488 (ii).
Geological Survey, Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13575 (vii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3459 (ii).
Ry. Act (land surveys) Amt. (B. 30) 1° m., 560 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13482 (vii).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 911 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.)*
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 352, 363 (i).
Address, The, 94; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 531 (i).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4719 (iii).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12465 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).
——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 8444 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by British Govt. (remarks) 11706 (vi).
See 'Franco,' &c.
Apples seized at Port of Montreal, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5381 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).
Aud. Gen.'s Deptl. Rep. (Vol. i)—(presented) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii)—(presented) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii)—(presented) 6 (i).
Aud. General, Salary (B. 208) Prop. Res., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12645, 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 12645 (vii).
Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).
——— Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ans.) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 160) 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2° m., 10919; in Com., 10933 (vi).
Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4298 (ii).
Banks, Aid to: *See* 'Dom. Notes Bill,' 'Wheat,' &c.
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9336 (v).
Belleville Harbour, Total Revenue, &c. (remarks) 2593 (ii).
Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8556, 8609 (v).
Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).
Boards of Trade Act Amt. (B. 133) 1°*, 5337 (iii); 2° m. and in Com., 11987 (vi); in Com., 12393 (vii).
Bonusing System, on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 (iv).
Boone Co., Payments to (remarks) 5083 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ans.) 13226 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13312 (vii).
British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1469 (i).
B.C., Revenue contributed to Dom. from 1872-3 to 1905, on M. (Mr. D. Ross) for Ret. 3436 (ii).
British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Budget, The, (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means (annual statement) 5137 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 560 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).
See 'Financial Review.'

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 430 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174, 6194 (iii); in Com., 6412 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

——— Trade Relations (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 209) prop. Res., 12392 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12646; 1°, 12649; in Com., 13053 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 187) on M. to place on Order Paper, 13493; 2° m, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press (B. 201) prop. Res., 12052 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12408 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii); 2° m., 12837; in Com., 12848 (vii).

——— Memorial from Pres'dt. J. Ross Robertson (read), 12837 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ans.) 5080 (iii).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).
See 'Loans,' &c.

Canadian Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. M. S. Schell) in Com., 5174 (iii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 6647 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarette, Anti-Legislation *re* (remarks) 7279 (iv).

Civil Servants, Increases *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) prop. Res., 11300 (vi); in Com. on Res., 11359 (vi); in Com., 11402, 11641 (vi), 12185 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, on Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolution *re* (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 90, 938, 1740 (i), 3043, 3317 (ii), 4316, 4832, 4963, 5408, 5491, 5567 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4495 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission's Rep., presented, 5620 (iii).

——— Number distributed, &c. (remarks) 5723, 6060 (iii), 6222 (iv).

——— Translation, &c. (remarks) 6222, 6926 (iv), 13477 (vii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Civil Service Commission's Report, Policy of Govt. (remarks) on M. to Adjn. House, 5883 (iii).

Civil Service System, Re-organization of, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9158 (v).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ans.) 6924 (iv).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ans.) 1938 (i).

Colonial Conference, 1907, Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 512 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).
See 'Intercolonial,' &c.

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, &c., Cor. *re* Govtl. Action (Ans.) 174 (i).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 2°* and in Com., 5492 (iii).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ans.) 1112 (i).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 659 (i).

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com., 9962 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10143 (v).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Customs, Outside Service (salaries) 9221 (v).

Debates, Official, Adoption of 2nd Rep. (remarks) 12505 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to Conc., 8835 (v).

——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling Due (Ans.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing 1908 (Ans.) 315 (i).
See 'Loans,' &c.

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10482 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1805 (i).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11202 (vi).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt., on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) on M. for 3°, 11977 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due to N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ans.) 2217 (ii).

Dom. Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ans.) 313 (i).

Dominion Notes Issue (grain advances) (B. 159), 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2°*, in Com., 10795 (vi).

See 'Seed Grain,' &c.

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Oct. 1907, Total Amount (Ans.) 692 (i).

See 'Loans.'

Dom. Power and Development Co.'s (B. 173) on Conc. by Senate, 12549 (vii).

Dominion Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ans.) 1734 (i).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office (Ans.) 687 (i).

——— (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dry Docks Subsidy (B. 119) M. for Com. on Res., 4314 (iii); in Com. on Res., 4675 (iii); 1°*, 4689 (iii); in Com., 6911 (iv), 10761; on Senate Amts., 11633 (vi).

Easter Adjournment (M.) *re* 6843 (iv).

Employees of Parliament, Religions, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).

Estimates of 1908-9 (presented) 554 (i).

——— Suppl. (1908) presented, 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. (1909) presented, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ans.) 840 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13442 (vii).

See 'Budget.'

Financial Stringency : *See* 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5780 (iii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty (B. 57), Res. prop., 941; (M.) for Com. on prop. Res., 1213 (i); on M. for 1°, 1421 (i); 2° m., 2220, 3502; in Com., 3582, 3636; 3°m., 4317, agreed to (Y. 103; N. 5) 4376 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 930 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Goods and Minimum Tariff, on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 851 (i).

——— Delay in Approval, &c. (Ans.) 12655 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delays *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13535 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i), 3754 (ii).

——— Distribution to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 12651 (vii).

——— Favoured Nation Clause and Foreign Countries (Ans.) 845 (i).

——— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Going into Effect (Ans.) 8614 (v).

——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion, &c. (Ans.) 846 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail (remarks) 1585 (i).

——— Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

——— Mess from His Ex. (presented) 6 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause (Ans.) 514, 564 (i).

——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Preparation of Stmnt. (remarks) 8 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution, &c. (remarks) 94 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ans.) 4763 (iii).

——— Stmnt. *re* Papers to be distributed 848 (i).

——— U.S. Exports, &c. (Ans.) 896 (i).

See 'Mess. from His Ex.'

Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ans.) 2982 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623 (ii).

Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).

——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 11123 (vi).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv).

Grain Shipments from the West, Financial Aid, &c. (remarks) 608 (i).

See 'Dom. Notes Bill.'

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract (Ans.) 5653 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12694 (vii).

——— Guarantee Bonds (B. 171) 1° m., 8835 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10771 (vi).

——— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Deductions (Ans.) 1937 (i).
—— Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ans.) 9473 (v).
—— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).
—— Route, Change of, Financial Reasons, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Ques. of Priv., 8089 (iv).
—— Securities *re* Construction Contracts (Ans.) 357 (i).
—— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).
Gunn, B. B., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 431 (i).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* accepting Municipal Offices (Ans.) 3430 (ii).
—— Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).
Hay and Straw Embargo, by G. B. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Immigrants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. (B. 42) 1° m., 827 (i); 2° m., 1741, (M.) to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv).
—— Introduction of (Ans.) 9272 (v).
—— (Remarks) 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Total Expenditure, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).
—— Evidence, Sale of, for private Profit (Ans.) 6059 (iii).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt., Salary (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).
Intercolonial Conference, Expenses of Canadian Ministers (Ans.) 13511 (vii).
—— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
See 'Colonial,' &c.
I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).
—— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907 (Ans.) 4245 (iii).
Judges Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ans.) 10735 (vi).
Lead Bounties (B. 191) prop. Res., 9773 (v); in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°*, of B., 10953 (vi); 2° m., 11235; in Com., 11243 (vi); 3° m., 12054 (vii).
Lead Bounty Bill, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11408, 11705 (vi).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. Outside of Canada (Ans.) 1506 (i).
Live Stock, N.B., Information *re* Figures, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).
Loans, Temporary, since Oct. 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loan of August, 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ans.) 564 (i).
Loan negotiated in London, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ans.) 11501 (vi).
Loan, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
See 'Dom. Loans,' &c.
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9509 (v).
McGee, Hon. Thos. D'Arcy, Monument to (remarks) 6288 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
—— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12794 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7330 (iv).
—— Deptl. Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
—— Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 10789 (vi).
—— Evidence, Printing, &c. (Ans.) remarks) 8517 (v), 11301 (vi).
—— on Inquiry for Evidence (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).
—— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).
—— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
See 'Civil Service,' &c.
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Number and Names of Establishments (Ans.) 1505 (i).
Military Camps, &c. (remarks) 9838 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Mint Building, Ventilation of (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

Mint, Date of Operation, Value of Coinage, &c. (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

——— Gold Coins, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

Mint, on Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).

Mint, Royal, Sums expended, Apptmts., &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).

Money-Lenders operating in Public Departments (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts, Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

——— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit in Govt. Hands (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

N.B. Credit, Amount of (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 10025 (v).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Old Age Annuities (B. 120) in Com. on Res., 4690; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 10848 (vi); 3° m., 12053 (vii); on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Old Age Pensions Bill (M.) to withdraw, 3654 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2433 (ii).

Ordnance Property, Toronto, Sale Bill (prop. res.) 13226 (vii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182, 6228 (iv).

Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 610 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloane) to Com. of Sup., 3978 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty (B. 199) in Com. on Res., 12406 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii).

Pianos rented, &c. for Speaker's Rooms (Ans.) 563 (i).

Post Office Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest (Ans.) 691 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

——— Communication with C. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).

P.E.I. and G.B., SS. Subventions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12754 (vii).

P.E.I., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12636 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

P.E.I., Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement, &c. (Ans.) 315 (i).

——— Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ans.) 8616 (v).

——— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c. (Ans.) 564 (i).

——— Date of last Payments, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

——— Increased Payments, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Public Accounts (presented) 6 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3110 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 9504 (v).

——— on M. to Conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business (remarks) 13493 (vii).

——— Precedence of, &c. (remarks) 3404 (ii).

Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 5730 (iii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7146 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4937 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Deficit, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

——— Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2553 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion, &c. (Ans.) 5566 (iii).

——— Corrected answer, 6059 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Report, on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

——— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11605 (vi).

Railway Commissioners Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Religious Fanatics in Man. (remark) 12161 (vii).

Representation of the Mar. Provs. in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9839 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9892 (v).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 6010 (iii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Price, &c. (Ans.) 5654 (iii).

Royal Mint, Amount of Gold and Silver Coins (Ans.) 8613 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Royal Mint, Ques. of Order *re* Govt. Apptmts., 1461 (i).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563, 8610, 9068, 9167 (v).

Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2780 (ii).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2770 (ii).

See 'Grain,' &c.

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2916 (ii).

Senate Sittings, Number of Days, Cost, &c., for 1895, 1906-7 (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).

——— Royal Commission *re* (remarks) 5916 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5520 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

South Huron By-Election, Amount paid Returning Officer (Ans.) 9270 (v).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5822; (amt.) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879 (iiii).

Supply—(M.) for Com., 554 (i).

Supply (B. 96) *re* Seed Grain, 1° m., 2°*, and in Com., 2782 (ii).

——— (B. 136) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

——— (B. 186) 1°*, 2°*, and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

——— (B. 220) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

——— Charges of Obstruction by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9395 (v).

See 'Obstructions,' &c.

——— Conc. (M.) 5499, 5915, 5919 (iii).

——— Discussion *re* Estimates (remarks) 5661 (iii).

——— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5920 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10588 (vi).

Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 5562 (iii); (Receiver General) 12160 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) Conc., 13578 (vii); (Ross, H. T.) 12914 (vii); (salaries) 637 (i); Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610 (i); Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i), 9708 (v); Militia (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612 (i); Privy Council (Bennetts, F. K.) 12902 (vii); Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii); Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

Finance (Treasury Board) 5562 (iii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508 (vi); (printing, &c.) 10507; (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13578 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Insurance (Supt.'s office) 12160 (vii).

Justice (Exhequer Court) 5507 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii); (China and Canada, &c.) 13152 (vii); (G. B. and Canada) 12728 (vii); (P.E.I. and G.B.) 12264 (vii); (St. John and Cumberland) 12263; (subsidies) 12262 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4017 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662 (iii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Brantford monument, Telephone) Conc., 13567 (vii); (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii); (Jamaica Earthquake) 5784 (iii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed wheat) 2770 (ii); (Yukon, Bank of Commerce) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3152 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Post Office (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8535 (v); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1453, 1472 (i); (rents, &c.) 11004 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7437; (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Lakevale channel) Conc., 13568 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways Generally (extra clerks) 10344 (vi); I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5694 (iii); (Moncton—Truro, additional line) 12760 (vii); (salaries) 10128 (v); Ry. Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Senate (salaries) 10489 (vi).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 234, 235 (i).
Town Site, Section 32, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ans.) 562 (i).
See 'Colonial,' &c.
Uniforms and Customs Refunds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).
Wallberg, E. A., Payments by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 5086 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
——— (remarks) 13416 (vii).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 554 (i), 13579 (vii).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 5137 (iii).
Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6118 (iii).
Wednesday Evenings and Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9486 (v).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).
West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).
——— Bank Negotiations (Ans.) 171 (i).
——— Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).
——— Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Papers, &c., 899 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Cor. &c., 2176 (ii).
——— Special Arrangements *re* Shipments of Feed Wheat with Ry. Cos. (Ans.) 893 (i).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines, Customs Frauds, &c. (remarks) 9894 (v).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
——— Dom. Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 1346
——— Expenditures, Total Expenditure (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).
——— Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).
——— Money Transmission, Rates, *re* &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).
——— Revenue and Expenditure, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

FINLAYSON, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1733 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12872 (vii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11865 (vi).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse. (M.) 9579 (v).
Washington Fisheries Commission at Washington, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1732 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Accountants for Marine Dept., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4111 (ii).
Address, The, 213 (i).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ans.) 8611 (v).
——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co. (Ans.) 8615 (v).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5385 (iii).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ans.) 6057 (iii).
Blankets purchased, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6465 (iv).
Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
——— Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ans.) 686 (i).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6202 (iii).
Canned Goods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6870 (iv).
Canned Goods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ans.) 3846 (ii).
Canned Goods Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ans.) 514 (i).
Cattle Embargo by G. B., Removal of, Action of Govt. since 1896 (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
——— Par. in Montreal Gazette, 13081 (vii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).
Census (complete) of the N.W. Provinces Report (presented) 3422 (ii).
Census Map, Publication of (Ans.) 4406 (iii).
Central Experimental Farm, Sale of Cattle, &c. (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

Chartered Banks of Canada, Report (presented) 8086 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5109 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 189) in Com. on Res., 11350; 1° m., 10717; 2° m., 11315; in Com., 11362, 11536, 11634 (vi), 12163; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11018 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
See 'Marine.'

Civil Service Act Amt. Bill, (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Examiners' Report (presented) 8086 (iv).

Cold Storage Establishment in East Elgin, Assistance to (Ans.) 352 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Cold Storage, Number constructed, Applications, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for, 4223, 4407 (iii).
See 'N.B.'

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1908 (Ans.) 6404 (v).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs. (Ans.) 7990 (iv).

—— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

—— Establishment of (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

—— Number under control of Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Rep. (presented) 1018 (i).

—— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4585 (iii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c. (Ans.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2756 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 516 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Amt. (B. 148) 1° m., 6221 (iv); in Com., 10553 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apples, &c. (Ans.) 4831 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. (B. 123) 1°*, 5337; in Com., 5495 (iii).

—— (B. 197) 1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°*, in Com., 12554 (vii).

Govt. Steamers, Built in Canada (stmnt.) 11124 (vi).

Grain Commissioners Report, on Inquiry for, 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 5791 (iii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 10737 (vi).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ans.) 9280 (v).

—— Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13089 (vii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).

House of Commons Accountant, &c., Increase of Salary under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. (B. 148) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Inspectors of Food Products, Number of Apptmts. (Ans.) 353 (i).

Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, &c. (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2123 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 880 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigations, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7351 (iv).
See 'C. S. Commission.'

Meats and Canned Foods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 149) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6890, 7244; 3° m., 7215 (iv).

Meats and Canned Foods Inspectors, Number appointed, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, &c., Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in Debate on Address, 213 (i).

Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, by Govt. (Ans.) 3818 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9321 (v).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ans.) 9272 (v).

Order, Ques. of, *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, Remarks of Hon. Mr. Scott, 4065 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Perdue, Dr. M. B., Duties and Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for 1018, 1740 (i), 2385 (ii).

Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 6000 (iii).

Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c. (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Smith, Mr. W. M., Dom. Fruit Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Appmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5860 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture (Archives) 671; (census, &c.) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (dairying) 10397; (exhibitions)10569 (vi), 12889; (fumigating stations) 12879 (vii); (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi); (live stock) 12895 (vii); (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (Patent Record) 672 (i); (Seed Control Act) 5500 (iii); (seeds) 12891 (vii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); (salaries) 645; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4044 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13340 (vii); Que. (Cookshire) 7283; (Grosse Isle) 7290; (Knowlton) 7291 (iv).

Quarantine (public health) 5504 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) 1° m., 11120 (vi); in Com., 12408 (vii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Wheat Frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

FORGET, Mr. R., *Charlevoix.*

I.C.R. 'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and ending of running (Ques.) 6054 (iii).

——— Trains and Official Cars, &c. (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ques.) 5795 (iii).

FORGET, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *Toronto, North.*

Accountants for Marine Dept., Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4110 (ii).

Address, The, 66 (i).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 509 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Amounts of Rebates, &c. (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

All-Red Route (remarks) in debate on Address, 87 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12419, 12488 (vii).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Duties in England (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Statement *re*, Negotiations (remarks) 366 (i).

American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Analytical Index to Debates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification of by British Govt. (remarks) 11705 (vi).

See 'Franco, &c.

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 600 (i).

'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907 (Ques.) 184 (i).

——— Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13573 (vii).

Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7307 (iv); on M. for 2°, 10924; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4309 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9335 (v).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4380; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Belleville Hospital Site, Inquiry for Ret., 7506 (iv).

Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports Flagged by him (Ques.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes *re* (remarks) 194 (i).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1291 (i).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Brass Importations, &c. (remarks) 6233 (iv).

Briar Island, N.S., Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904 (M. for ret.*) 1689 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Buchanan Town Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10086 (v).

Budget, The (reply) 5163; (M.) to adjn. debate, 5199; (rsmd.) 5260 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 559 (i); 4316, 4670 (iii).

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).
See 'Financial,' &c.

Buffalo Herd, Location in Elk Park, &c. (Ques.) 5208 (iii).

——— Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

——— Purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ques.) 896 (i).

Business of Hse. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).

Cabinet Appointments (remarks) in debate on Address, 80 (i).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12841, 12850 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11253 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11351; on M. for 1°, 10718, 10727; in Com., 11369, 11549, 11634 (vi), 12164 (vii).

——— (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, Inquiry for, 7505 (iv).

——— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).

Civil Service Commission, Rep., Inquiry for, 938, 1740 (i), 2787, 3043 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).

——— Number printed, &c. (remarks) 6222 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5884 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5631 (iii).

Civil Service System, prop. Res. (M.) to drop, 6242 (iv).

——— (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9132 (v).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 11300 (vi).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 8379 (v).

Cold Storage Ret., Missing Letter (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv. *re* Minister's Stmnt. *re* Insurance Commission, 9337 (v).
See 'N. B. Cold Storage,' &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address, 82 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
See 'Imperial.'

Committee Meetings, Rep. in 'Globe,' on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2383 (ii).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Administration of Estates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

——— Instructions *re* Estates Trusts (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ques.) 1112 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11981 (vi).

Customs Defalcations, Punishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9455 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10133 (v).

Customs, Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8 (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order, *re* Stmnts., 8460 (v).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Deep Waterways Commission, Inquiry *re* Proceedings (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Customs Tariff *re* Materials, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10472 (vi).

——— (remarks) 13526 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1135 (i).

——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called, 2794 (ii).

——— Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1766 (i).

———Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1628 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1851 (i).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8321 (v); in Com., 11828, 11895 (vi), 12945; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 13257 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126 (vi).

——— in Com., 11163, 11165, 11203, 11408,11503, 11453, 11940; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ques.) 313 (i).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10796 (vi).

Doukhobors, Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2218 (ii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4679 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B. C. and Natal Act, &c. (remarks) 1738 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239, 4577 (iii).

Estimates, Insufficient Votes, *re* Public Works, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).

Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

Falconer, K., Payment to for Services (Ques.) 8890 (v).

——— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

'Fielding' Dredge, Number of Days Working (Ques.) 7199 (iv).

Financial Review, (amt.) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).

See 'Budget.'

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7646 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7784 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Original Papers, 8901 (v).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Production of Original Papers (remarks) 9281 (v).

Fish Exportations from Man., Value, &c. (remarks) 4241 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations with Provs., Instruction to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1253 (i); on M. for 2°, 2220; in Com., 3582 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4341 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Discussion *re* prop. Res. (remarks) 942 (i).

——— preparation of stmnt *re* duty units, 943 (i).

——— Delays in Ratification (remarks) 13536 (vii).

——— Distribution of, to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail asked for, 1585 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 931 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 93 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 86 (i).

——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs (remarks) 8 (i).

——— U. S. Exports, Articles, &c. (Ques.) 896 (i).

Geological Survey Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 991

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Girouard, Mr., Resignation from Yukon Council (remarks) 11634, 11938 (vi).
See 'Yukon.'

Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11908 (vi).

Govt. Ownership, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 75 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for three years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).

Grain Transportation from the West, Financial Aid, Explanation in the Senate (remarks) 607 (i).

G. B., Australia and Canada, &c., Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2227 (ii); in Com., 12061 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8134 (iv).

——— Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8837 (v); in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8440 (v).

——— Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).

——— Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6458, 6636 (iv).

——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections (Ques.) 6234 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Liquor Prohibition Sale: Inquiry for Ret. 2024 (ii).

——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

——— Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

——— Prohibition Zone, Cor. Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

——— Purchase of Rails for Eastern Division, &c. (Ques.) 9263 (v).

——— Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 356 (i).

——— Transcontinental Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Halifax Platform of Conservative Leader (remarks) in debate on Address, 66 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims *re* Damages (remarks) 5791 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Ret., Inquiry for, 2882 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against by Immigrants, Par. in Ottawa Citizen, 5488 (iii).

——— Tel. *re* Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).

Honey Imports, from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8177 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 10495 (vi).

——— Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 591 (i).

——— and Senate, Cost outside of Indemnities (Ques.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii).

Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 511 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).
See 'Colonial.'

Imports and Exports, ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 350 (i).

——— Values from June, to Dec. 1907 (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8 (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6467 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. for 2°, 1742 (i).

Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).

——— Discussion *re* (personal explanation) Par. in Montreal 'Star,' 1860 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).

Insurance Commission, Rep. *re* Political Literature, Ques. of Priv., 10792 (vi).

——— Rep., Ques. of Priv., 9461 (v).

——— Total Expenditure of Commission, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).

I.C.R., Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

——— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Circular Letter *re* Payments of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).
——— Claims for Damages, by A. W. Belyea, &c. (Ques.) 9472 (v).
——— Employees, and N.B. Elections (remarks) 3317 (ii).
——— Extension Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 73 (i).
——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv).
——— Transportation, &c. on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4424 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 970 (i).
——— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) in debate on Address, 77 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt., 1763 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2101 (ii).
Lacas, E., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980, 1035 (i).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ques.) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ques.) 8379 (v).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10528 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; on M. for 3° (remarks) 11250 (vi), 12054 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11407 (vi).
Lead Production, by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11705 (vi).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ques.) 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ques.) 564 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c. (personal explanation) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest outstanding, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts: *See* 'Dom. Loans.'
'Lord Kitchener' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ques.) 7198 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to for Legal Services (Ques.) 695 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).
Marconi Co., and Commercial Press Business, (Ques.) 512 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Change of Book-keeping System, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 510 (i).
——— O.Cs., Cor., &c., *re* System (M. for copies*) 852 (i).
——— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).
——— Deputy Minister, Date of Apptmts. of Suspended Officers, &c. (Ques.) 6982 (iv).
——— Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7335 (iv).
——— Amounts paid Counsel (Ques.) 8837 (v).
——— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c., M. to adjourn (remarks) 8445 (v).
——— Evidence *re* (remarks) 11203 (vi).
——— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
——— Evidence and Reports, Printing, &c. (remarks) 11301 (vi).
———Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10741 (vi).
——— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 8889 (v).
——— Public Investigation, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Returns, Inquiry for, 2883 (ii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).
Militia Depts., Threats by Min. of Militia (remarks) 13583 (vii).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).
Militia Stores, Inspection of, &c. (Ques.) 8181 (iv).
Mines Branch, Acting Director, Additional Salary (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Mint, Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c. (Ques.) 11296 (vi).
——— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).
——— Total Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

'Montcalm,' Str., Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).

——— Rep. *re* Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9483 (v).

Motions, Unopposed (remarks) 8839 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Interests, &c., on M. for Sup., 9283; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9425 (v).
See 'St. John,' &c.

N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials (remarks) 3579 (ii).

——— Telegram (read) *re* Interference, 3229 (ii).

——— M. to adjn. House, 3657, 3678 (ii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3060 (ii).
See 'Govt. Officials.'

Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid (Ques.) 509 (i).

Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5060 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).

Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10033 (v).

——— Order, Question of (Mr. D. Ross) 10024 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10332 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); in Com., 10850 (vi).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2425 (ii).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ques.) 11499 (vi).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896 (M. for ret.) 2822; (amt.) to Ret., 2846 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 9579 (v), 12919 (vii).

Patronage *re* Civil Service, &c. (M.) to drop, 6243 (iv).
See 'Civil,' &c.

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11300 (v).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).

Preston, W. T. R., Employment by Govt. (Ques.) 360 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2743 (ii).

Printing in 'Sun,' &c., Inquiry for Ret., 5661 (iii).

Prisoners, Released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'

Protection Tariff, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 74 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Dates of last Payments, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).

——— Sums owing, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 79 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings of (remarks) 945 (i).

——— Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3106 (ii).

——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4496 (iii).
See 'Documents,' &c.

Public Lands of Dom. (remarks) *re* in debate on Address, 70 (i).

Public Works, Applications *re*, Useless Expenditures (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).

——— Deptl. Salaries in Hamilton, Delays (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).

——— Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report, Inquiry for, 4494 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rental, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials (Ques.) 13517 (vii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans Association (remarks) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10633; in Com., 10638; on M. for 3°, 11613 (vi).

Railway Estimates, Obstruction of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v).

Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Ry. Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 13069 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2385, 2882, 3318 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii), 13081 (vii).

Returns ordered and lost in H. of C., placed in Record Dept. (remarks) 2882 (ii).

——— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. 4663 (iii).

Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure (Ques.) 5467 (iii).

Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).

Ross Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, Advances, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i), 8180 (iv).

——— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

St. John Cold Storage Ret., Inquiry for, 2309, 3690 (ii).

——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii). *See* 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

St. Louis, H., Employment by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232, 4579 (iii).

School Lands Exhange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8086 (iv); on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Seed Grain buying and distribution, Information *re* (remarks) 13420 (vii).

——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).

Senate, Number of Sittings, Cost, &c., for 1895 and 1906-7 (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1574 (i).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 70 (i).

Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (Ques.) 1112 (i).

——— Payments to (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5410 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Smith, Mr. Obed, Status in London (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Spain, Commander, Expenses *re*, Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).

——— Aud. Gen.'s Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4405 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1033 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8847 (v).

Sub-target Machines, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Sub-target Machines, Papers referred to Com. for last Session (remarks) 945 (i).

——— Return, Ref. to Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 312 (i).

Supplies for Govt. Contracts, Tenders, Appmt. of Purchasing Commission (prop. res.) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5838 (iii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical offices) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5675 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 636 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) 13578 (vii); (salaries) 637; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610; Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 619 (i); 9693 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 976, 1033; Militia (salaries) 611 (i), 8871 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 614; Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 610; Public Works (salaries) 639; Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9229, 9444; (ports, &c.) 9220 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10054; (homesteads) 10086 (v).

Geological Survey (explorations, officers, &c.) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (printing, &c.) 10507; (Library of Parlt.) 10504; (salaries) 10501 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13577 (vii).

Immigration (general expenses) 5754 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrols) 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1885, 1904 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752; (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662, 5732 (iii), 10289 (v), 13540 (vii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (Ross rifle) 13542 (vii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (seed grain) 2773 (ii).

N.W.M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries) 8863 (v).

N.W.T. (Govt. salaries) 10116; (school grants) 10117 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i); (ice-breakers) 2969; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Post Office (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9108; (uniforms, &c.) 9110 (v).
Public Works (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Alberta (Edmonton) 5705 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Fernie) 5706 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8519; (Dauphin) 8520 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700; (improvements) 5707; (rents, &c.) 5707 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Quebec (Montreal pneumatic postal station) 5703 (iii); (Montreal station C) 7419; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Baddeck) 11219; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11273; (Porter's Lake) 11263 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Architects' branch) 11096; (cement testing) 11088; (clerical assistance) 11099, 11100; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (gratuities) 5730; (graving docks) 5731 (iii); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731; (B.C., Cape Beale Lines) 5731; (cable service) 5731 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5695 (iii); (salaries) 10126; (train service) 10159 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).
Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).
Yukon (Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5206 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ques.) 1126 (i).
Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal, *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8703 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).
—— (Ques.) 3038 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
—— Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Copies, 2855 (ii).
Timber Limit Grants to Messrs McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
—— Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff, Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).
Timber Sales, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff), Ques. of Order, 11304 (vi).
FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10700 (vi).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (remarks) 5565 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (remarks) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information (remarks) 10916 (vi).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 13517 (vii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers at Colonial Conference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).
—— Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Trent Canal, Newmarket Canal, Reps., Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, on M. for Sup., 7651 (iv).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).
Washington Treaty Negotiations and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11233 (vi).
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c. (Ques.) 512 (i).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10283 (v).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid by Govt. (M.) for Copies of Memorials, Cor., &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Negotiations with Banks, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).
See 'Bank,' 'Financial Stringency'
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).
—— (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11166 (vi).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1131 (i).
See 'Congdon,' &c.
Woollen Industry, Reply to Manufacturers Ass'n. by Prime Minister (remarks) 13420 (vii).
Woollen Industry, Pet. *re* (remarks) 13518 (vii).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10529 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).

——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5785 (iii).

Yukon-Congdon, F. T., Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts (Ques.) 12050 (vii).

See 'Wiley.'

——— Election Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1114 (i).

——— Expenditures, Total Amount (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).

——— Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 1346 (i).

Yukon Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe (M. for copy*) 1132 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

Yukon, Govt. Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. T. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10519 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instruction to N.W.M.P. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

——— Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 512 (i).

——— White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Lands. Names (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley vs. Congdon, O.C.s., &c., *re* Charges (M. for copies) (amt.) 1691 (i).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W., *Kings and Albert, N.B.*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7669 (iv).

Budget Debate, Ques. of Order, 6616 (iv).

Buildings, Architectural Designs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Campaign Literature (French) sent by Justice Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10354 (vi).

Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8612 (v).

Campbellton Wharf, Tender *re* Piling Supply (Ques.) 8612 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vii).

Cigarette Restraint Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13015 (vii).

Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11362, 11553 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) on Presentation, 5640 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9187 (v).

Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 695 (i).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13540 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11842 (vi), 13033 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11162, 11165, 11475, 11508, 11964 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10823 (vi).

Doukhobors Bonuses *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 9952 (v).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).

Foresters, I. O., Charges in 'Le Canala,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs, &c. (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12072 (vii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6391 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 629 (i).

Insurance Commission, Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit (Ques.) 6059 (iii).

I.C.R., Answer to Questions (remarks) 13415 (vii).

——— Earnings and Expenses (Ques.) 13510 (vii).

——— Employees, Circular *re* Non-Payment, Par. in St. John Press, on M. for Sup., 10016 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2465 (ii).

——— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

——— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ques.) 13511 (vii).

——— Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

——— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ques.) 9712 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co. (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Loggieville Dredging, Payments *re* (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12793, 12816 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Official, Remarks checked, 6633 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St., &c. (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

National Battlefields Commission (land) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13505 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9328; (M.) to adjn. debate, 9330; rsmd., 9344 (v).

N.B. Elections, Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).

——— Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

N.B. Post Offices, Closing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

N.B. Ry. Mail Service Vacancy, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10331 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Circular Letter from C. S. Association (read) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3130 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7153 (iv).

——— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4924 (iii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13485 (vii).

Rattenbury & Co., Govt. Agents *re* purchasing Oats in P.E.I., Assignment, &c. (Ques.) 12392 (vii).

Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vii).

Ross Rifle Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9053, 9070 (v).

St. John River, Removing Snags, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3477 (ii).

Salmon Fishing by Nets, Privileges in Restigouche River (Ques.) 13518 (vii).

Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598; in Com., 13047 (vii).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10607 (vi); (live stock) 12899; (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Generally (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi); Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174; Trent (damages) 12768 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878; Finance (Ross, H. T.) 12914; Marine and Fisheries (asst. dep. min.) 12915; Railways (Butler, Mr. M. J.) 12755; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 650 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9240, 9260, 9444 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10041, 10051; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Geological Survey (oil boring) 13165 (vii).

House of Commons (salary increases) 13567 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13170 (vii).

Immigration (agents, U.S.) 9965; (literature, &c.) 9950; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12752; (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 12728 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10287 (v); (gratuities) 13177; (R.M. College) 13177; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon) 13168; (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2954 (ii).

Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9107 (v), 13153 (vii)
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 13338: (Ladysmith) 13338 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (rents, &c.) 10982 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10974 (vi); (Portage la Prairie) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10960; (Winnipeg military) 10970 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John, military) 7186; (Tracadie, lazaretto) 7187 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7151; (Yarmouth) 7181, 7182 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490; (Guelph, armoury) 7684; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7698; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702; (London, magazine) 7706; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7811; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Port Arthur) 7825; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7830 (iv).
Public Works—Building—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 11011; (grounds) 11012; (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (museum) 1504 (i); (rents, &c.) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi); (Victoria Museum) 13477 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7279; (Cookshire) 7281; (Dom. renewals) 7286; (Farnham) 7287; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Lachute) 7294; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Levis) 7298; (Longueuil) 7305; (Montreal, post office) 7417; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Nicolet) 7428; (Plessisville) 7430; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, Dom. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Quebec, hospital) 7433; (Quebec, immigrant) 7432; (Quebec, warehouse) 7432; (St. Hyacinthe) 7440; (St. John's) 7441; (St. John's, military) 7442; (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Moose Jaw) 13337; (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver Harbour) 13344; (Dorchester) 13344; (Harvey) 13344; (Leonardsville) 13344; (Lorneville) 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (St. Andrews) 12011; (St. John) 12013; (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345; (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11279; (Round Hill wharf) 11282; (Yarmouth) 11291
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich breakwater) 13350; (Juniper Island) 13350; (McGillicuddy & Smeeth claims) 13350 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Souris) 13341; (Summerside) 13343 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028; (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029; (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029; (Batiscan) 12036; (Berthier) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Chicoutimi) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (East Templeton) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Les Eboulements) 12033; (Montmagny) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Peribonka) 12035; (Petite Decharge) 12034; (Piche Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12037; (Rimouski) 12035; (Rivière du Lievre) 12037; (St. Laurent) 12042; (St. Maurice) 12041 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. and Alta. (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11099; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Chicoutimi) 13179; (operating) 13178 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (locomotives) 10150 (v); (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759; (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329 (vi).
Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12762 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup, 7653 (iv).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10533 (vi).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*

Alberta and British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 192) 1°*, 11120 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3474 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 350 (i).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 606 (i).

Cannon, Catharine Ann Relief (B. 175) M. to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10760 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5128 (iii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1170 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8619 (v); in Com., 11894 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

—— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 5913; 2° m., 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6437 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6492 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 959 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 878 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11237; in Com., 11243 (vi); on M. for 3°, 12059 (vii).

Metal Shingle Patent Relief (B. 207) 2° m., 12649; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Private Bills, 12649 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1108; 2° m., 1468 (i).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9224 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Conc., 13405 (vii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13404 (vii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4967 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10653 (vi).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payments, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5413, 5519 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3808 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3284 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10070 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1484 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8489 (v)

GANONG, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3870 (ii).

Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Geological Report *re* Graphite Properties, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

I.C.R. Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 5466 (iii).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re* (Ques.) 9270 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3667 (ii).

Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms (Ques.) 563 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4935 (iii).

Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., &c., Amounts paid and still due (Ques.) 9269 (v).

GANONG, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 12412 (vii).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

Marine, &c., Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10883; (Victoria immigration) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10897 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8533 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7497; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7705; (Leamington) 7705; (Markham) 7710; (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (rents, &c.) 11002 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10189; (train service) 10160 (v).

Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12923 (vii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ques.) 4582 (iii).

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

——— Rep. of Inspectors, &c. (M. for copy*) 697 (i).

Literary Aid Fund, Proposed Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1286 (i).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3485 (ii).

Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt. of, Capt. Koenig's Duties (Ques.) 11699 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4757 (iii).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 12265, Agreed to, 12389 (vii).

——— 1st rep. (presented) 8515 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works — Buildings — Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4852 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., Ques. of Order, 2809 (ii).

Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 84) 1°*, 1859 (i).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 891 (i).

Port Colborne Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3093 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12207 (vii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal (St. James).*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) on prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4854 (iii).

Anglo-Canadian Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 126) 1°*, 5256 (iii).

Architects, Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10950 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3419 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11538 (vi).

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 92) 1° m., 2543 (ii).

——— (trade restraint) Amt. (B. 96) 1° m., 2976 (ii).

Debates, Official (M.) *re* Correction in Res. on Committees, 824 (i).

——— 1st Rep. (presented) 2590 (ii).

——— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee (presented) 6979 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 7834 (iv); (amt.) 13224 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 8835 (v).

——— 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10228 (v).

Debates, Official Reporters, and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com. on B. 189, 11539 (vi).

Dom. Guarantee Co., Limited (B. 127) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13302 (vii).

Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on Bill 206, 12552 (vii).

Montreal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott, Ques. of Priv., 4064 (ii)

GERVAIS, Mr. H.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2996 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

Supreme Court Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 91) 1° m., 2542 (ii).

Travellers Life Assurance Co.'s Incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 606 (i).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Chicoutimi Public Works Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13188 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4886 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s (B. 107) 1°*, 3834 (ii); in Com., 5386 (iii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *Kent, E.*

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389 iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of Sale, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

Floods at Chatham, Damages *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4743 (iii).

Giraud, Eugene Francois, Patent Relief (B. 52) 1°*, 1108 (i).

Immigration Agents in Ont., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3176 (ii).

Immigration Distribution Agents, James S. Waugh, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1690 (i).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9898 (v).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7486 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Brockville.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 892 (i).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

Bear River Station Dwelling, P.E.I. Tender, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

—— Lease to Robert Co., &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

—— Lease on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).

—— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Co. and G.T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2811 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552, 9066 (v).

'Bessie Butler' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).

—— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 13310 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. (remarks) 192 (i).

—— Connections with C.P.R. (remarks) 432 (i).

Brockville-Ottawa and Prescott Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

Buell, W. S., Employment *re* Telephone Commission (Ans.) 10011 (v).

Campaign Literature sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com. 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 214) prop. Res., 13282; in Com., 13420 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood Branch (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

—— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canals, Statistical Branch, List of Officers (read) 10317 (vi).

Cataract Power Co., Amount of Water diverted at De Cew Falls (Ans.) 897 (i).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter, Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5656 (iii).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction (Ans.) 517 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5894 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9207 (v).

Cold Storage Co. of N.B., Lease of Land to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

Cold Storage Cars for I.C.R. *re* Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1688 (i).

Cooper & White, Payments to Govt. for Land at Welland (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Accident to Bank (statement, 11120 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, (remarks) 12660 (vii).
——— Rep. *re* Repairs, 12161 (vii).
——— Statement *re* Breakage, 11406 (vi).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos., *re* Water Power (remarks) 13084 (vii).
——— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Deep Waterways Commission, Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13152 (vii).
Dom. Power Co.'s Bill, on Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ans.) 9711 (v).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 213) prop. Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1° of B., 13282; in Com., 13419 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5483 (iii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Express Charges in Mar. Prov., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 518 (i).
Falconer, Kenneth, Emplymt. in Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
——— Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6181 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635, 3794 (ii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Accidents *re* Construction, Prevention of (remarks) 6850 (iv).
——— Accidents to Workmen, Investigation, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora (Ans.) 895 (i).
——— Branch Lines, B. 51 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 8137 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8742, 9381 (v).
——— Classifications of Districts 'B' and 'F,' Investigation *re* (Ans.) 12051 (vii).
——— Construction, Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).
——— Contracts, Dates, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6158, 6637 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c. (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Contract for Supplies to District No. 3 (Ans.) 1120 (i).
——— Cost of Construction (M.) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction, on Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12247 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction (reply) on M. for Sup., 12662 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction (remarks) 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).
——— Discrimination against Canadian Contractors (Ans.) 7936 (iv).
——— Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ans.) 5563 (iii).
——— Eastern and Western Limits, Establishment of (Ans.) 9265 (v).
——— Engineering Staff, Changes *re* (Ans.) 509, 681 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, Inclusive of Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 9265 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10395 (vi).
——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9266 (v).
——— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Floods, &c. (explanation) 8894 (v).
——— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding (remarks) 8607 (v).
——— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).
——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ans.) 8618 (v).
——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).
——— Moncton and Winnipeg Section, Number of Miles located (Ans.) 2387 (ii).
——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
——— and N.T. Ry., Disputed Question (Ans.) 6236 (iv).
——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).
——— Prohibition Zone, Reduction of (Ans.) 517 (i).
——— Protest *re* Land Acquisitions (Ans.) 6640 (iv).
——— Purchase of Rails, &c., for Eastern Div. (Ans.) 9264 (v).
——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).
——— Return, on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).
——— Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ans.) 12775 (vii).
——— Steel Rails, Names of Manufacturers, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10790 (vi).
——— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10738 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Steel Rails purchased, Corrected Answer, 13065 (vii).

——— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9026 (v).

——— Transcontinental Commission, Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 13226, 13517 (vii).

——— Transportation of Supplies, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

——— Winnipeg to Moncton Section, Number of Miles completed, &c. (Ans.) 6643 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Halifax and South-western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, 3621, 3702, 3726 (ii),4225; on M. for 3°, 4363, 4542 (iii).

Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connection (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, Total Cost *re* Construction (Ans.) 1686 (i).

——— Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) 1739 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2882, 3042, 3690 (ii).

Hodgins, Major, Resignation from G.T.P. Staff (Ans.) 516 (i).

Holland River Dredging, Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

——— Name of Inspector (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

——— Payments to Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1292 (i), 3237 (ii).

I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re*, &c. (remarks) 6987 (iv).

——— Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10012 (v).

——— Amqui Station, Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

——— Asphalt Platforms: *See* 'Stations.'

——— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151, 10214 (v).

——— Book-keeping System, Cor. *re* Par. in St. John Daily Telegraph, 5260 (iii).

——— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

——— Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).

——— Claims Agent, Mr. E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

——— Claims *re* Damages, Settled and unsettled (Ans.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6002 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Concrete Pipe Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6640 (iv).

——— Connections with Quebec Central at Lévis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).

——— Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

——— Delays to 'Maritime Express' (Ans.) 8615 (v).

——— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).

——— Earnings and Expenses (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13415 (vii).

——— Employees and Civic Elections in Halifax (remarks) 6845 (iv).

——— Increased Wages, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

——— Employees, and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2884 (ii).

——— Employees, Number and Names of Persons taken in N.B. during Jan. and Feb. (Ans.) 5793 (iii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ans.) 4582 (iii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 4576; in Com., 4994 (iii).

——— Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

——— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ans.) 13225 (vii).

——— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

——— Horses killed at Truro, Compensation &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

——— Ice Supply Contract (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

——— Lac Saumon Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

——— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing (Ans.) 5800 (iii).

——— Motor Cars, Test *re* Operation, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

——— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

——— Notices printed in French, &c. (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

——— 'Ocean Limited,' Number of Trips, &c. (Ans.) 6054 (iii).

——— O'Shaughnessy, Pass to (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

———Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 10733 (vi).

——— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene Train Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10158 (v).

——— Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald, &c. (Ans.) 2387 (ii).

——— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax Division, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., answer to question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

——— Pictou and Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

——— Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

——— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10790 (vi).

——— Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I. (Ans.) 5995 (iii).

——— Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

——— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

——— Riviere du Loup Station Master (Ans.) 7445 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock, &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).

——— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

——— Stations, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, *re* (Ans.) 5466 (iii).

——— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ans.) 9269 (v).

——— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

——— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 9712 (v).

See 'Audit,' &c.

——— Sunday Trains, Instructions *re* (Ans.) 10735 (vi).

——— Tatamagouche, Delay in Train Service (Ans.) 1292 (i).

——— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ans.) 12052 (vii).

——— Trains, Hauling of Private Cars (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv). 10149 (v).

——— Transportation, &c. (annual statement) on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).

——— Trois Pistoles Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

——— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

——— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ans.) 1936 (i).

——— Truro Station, Unsanitary Condition (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

——— Williams, Mr., Emplymt. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

——— Unopposed Returns (remarks) 5914 (iii).

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Stock, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Inverness County Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12404 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Name of Contractor of G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 893 (i).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ans.) 8892 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7659 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 9270, 9714 (v).

N.B. Elections, and Govt. Employees (remarks) 3317, 3579 (ii).

——— Interference by Dom. Govt. on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3662 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5049 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10512 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288, 13289 (vii).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power (Ans.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5567 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville & St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ans.) 691 (i).

——— Appmt. of Mr. W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ans.) 9274 (v).

P.E. I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 6642 (iv).

——— Bear River Stationmaster's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1737 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3264 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).
——— Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ans.) 1123 (i).
——— Contract *re* News Agency (Ans.) 8444 (v).
——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).
——— Earnings and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 848 (i).
——— Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) prop. Res., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 2° m., 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2751 (ii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim (remarks) 7100 (iv).
——— Montague Branch Extension (M.) to dsch. Bill, 11405 (vi).
——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Reps., Surveys, &c., on M. for Ret., 850 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
——— Station Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).
——— Time-Table, Protest *re* (Ans.) 1124 (i).
——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ans.) 569 (i).
——— Tunnel, Rep. *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ans.) 562 (i).
——— Winter Communication, Mail Service, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 1206 (i).
Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8851 (v).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s (B. 217) prop. Res., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; in Com., 13491 (vii).
Quebec Bridge Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ans.) 8173 (iv).
——— Names of Jurymen (Ans.) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse or Vehicle Traffic (Ans.) 10739 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report (presented) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
——— on Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii), 6223 (iv).
——— Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv), 8608 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Distribution of Printed Evidence (remarks) 10302 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Co., Salaries to Officials (Ans.) 13517 (vii).
Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 581 (i); on Amt. to Senate Amts., 12192 (vii).
——— (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).
——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3389 (ii).
——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Kennedy) on M. for 2°, 939 (i).
——— (telegraph and telephones) Amt. (B. 118) 1° m., 4658 (iii); 2° m., 10625, 10633; in Com., 10636; 3° m., 10777; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 10783, 11124; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11622; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607 (vi).
Railway Commission Act (Ass't Chief, &c.) Amt (B. 112) prop. Res., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1° m., 3933 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510 (v).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ans.) 9271 (v).
Railway Commission, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Counsel Fees (Ans.) 10257 (v).
Railway Estimates, Vote for (remarks) 10007 (v).
Ry. Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).
Railways and Municipal Agreements, &c. (remarks) 6988 (iv).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Amounts paid and still due (Ans.) 9269 (v).
Ry. Semaphores, Iron Ladders and Posts, &c. (Ans.) 239 (i).
Railway Statistics Report (presented) 1346 (i).
Railway Subsidies (B. 215) prop. Res., 13066; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1° m., 13315; in Com., 13478 (vii).
——— (stmnt.) re Railways under Construction, 13478 (vii).
——— Applications for, Memorandum *re*, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, Bridge Construction (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

Ry. Surveys in Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

——— Correction *re* Answer, 5046 (iii).

Ry. Tracks crossed by Water Mains, &c. (Ans.) 690, 1109 (i).

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 12412 (vii).

Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

Ste. Barbe, Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Plans, Surveys, &c., 3005 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4234, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13474 (vii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 9714 (v).
See 'Ry. Semaphores.'

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Soulanges Canal, Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ans.) 10011 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Overseer (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

———(Ans.) 12413 (vii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Investigation (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ans.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Canals (additional remuneration) 13174 (vii).

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remunerations) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304; (statistical branch) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Cornwall (break in bank) 12768; (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Murray (houses) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—St. Lawrence (District office) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii); (Manning & Macdonald's claim) 5668 (iii).

Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12225 (vii); (damages) 10308 (vi); (damages) 12768; (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi).

Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207 (vii); (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi), 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12755 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (Owen Sound) 7822; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185; Que. (Dominion Arsenal) 7437 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11085 (vi).

Railways—C.P.R. (compensation) 5561 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378; (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12764 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10187 (v); (Amherst) 12233; (Antigonish) 12229; (bridges) 12259; (Chatham diversion) 12757 (vii); (claims dept.) 10177 (v); (collection of revenue) 5694 (iii); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (facilities, &c.) 12259; (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12227; (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (legal costs) 5557 (iii), 10190; (locomotives) 10150 (v); (machinery) 12257; (Moncton, car shops) 12250; (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Mulgrave) 12229; (New Glasgow) 12230; (North Sydney) 12229; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii); (Pictou) 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549 (iii), 12257; (St. Cyrille, diversion) 12756; (St. John, accommodation) 12257 (vii); (St. Rosalie, improvements) 5558 (iii); (Ste. Rosalie) 12259; (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10127 (v); (Springhill junction) 12233 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v); (Stellarton) 12230; (surveys, branch lines) 12764; (Sydney Mines) 12229; (Sydney Mines, diversion) 12759; (Truro) 12231 (vii); (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (extra clerks) 10342; (inspections, &c.) 10341; (litigation) 10357; (statistical branch) 10328; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 6400 (iv).

Telephone Wires, Application to cross R. Tracks (Ans.) 690 (i).

See 'Ry. Tracks,' &c.

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

See 'G.T.P.,' &c.

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

——— Cameron Lake, Water Level, &c. (Ans.) 9772 (v).

——— Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1735 (i).

——— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11940 (vi).

——— Tributaries, Completion of Works, &c. (Ans.) 1115 (i).

——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

——— Surveys, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Tusket Wedge, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Valleyfield Floods, Damages, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808, 7996 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

——— Resignation of John E. Scott (Ans.) 6059 (iii).

White Horse Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade (Ans.) 10736 (v).

Wilberforce Dam, Obstruction to Traffic, &c. Cor., Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Copies, 2989 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Yukon Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ans.) 894 (i).

GRANT, Mr. G. D., *Ontario, N.*

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1584 (i); on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

GREENWAY, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*

Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7880 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1355 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *Wellington, S.*

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. (B. 141) 1°*, 6054 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).

Budget, The, 6011 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).

Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Eastern Trust Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court, &c. (B. 62) 1°*, 1283 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Hamilton Electric Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3697 (ii).

——— on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, *re* Ref. back to Committee, 3362 (ii).

Northern Bank and Crown Bank (B. 156) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3339 (ii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 1°*, 350 (i).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry (prop. res.) 2856 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *Lanark, S.*

Address, The, 548 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3864 (ii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co's B. 214 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13285 (vii).

C.P.R. Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6153 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5643 (iii).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8899 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1175 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1778 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 758 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6774 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5484 (iii).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1240 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3632, 3803 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P. Ry., Branch Line Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9462 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12717 (vii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12249 (vii).

——— Montreal Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

——— Port Arthur Branch, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3748 (ii), 4228 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6431 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13128 (vii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).

——— Rolling Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Transportation, &c. (reply) to Annual Statement, 4448 (iii).

Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 8481 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11245 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12802 (vii).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted, Ruling *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6228 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3270 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in Debate on Address, 548 (i).

Quebec Bridge Report, Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13292 (vii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii); in Com., 4980 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10664 (vi).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3011 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4579 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5450 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Cornwall (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii); (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5668 (iii).

Canals—Trent (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12196 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i).

Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452 (i).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10381; (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 12259 (vii); (collection of revenue) 5693 (iii); (double tracking) 12237; (facilities, &c.) 12259 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12228 (vii); (locomotives) 10149 (v); (Moncton car shops) 12253; (North Sydney) 12229 (vii); (Pictou) 5559 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549, 5550 (iii), 12257; (St. John, accommodation) 12258 (vii); (St. Rosalie) 5558 (iii); (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10128; (supplies) 10202 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10386 (vi).

Temiskaming Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 13305 (vii).

Tenders, *re* Opening of, Ques. of Priv., 2738 (ii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2339 (ii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

HALL, Mr. R. R., *Peterborough, W.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).

Dominion Lumbering and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 9021 (v).

——— Pet. (presented) 1731 (i).

Petition (M.) to Present, 1731 (i).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clark) in Com., 3731 (ii).

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11091 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 5763 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4398, 4517 (iii).

See 'National,' &c.

Binder Twine Bounty, Amount paid from 1903 to 1907, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 191 (i).

Bronte Harbour Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6166, 6174, 6195 (iii); in Com., 6411 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) in Com., 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5119 (iii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) 9734 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, and Customs Tariff, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10488 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13022; on M. for 3°, 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11194 (vi).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 613 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545 (iii).

——— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13268; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase of, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7665 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7797 (iv).

Fort William Ry. Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3584 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10557, 10568 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12557 (vii).

'Grafter,' Use of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 10994 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2236 (ii).

G.T.P., Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141 (iv), 8751 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 95 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3621, 3712, 3735, (ii), 4226; on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10499 (vi).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1323 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13137 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10528 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3035 (ii).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P.R. Extension (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7661 (iv).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13504 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) 797 (i).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4698 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Postal Rate Reduction, &c. (remarks) 3159 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv); in Com., 10704 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).

——— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4939 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3913 (ii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10669 (vi).

Railways and Municipal Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations (remarks) 6987 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7676, 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4235, 4546 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2777 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Supply, Estimates, Total Appropriations, 5919 (iii).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2782 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10572 (vi); (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9748 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613; Sec. of State (salaries) 612 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 814; (tobacco stamps) 816 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4207 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1896 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (wrecks) 3197 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5526; (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5699 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10864; (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10870; (Victoria, immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military) 10973 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) customs) 7143; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, miltary) 7143 (iv); (Parrsborough) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7498; (Guelph, armoury) 7680; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7694; (Hamilton, post office) 7696; (North Bay) 7714; (Owen Sound) 7818; (Sarnia) 7829; (Simcoe) 7830; (Welland) 7831 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents, &c.) 10983, 10994 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Bronte) 12091 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5712 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11108 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 12728 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Tobacco, Canadian, Protection to, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 914 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Vancouver Bank incorp B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2787 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Alberta.*

Blairmore Townsite (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12741 (vii).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3475 (ii).

Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10547 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in Possession of Govt. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13309 (vii).

Customs Officers at Windsor, Age, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11915 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 761 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11136; in Com.,11164, 11169, 11410, 11504 (vi); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12397 (vii).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 3433 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Fishery Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13214 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Application for, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Homesteaders for Sections 16, 15, 27, &c., Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c. *re* Coal Mining Lands, (M. for copies*) 698 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure from March, 1907, 1908 (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4674 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin under Irrigation Regulations (Ques.) 7209 (iv).

Land Patents, S.E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8867 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 430 (i).

Macleod Post Office, Report re Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13223 (vii).

Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipping, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3402 (ii).

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470 (v).

Section 14, South-east Quarter, Application for, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1360 (i).

Seed Grain Supply Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2782 (ii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3810 (ii), 12596; in Com., 12620; in Com., 13048 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Squatters' Claims in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10617 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 632 (i).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (coal lands) 10072; (forest rangers) 10049; (salaries) 10044 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9881; (agents, U.S.) 9967; (deportations) 9884 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753 (vii).

Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5758 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5743 (iii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8867 (v).

Post Office (inspectors) 9109 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farm, repairs, &c.) 10907; (quarantine stations) 11008 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Edmonton) 8580; (Humboldt) 8587 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2373 (ii).

White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6183 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J., *Kings (P.E.I.)*

Address, The, 380 (i)

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

Budget, The, 6097 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1709 (i).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name of I.C.R., &c. (prop. res.) 6243, 6284 (iv).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2449 (ii).

Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald,' Ques. of Priv., 8289 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12826 (vii).

Nipissing Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 170) 1°, 8694 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3258 (ii).

—— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12635 (vii).

—— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

P.E.I., Ice-Breaker, Contract for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 365, 1734 (i); 5796 (iii); 8444 (v).

—— Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re* (remarks) 8515 (v).

—— Winter Comunication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4628 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7752 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943, 2953; (wrecks) 3191 (ii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2212 (ii).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*

Advertisements in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Balsam Lake and Gull River Ret., Incomplete, &c. (remarks) 6059 (iii).

Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10308(vi). *See* 'Trent,' &c.

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); in Com., 4399, 4417, 4527 (iii).

'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Board of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, Protection *re* (prop. res.) 2992 (ii).

—— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Booms in International Streams, Regulation B. 105 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 1°, 3655 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization and British Rights, on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii). *See* 'Naturalization.'

C.P.R. Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Canadian Patriotic Funds B. 216 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 13320 (vii).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).
Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11317; in Com., 11544, 11639 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7579, 7596 (iv)
Cornwall Canal, Breakage, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 13085 (vii).
Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup., (remarks) 10136 (v).
Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10247 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11808, 11837 (vi); 12955 (vii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B.181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11170, 11950; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi).
Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13281 (vii).
Fishing Licenses in B.C., Grants to Japanese (Ques.) 7445 (iv).
Fruit Inspection, Apples, &c., Complaints *re*, 2757 (ii).
G.T.R., Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12078 (vii).
G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6657 (iv).
—— (remarks) 6850 (iv).
G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12680 (vii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10396 (vi).
G.T.P., Supplies, Transportation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi)
—— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1448 (i).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6706 (iv).
Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportation, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).
I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re* (read) 6986 (iv);
—— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10218 (v).
—— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1601 (i).
Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ques.) 10735 (vi).
Lancaster, Cadet, R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct, &c., on M. for Sup, 1019 (i).
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ques.) 10014 (v).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 606 (i).
Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. for Sup., 9504 (v).
Lumber Industry, Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).
Militia Rations, Cost per Day (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13505 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com.,11992 (vi).
See 'Canadian Naturalization.'
Newmarket Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. for Sup., 10403 (vi).
Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting (M. for copies) 3851 (ii).
Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).
—— Homesteads leased, sold, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).
Peace River Valley Lands, Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).
Postal Service in the House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 12629 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, in Com. on B. 215 (remarks) 13485 (vii).
Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald (Ques.) 6401 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4953 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).
—— City Corps., &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Quebec Tercentenary, Transportation of Volunteers (remarks) 8377, 8384 (v).
Ques. of Priv. *re* Doukhobors, &c., 7321 (iv).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3413 (ii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re* (Ques.) 8610 (v).
Religious Fanatics (remarks) 12161 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ques.) 11494 (vi).
——— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).
——— Deficiency in Manufacture, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).
——— Par in Ottawa Citizen, *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges (Ques.) 10515 (vi).
———Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v)
——— Tests, &c. (remarks) 8169 (iv).
See 'Lee-Enfield,' &c.
R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1019 (i).
School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6864 (iv).
Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., Extension, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903, 2935 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1360 (i).
Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).
Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).
S. A. Contingent, Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ques) 1110 (i).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) on prop. Res., 3759 (ii); in Com. on Res, 12596 (vii).
S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ques.) 1110 (i).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).
Stewart, James, Inspecting Auditor, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10152 (v).
Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi).
Canals—Cornwall (repairs to bank) 12768 (vii).
Canals—Generally (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).
Canals—Trent (damages) 12768 (vii); (repairs, &c.) 10305 (vi).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12219 (vii).
Customs—Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v).
Excise (methylated spirits) 823 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13162 (vii).
Indians—N.B. (schools) 13170; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12751 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4030 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (provisions, &c.) 12152; (R. M. College) 12152 (vii).
Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commission) 13168; (cotton strikers) 13158; (Olympic Games) 13167; (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (seed grain) 2775 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7495 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7712 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1459 (i); (ventilation) 11010 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10885 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Porter's Lake) 11263; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11270; (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090; (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12090; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Collingwood) 12096; (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11093; (engineering branch) 11095; (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11071 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (operating) 13178; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12760; (Sydney Mines diversion) 12759 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Resolution from Moral Reform Associations, 11302 (vi).
Trent Canal, Cameron Lake Water Level, Purchase of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).
——— Extension to Gull River, Reps., Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies) 2991 (ii).
See 'Balsam,' 'Bobcaygeon,' 'Newmarket.'
——— Tributary Works, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).
Wilberforce Dam., Obstruction to Traffic, &c., Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2988 (ii)

HUNT, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*

Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4818 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8242 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11173, 11442, 11526, 11954 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act, Man. Voters' Lists, Polling Divisions made by Judges (remarks) 13139 (vii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10819 (vi).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11035 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12583 (vii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Ques. of Priv., 10793 (vi).

Ques. of Privilege, Letter from Mr. Cyr (read) 8460 (v).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1365 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 9881 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; (Selkirk) 8548; Sask. (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8602 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12767 (vii).

JACKSON, Mr. W., *Elgin, W.*

Address, The, 412 (i).

Budget, The, 5959 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vii).

Cattle sold at Central Experimental Farm, Sale of (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for seeds, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

—— Sale of Cattle, &c. (Mr. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amount of Expenditure for Cleaning, &c. (Ques.) 8888 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Vehicle Traffic (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10576 (vi); (live stock) 12899 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4086 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1077 (i); (naval schools) 3224; (wrecks) 3205 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Yarmouth) 7181 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii).

'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ques.) 682 (i).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A., *Cape Breton, South.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13056 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5254 (iii).

Committee Meeting, Rep. *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Ques. of Order, 2383 (ii).

Co-Operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9129 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1337 (i).

I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4487 (iii).

Keewatin Diocese Synod incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9330 (v).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal (B. 185) 1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries, Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896 (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Metal Shingle and Siding Co.'s Patent (B. 210) 1° m., 12649 (vii).

Obstruction to Supply, Ques. of Order, 10024 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2429 (ii).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3128, 3139 (ii).

——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 9890 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4949 (iii).

Public Works, &c., in N. S., Irrelevancy of Debate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7129 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on order for 2° (remarks) 5211 (iii).

Sessional Papers and Returns: Number ordered, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Number presented, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).

Supplies purchased for Govt., &c., Ques. of Order, *re* Investigation by Pub. Accounts Com., 5830 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5667 (iii).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

House of Commons (contingencies) 10502 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4759 (iii).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1906 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1053 (i); (ice-breakers) 2958 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby) 11226 (vi); Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 12258 (vii); (supplies) 10201 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) 1°*, 9330 (v); on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E., *Toronto, East.*

Address, The, 434 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12460 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of B. E. Walker (read) 6008 (iii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12877 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6889 (iv).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9735 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12932; on M. for 3°, 13230 (vii).

Election Corruption, Charges of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, ref. to in debate on Address, 435 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Miles Located, &c. (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12567 (vii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9487 (v).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12218 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3893 (ii).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3906, 3922 (ii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (constrution) 12226; (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12209 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9738; (salaries) 9699 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2962; (life-saving stations) 2972 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (new deptl. building) 5701; (post office) 5705; (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal,

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

postal station B) 7419; (Montreal, post office) 7411; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Point St. Charles) 7419; (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 5702; Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10146 (v).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Toronto Harbour, (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 10014 (v).

KENNEDY, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*

B. C. Fishing Licenses to Packer's Association, Issue of (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

Customs Defalcations in B. C., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10485 (vi).

——— Ques. of Priv., 9459 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Speakers (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1725 (i).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031 (vi).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 748 (i).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9501 (v).

Obstructions *re* Supplies, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9943 (v).

Ry. Act, 1903 (fires, &c.) Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 350; 2° m., 938 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Assiniboia, West.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11549 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11413, 11958 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10826 (vi).

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8128 (iv), 9382 (v).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. for Sup., 6291 (iv).

Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9510 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9068 (v).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1368 (i).

Seed Wheat in N. W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P., Ques. of Priv., 1438 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12595 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9700 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8596 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9668 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Address, The, 459 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4713 (iii).

Autonomy Act Validity, Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12740 (vii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Buchaman Townsite, Applications *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10079 (v).

Budget, The, 5605 (iii).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309 (vii).

——— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R. Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6882 (iv).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10550 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c. (Ques.) 12656 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Coal Mines Royalty, Sums received by Govt. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).
Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1637 (i).
——— on M. for Sup., 1839 (i).
Documents, Original, *re* Timber Berths (M. for papers, &c.) 2855 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8150 (iv), 11791; in Com., (amt.) 11898 (vi).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11158, 11168 11415, 11505, 11942; on M. for 3° (amt.) 11976 (vi), 12395; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 65) 12395; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).
Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 754 (i).
Dom. Lands, Area disposed of by Govt. (Ques.) 3431 (ii).
——— Sales of during 1907 (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
——— Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).
——— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905, &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).
Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10816 (vi).
Doukhobor Prisoners at Fort William, Pardon by Justice Dept. (remarks) 6847 (iv).
——— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ques.) 6983 (iv).
Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. *re* Conduct, &c. (remarks) 7621 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, 6752 (iv).
Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ques.) 694 (i).
Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3651 (ii).
Grain Commission's Rep., Inquiry for, 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13208 (vii).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9469 (v).
Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. in Excise Dept., &c. (Ques.) 7730 (iv).
Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10100 (v).
Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by R. Cruickshank, of N. W. (M. for copies*) 698 (i).
LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Homestead Entry for S. W. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ques.) 2167 (ii).
Homestead Entries N. E. ¼ Sec. 28, Permissions *re* Grants (Ques.) 1941 (i).
Homestead Entries in N. W. Quarter Section 35, &c. (Ques.) 4762 (iii).
Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).
Homesteads, Sale of in Township 13, Range 13 (Ques.) 7206 (iv).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6368 (iv).
Indian Lands, Sale of, Ret., Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 962 (i).
Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of ¼ section 16, &c. (Ques.) 3432 (ii).
Land Patents, Sections 36, &c., Issue of (Ques.) 3481 (ii).
Land Sales in N. W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).
Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of (Ques.) 5083 (iii).
Land Titles Act Assurance B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8481 (v).
Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ques.) 9475 (v).
Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).
McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton (Ques.) 6981 (iv).
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).
McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ques.) 6401 (iv).
Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re* (remarks) 9281, 9723 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13221 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6890 (iv).
Moberly, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3848 (ii).
Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9493; (amt.) 9494 (v).
Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ques.) 5082 (iii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10001 (v).

'Phoenix' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10713 (vi).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. and SS. Co., Last Deficit, &c. (Ques.) 6459 (iv).

Quarter Sections 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3410 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3401 (ii).

Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 5209 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).

Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 3435 (ii).

———.Report *re* (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

See 'Timber,' &c.

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, Mines, &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3431 (ii).

School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c. Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Payment, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution to Settlers in N. W. (Ques.) 692 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1352 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

Six Nation Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 6242 (iv).

——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ques.) 6239 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3790, 3831 (ii); in Com. (amt.) 12621; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9764 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10041; (homesteads) 10082; (salaries) 10041 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 9858; (deportations) 9882; (Doukhobors) 9956; (hospitals) 9983; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12733 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii).

N. W. M. Police (pay of force) 8869 (v).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii).

Post Office (inspection) 9114 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10906 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10957 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10910 (vi); (North Bay) 7715 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta (Edmonton) 8579; (Battleford) 8577; (Estevan) 8581; (Humboldt) 8582; (Regina) 8602 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (Lesser Slave) 5719 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 12764; I.C.R. (surveys, branch lines) 12764 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1220-1272, on Order for Ret. (amt.) 849 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ques.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

——— (M.) for Com. of Investigation, 2260, 2269; Amt. Neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).

Timber Sales, &c., on Amt. to Com. of Sup., 8769; (amt.) 8778; Amt. neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).

Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

Wheat Feed Shipments, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos. (Ques.) 893 (i).

Wheat Transportation, Financial Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Address, The, 292 (i).

Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6177, 6197 (iii).

Canada-Germany Trade Relations (remarks) 13081 (vii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Cattle exported to U. S. during 1900-7, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11252 (vi).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ques.) 1937 (i).

Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13039 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13265 (vii).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Packing of Apples (remarks) 2760 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11249 (vi).

Meat and Canned Food Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 352 (i).

Militia Stores and Arms, Care of for Rural Battalions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).

Port Maitland, Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ques.) 690 (i).

——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10714 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, &c. (remarks) 8862 (v).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10676 (vi).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 677 (i).

Canals, 10319 (vi); Welland (Port Maitland) 5676 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5735; (stores, care of) 5736 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8522 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Leamington) 7815; (Owen Sound) 7822; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7832 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11275; (Pugwash wharf) 11281 (vi).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Welland Canal, Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation (M. for copy*) 852 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).

——— Resignation of John R. Scott (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2189 (ii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Charges against A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 657 (i).

Woollen Industry, Deputations *re* (remarks) 13082 (vii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 362 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4865 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3473 (ii).

Campaign Literature, franking by Depts., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) on M. to place on Order Paper (remarks) 13494 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cannon, Catherine Ann Relief B. 175, on M. (Mr. Galliher) to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12204 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1814 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11726; in Com. (amt.) 11816; (amt.) 11841 (vi), 12967 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11177 (vi).

Electrical and Gas Power Licenses granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ques.) 360 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trades Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3532 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3801 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5239 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10313 (vi).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9382 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup. 12707 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12318 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2246 (ii); in Com., 12076 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3718 (ii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12400 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12566 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 90 (i); 2° m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).

——— on Order for 2° (remarks) 570 (i).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13501 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9367 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3057 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Purchase for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

Niagara Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5002 (iii).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9906 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* improvements (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 91; 2° m., 570; in Com., 583 (i); (amt.) on Senate Amts., 12191, Neg. (Y. 42; N. 85) 12192 (vii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3353 (ii).

———(compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5247 (iii).

Railway Commission (ass't chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3909 (ii); in Com., 4967 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10645; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11624; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

——— (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

Ry. Act (mortgages) Chap. 38, B. 204 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 12550 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12601 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10309; (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12221; (surveys) 12208 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9753 (v).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540; Miscellaneous (legal expenses) 9578; Outside Service (salaries) 9439 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4050, 4103 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Colborne) 12096; (Collingwood) 12096; (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (inspections) 10342 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) in Com., 12408 (vii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

Waterways Commission *re* International Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9753 (v).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

——— Deepening, Estimated Cost (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).

——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2190 (ii).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 17 (i).

Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ques.) 516 (i).

——— O.C. *re* (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3373 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay Patrol) 4027 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provinces (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

——— Number under Control of Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).

LAURIER, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Prime Minister) G.C.M.G., *Quebec East.*

Address, The, (M.) *re* Precedence, 8 (i).

Address, The 40 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 544 (i).

——— (M.) to present, 554 (i).

Adjournment for Christmas: (M.) 754 (i).

See 'Business,' &c.

Advertisements for Tenders of Public Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4706 (iii).

All-Red Line (prop. res.) 12414, Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501 (vii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12495 (ii).

All-Red Route, Authority *re* Negotiations, &c. (statement) 366 (i).

——— Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ans.) 353 (i).

——— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ans.) 10254 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Presence in London (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. White's Duties in England (Ans). 694 (i).

——— Resolutions (remarks) 12162 (vii).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of (remarks) 8440 (v).

Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. &c. (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 7447 (iv), 8516 (v).

——— on Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

——— Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Tel. from Mr. Bryce *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty Cor, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 599 (i).

See 'Japanese.'

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 4221, 4314 (iii).

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) prop. Res., 3579, 3901; 1° m., 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4530, 4534, Agreed to (Y. 90; N. 11) 4535 (iii).

Battlefields Commission (lands) Amt. B. 219 1° m., 13495; in Com., 13501 (vii).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, New Lease (remarks) 947 (i).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2820 (ii).

Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, &c. (remarks) 241 (i).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3471 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (remarks) 895 (i).

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re* Installation (Ans.) 9474 (v).

Business of the House (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii), 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) 2982 (ii)

See 'Govt. Business,' &c.

Cabinet Appointments, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 44 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges and Investigation *re* (remarks) in debate on Address 65 (i).

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Discontinuance of (Ans.) 941 (i).

——— Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i),

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ans.) 12391 (vii.)

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6418 (iv).

Canada and U. S. Treaties, on Inquiry (Mr R. L. Borden) 7835 (iv).

See 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by Customs Officer of U. S. (remarks) 11122 (vi).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12849 (vii).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— Conditions *re* Investigation of Marine Dept., 6143 (iii).

——— Cor. *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. Laid on Table, 6464 (iv).

See 'Civil Service,' &c., 'Marine and Fisheries.'

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo by G. B., Cable *re* Removal (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes (remarks) 9127, 9343, 9460 (v).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8894, 9266 (v).

Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ans.) 514 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on M. to resume adjn. debate, (remarks) 5246, 5251 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11562 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6148 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).

——— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals (announcement 6003 (iii).

——— Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to Adjn. House, 5887 (iii).

——— Report, (remarks) on Presentation, 5633 (iii).

——— Translation of (remarks) 11312 (vi).

Civil Service List (presented) 93 (i).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9200 (v).

Cold Storage, Papers on, Inquiry for, 3690 (ii).

See 'N.B. Cold Storage, &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address 41 (i).

See 'Travelling,' &c.

Commercial Travellers Tax, Condition *re* Abolition of (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 6 (i).

——— (M.) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).

——— Organization of (remarks) 505 (i).

——— (M.) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 583 (i); (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 28 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 940 (i).

Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9283 (v).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 2786 (ii).

Debates of the House, Average Price per Column (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).

——— (remarks) 12505 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Debates of the House, 4th Rep. (translaters) on M. to ref. back to Com. (remarks) 8900, 9710, 9889, 10119, 10242 (v).

Debates, Official, French Edition, Delays in Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

——— French Supt. of Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).

——— Instruction *re* Laying on Table (remarks) 7810 (iv).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1623 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1845 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 1927 (i).

——— on Notice being called, 2794 (ii).

See 'Public Documents,' 'Timber,' &c.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 5247 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8296 (v); in Com., 11807 (vi), 12922; on M. for 3°, 13231 (vii).

Dom. Election Bill, 1903, Preparation of (remarks) &c., 8393 (v).

Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with (remarks) 7721 (iv).

Dom. Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) on Senate Amts., 12773 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi).

Doukhobors, Prisoners at Fort William (remarks) 6848 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7620 (iv).

Dredging Companies, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

——— O.Cs. *re* Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6747 (iv).

Dredging in Quebec Harbours in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) 1738 (i).

——— Tel. of Sec. of State (read) 1859 (i).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Easter Adjournment (M.) 6464 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3239 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to S. Africa (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Empire Day and Ascension Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 8894 (v).

Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (remarks) 5206 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations, &c., between U. S. and Canada (remarks) 2023 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty Boundaries with U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6740, 6844 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8295 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty (remarks) in debate on Address, 43 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* 3°, 3754 (ii).

See 'Canada and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Govt. Business, (announcement) 7834 (iv).

——— Introduction of Bills (remarks) 10258 (v).

——— Legislation (remarks) 10303, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).

——— Stmnt. *re* Legislation, 12049, 12163 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (M.) 6287 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) 11903 (vi).

Govt. Ownership of Rys., &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 51 (i).

Grain Commission, Number of Members, &c. (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

Grain Commissioner's Report (Ans.) 180 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 609 (i), 2381 (ii).

Grain Inspection, Total Expenditure and Receipts in 1906 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9465 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimate of Cost (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com., 7320 (iv).

——— Charges *re* Classification (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— Statement from Mr. Parent (remarks) 6985, 7097 (iv).

——— (M.) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Location, Conference in Montreal, Par. in Toronto 'World' (remarks) 7809 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2224 (ii); in Com., 12071 (vii).

G.B. and U.S. Treaties, Papers laid on Table, 8694 (v).

See 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ans.) 184 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of (remarks) 1208 (i).

Halifax Platform, *re* Conservative Speeches (remarks) in debate on Address, 47 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3695 (ii), 4226 (iii).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hindus, Immigrants and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5489 (iii).

Hodgins, Major, Retirement of (remarks) 366 (i).

See 'G.T.P.,' &c.

House of Commons Act Amt. B. 66 (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for 2°, 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allottment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).

——— Employees, Apptmts. and Recommendations, &c. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

——— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 588 (i).

House of Commons and Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities (Ans.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Co., Lord Selkirk's Estate, Original Land Registers, &c. (Ans.) 4403 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6432 (iv).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ans.) 567 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7077 (iv).

——— on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7454 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued, &c. (remarks) 607 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations (Ans.) 1939 (i).

Indian Lands, Sale in Algoma, Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 13416 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Indian Lands (remarks) 13532 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6479 (iv).
Insurance, Supt. of, Salary (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).
I.C.R., Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea (Ans.) 9472 (v).
——— Freight Rate *re* Fredericton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor., 2562 (ii).
——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line, Representation *re* Placing of Buildings (Ans.) 356 (i).
——— Correction of Answer, 519 (i).
Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10596 (vi).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 1424 (i).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) on debate on Address, 58 (i).
——— Debate in Japanese Diet, *re* (remarks) 4738 (iii).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret., 864 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1929 (i).
See 'Anglo-Japanese,' &c., 'Dunsmuir.'
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of, from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).
Labour Rep. (presented) 841 (i).
Library of Parlt., Com. (M.) 312 (i).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Lumber Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Inland Rev. Dept. at Toronto and Sub-Postal Stations (Ques.) 5798 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Toronto Globe' *re* (remarks) 6986 (iv).
Major's Hill Park and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425 (i).
See 'G.T.R.,' &c.
Manitoba Boundaries (prop. res.) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
——— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 2882 (ii), 7506 (iv), 11706 (vi).
Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4006 (ii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of (remarks) 7996 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Ass't. Judge (remarks) 11312 (vi).
——— Delay in Investigation, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8453 (v).
——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup., 9731 (v).
——— Evidence transmitted day by day to House (remarks) 8293 (v).
——— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
——— Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
——— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
Marine Deptl. Officials, Suspension, &c. (remarks) 6003 (iii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 46 (i).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).
Midland 'Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertising (Ans.) 3235 (ii).
Montreal Directory in Library of House, (Ans.) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures *re* for the last fifty years (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3441, (amt.) 3442, Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).
——— Claim of Govt. *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
Morning Sittings (M.) 9477; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9495 (v).
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 5256 (iii); in Com., 11990 (vi).
Naval Defences, Imperial, Contributions by Canada (Ans.) 1118 (i).
N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3049, 3075 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3675 (ii).
Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid, &c (remarks) 509 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 3 (i).
Obstruction Tactics *re* Dom. Elections Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10035 (v).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Payments to (Ans.) 4244 (iii).
Old Age Pensions (M.) for Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2423 (ii).
Ontario, Northern Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).
Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6852 (iv).
——— Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2853 (ii).
Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13581 (vii).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3971 (ii).
Petroleum Bounty Bill (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy, &c. (Ans.) 352 (i).
Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).
Post Office, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 93 (i).
Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2742 (ii).
——— Mail Service, on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., &c., 1206 (i).
P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-Establishing of (Ans.) 8383 (v).
P.E.I., Queen's County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 355 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4650 (iii).
Printing and Lithographing outside of Canada, Amounts expended (Ans.) 1732, 1931 (i).
Printing, Supt. of, Apptmt. of a Frenchman (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 312 (i).
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time (M.) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10123 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 61 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3075 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1384 (i).
Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (M.) to ref. to Public Accounts Committee, 311 (i).
Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure (remarks) 2940 (ii).
Public Documents, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).
——— Production in Committees, 1428 (i).
See 'Documents.'
Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height (Ans.) 5203 (iii).
——— Change of Site, &c. (remarks) 7931
Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2557 (ii).
——— Ref. to, in debate on Address, 544 (i).
Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13403 (vii).
——— (remarks) 3901 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans (remarks) 7448 (iv).
——— Legal Holidays (Ans.) 7934 (iv).
——— Transportation of Volunteers remarks) 8378 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary, and Visit of Prince of Wales, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5210 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary: *See* 'Battlefields.'
Questions, Precedence of (Ans.) 350 (i).
Railway Act (water mains, &c.) Amt. B. 43 (Mr. Barr) on M. for 2°, 5225 (iii).
——— B. 85 (Mr. A. Lavergne) on M. for 2°, 5243 (iii).
——— (passenger tickets) Amt. B. 90 (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for 2°, 5245 (iii).
——— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10644; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11605 (vi).
——— (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10121 (v).
Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
Returns, Inquiry for 569, 1739 (i), 2024 (ii), 6010 (iii).
See 'Sessional.'
Rolla L. Crain, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 3239 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Report from Public Accounts (remarks) 5914 (iii).
——— Target Practice, Suspension by N. W. M. Police (Ans.) 3818 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to amend, 2986 (ii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3012

St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to (Ans.) 2977 (ii).

Saturday Sittings (M.) 11501 (vi).

School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6866 (iv).

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1567 (i).

Sessional Returns, Number presented, &c. (Ans.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping Cos., Pacific Coast, Amount of Subsidies (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract for (Ans.) 2386 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res., 3757 (ii).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition by Govt. (Ans.) 2791 (ii).

South Huron Elections Expenses, Payment by Ret. Officer (Ans.) 11935 (vi).

Speech from Throne, Reply from Gov. Gen. (presented) 1584 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8846 (v).

Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of (remarks) 8087 (iv).

——— Ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections (M.) 8887 (v).

Sub-Target Machines, on submitting Papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3286 (ii).

Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under (Ans.) 7989 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5816 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10594 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

N. W. M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries, &c.) 8863 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10364 (vi).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Telegraph and Telephone Bill, and Man. Boundaries (remarks) 3043 (ii).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Timber Berths, Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret. (amt.) 2856 (ii).

——— Returns, on Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921; Ques. of Order, 921 (i).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5199 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).

Treaty Negotiations between Canada and U. S., &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

See 'Anglo-American.'

Trent Canal Extension, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2992 (ii).

Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

U. S. Training Ships passing through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5338 (iii).

——— Inquiry as to Armaments, &c. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings (M.) 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

Winnipeg Bank Co.'s incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Henderson) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) 7452 (iv).

Woollen Industry Relief, Legislation (remarks) 12772 (vii).

——— Memorandum from Mfg. Ass'n. read 13518-19 (vii).

——— Specific Duties (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9648 (v).

——— Finance Ret., on Inqiury for, 6464

——— Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689 (vii).

——— (remarks) 10303 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N. W. M. P. (remarks) 565 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*

Address, The, 476 (i).

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4410, 4499; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4533 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ques.) 842 (i).
Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ques.) 2545 (ii).
——— Payments *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
——— Residence in District, &c. (Ques.) 2218 (ii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5900 (iii).
Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Beauparlant) on M. for 1°, 7319 (iv).
Customs Dues on French Books, Reduction *re* French Treaty (Ques.) 2160 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3487 (ii).
——— Delays in Printing (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
——— French Supt. of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1827 (i).
French Language, Par. in 'La Presse,' Ques. of Priv., 8291 (v).
——— Pet. *re* (read) 8886 (v).
——— Ques. of Privilege *re* Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 1209 (i).
——— Use of on Railway Crossings, &c. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii).
Halifax Garrison, Replace by Imp. Troops (Ques.) 1288 (i).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3716 (ii).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6718 (iv).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1303 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1287 (i).
I.C.R., Notices printed in French, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2137 (ii).
——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1603 (i).
Japanese Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta (Ques.) 2162 (ii).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ques.) 357 (i).
Justice, Administration of, in Quebec, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 842 (i).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruption of Services, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).
Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G. T. P. Commission (Ques.) 2162 (ii).
Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4070 (ii).
Order Paper, Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).
Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 7934 (iv).
——— New Series, Issue of (Ques.) 6397 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3095 (ii).
Quebec Superior Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (Ques.) 1288 (i).
Quebec Tercentenary, Legal Holidays (Ques.) 7934 (iv).
——— Par. in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 4669 (iii).
——— Postage Stamps, Printing in French and English (Ques.) 7935 (iv).
——— Postage Stamps (remarks) 8895 (v).
——— Rep. of Commission (remarks) 7449 (iv).
——— Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle,' Ques. of Priv., 5209 (iii).
Ques. of Privilege, Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).
——— Voting of French Members (remarks) 7993 (iv).
Railway Act (dual language) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).
——— (scheduled time) Amt. (B. 106) 1° m., 3655 (ii).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3914 (ii).
Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ques.) 357 (i).
R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau, Ques. of Priv., 7094 (iv).
School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of (Ques.) 6644 (iv).
——— Notice of Discussion, 6647 (iv).
——— (M.) to adjn., 6854 (iv).
S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3758 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii).
Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadians as Commissioners, Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond & Arthabaska.*

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).

'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges *re* (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Construction of, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3269 (i).

SUPPLY—

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

Presbyterian College Board (B. 154) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii); (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A., *Prince (P.E.I.)*

Adjournment of the House (M.) 4495 (iii).

Alberton Fire, Damage Claims, Inquiry for Ret., 1209 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13053, 13055 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494 (vii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c. (Ques.) 681 (i).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders re Construction, &c. (Ques.) 513 (i).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).

Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract (Ques.) 4831 (iii).

Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ques.) 1733 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Estimates, Discussion on Resolutions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1726 (i).

Fisheries Jurisdiction between Dom. and Provs., Instructions to Agent (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6261 (iv).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8382 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Higgin's Shore, P.E.I., Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 694 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1686 (i).

——— Return, Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).

Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 10254 (v).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2444 (ii).

——— Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 8444 (v).

Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Issue of Licenses (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2430 (ii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3892 (ii).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).

P.E.I. Life-saving Stations, Establishment of (Ques.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishment of (Ques.) 8383 (v).

P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1686 (i).

——— (M. for ret.) 2171 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).

——— (remarks) 11679 (vi).

P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet *re* Construction (Ques.) 6642 (iv).

——— Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3254 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13490 (vii).

P.E.I. Ry., Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

——— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* News Agency (Ques.) 8444 (v).

P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4606 (iii).

——— Rep. *re*, Inquiry for, 9893 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ques.) 2546 (ii).
—— Discussion, &c, 4496 (iii).
—— Ice-breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).
See 'Ice-breaker.'
P.E.I. Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).
—— Withdrawal of Steamer, &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Changes (Ques.) 1940 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3920 (ii); in Com., 4975 (iii).
Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9821 (v).
Returns, Detention of by Members, Ques. of Priv., 5048 (iii).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690, 3752 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3777 (ii); in Com., 13047 (vii).
'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ques.) 687 (i).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley' (remarks) 6160 (iii)
SUPPLY—
Marine (ice-breakers) 1899 (i).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2944, 2949 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, P. O.) 8576 (v); Ottawa (Mint) 1459 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11679 (vi).
Tignish Breakwater Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3229 (ii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 682 (i).
—— Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tobacco Infractions of Inland Revenue Act. in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9526 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General and Min. of Labour) Gaspe.

Alien Labour Regulations, Pet. *re* from Sault Ste Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Charges *re* Customs, Montreal (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 134) 2° m., 5763 (iii).
Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Bonn P. O., Application *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 10516 (vi).
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ans.) 6642 (iv).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6404 (iv).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 1436 (i).
Canadian Newspapers, Refund *re* American Surtax (Ans.) 5203 (iii).
C.P.R., Papineauville Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12489 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ans.) 5654 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11403, 11636 (vi), 12179 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) *re* Distribution to Press, 5723 (iii).
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) 2° m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13317 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Denis des Saintes, Charges *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ans.) 1121 (i).
Digby to Westport, Mail Contractor, Name, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Labour Dispute, Settlement Tel. (read) 4995 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 13043 (vii).
Drop Letter One-cent Rate (remarks) 3159 (ii).
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton Mail Contract, Renewal of (Ans.) 5257 (iii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails (Ans.) 7731 (iv).
French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3183 (ii).
Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3846 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10733 (vi).
Harlaka Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
Hindoo Immigrants, and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).
House of Commons Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939; (stmnt.) 12044 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11704 (vi).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6444 (iv).
Immigration Agents in France (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9848 (v).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets, 12659 (vii).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ans.) 7197 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table, 1550 (i).
—— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).
—— Result of Mission (statement) 1585 (i).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 5201 (iii).
Labour Gazette, Cost of Printing, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Japanese Investigation) Rep. (presented) 1583 (i).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges to (Ans.) 6058 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).
Literature distributed through Mail (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9096 (v).
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).
Mackinnon Post Office, Application *re* Establishment (Ans.) 10517 (vi).
Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Mail Contract between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Mail Contract at Rimouski, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing of, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Matter delayed by C.P.R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
—— (remarks) 9281 (v).
Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2215 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B.C. (remarks) 3754 (ii).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Service, Soulanges county, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers, via Coteau Landing (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda,' &c. (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12830 (vii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ans.) 7200 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 9275 (v).
Montreal P. O. Building Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 7198 (iv).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).
N. B. Election, Patronage of Federal Govt., &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3046 (ii).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 11298 (vi).
—— Postal Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ans.) 11499 (vi).
North Grove Post Office Ret., on Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re* (remarks) 7722 (iv), 12660 (vii).
Opium Prohibition (B. 205) prop. Res., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 2° m., 12851; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train (remarks) 1425 (i).
Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).
Postage Stamps, New Series issued *re* Quebec Tercentenary (Ans.) 6398 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 7934 (iv).
—— Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangements of (remarks) 3040 (ii).
—— (statement) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3159 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3886 (ii).
Postal Notes Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 9279 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

Postal Rates on Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ans.) 3484 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ans.) 8381 (v).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7263 (iv).

Postal Service Improvements (Ans.) 8891 (v).

——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Post Office Act (P. O. supt., &c.) Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 7931 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10703 (vi); on Senate Amts., 12393 (vii).

Post Offices built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4761 (iii).

Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ans.) 6405 (iv).

Post Offices, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

Printing, Postal Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, signed 'P. M. G., Ques. of Priv., 11501 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Postage Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv), 8895 (v), 12414 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of a Successor (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. *re* Postmaster, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank, Recommendation *re* (Ans.) 4828 (iii).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

St. Peter's Bay Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1687 (i).

St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Sandy Cove Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).

Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii).

Southvale, N.S., Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 4829 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10599 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries) 12159 (vii); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8872; (salaries) 8872 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9848 (v).

Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13156 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii).

Post Office (contingencies) 5562; (Durston, R., promotion) 5561 (iii); (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9092 (v), 13155 (vii); (mail service) 5561 (iii); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii); (outside service) 9092; (stamps, &c.) 9111; (uniforms, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7459; (Hamilton, post office) 7697 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Levis) 7298; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7427 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5705 (iii); Montreal post office) 7411; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal station B) 7419; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12129 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10371 (vi).

Tenders, Advertisements *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Town Site, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Trent Canal, Clearing of Logs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith and Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).

——— Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

——— Service during Winter (remarks) 5137 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *Simcoe, S.*

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, &c., on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4708 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) in Com. on Res., 3901 (ii); in Com., 4507; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2818

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Campaign Literature sent from Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10346 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6164, 6215 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12348 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361; on M. for 1°, 10729; in Com., 11394, 11553, 11659 (vi), 12183 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9203 (v).

Criminal Code (ry. act.) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13318 (vii).

Devil's Elbow, Canal Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals,, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1155 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1776 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11869 (vi), 13020 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 9333 (v).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13263 (vii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545, 4577 (iii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collection *re* (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3615 (ii).

Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 129 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8609, 8741, 9377 (v).

G.T.P., Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspections *re* (Ques.) 12051 (vii).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12675 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12271; (amt.) Minority Rep., 12291. (Neg. (Y. 53; N. 98) 12388 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2233 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands, Reserved by Govt. (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lands Reservations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Township 12 to 19 (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 3228, in Com., 3692; on M. for 3°, 4540 (iii).

——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 10737 (vi).

Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of additional Living Allowance (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10497 (vi).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6446 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 8607, 8696, 9890 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Immigration, O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv), 11018 (vi).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iv).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6902 (iv).

I.C.R. Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4492 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction *re* B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1752 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, &c., on (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).

Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10527 (vi).

Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ques.) 11935 (vi).

Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

McInnes, Hon. W. B., Employment in the Yukon, Total Amount paid to, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12801 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Brodeur) to Com. of Sup., 7342 (iv).

Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

Mining Regulations, published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette' (M. for copy*) 5801 (iii).

Ministers of Crown and Govt. Contracts and Subsidies (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11997 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Co and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9398; (amt.) 9415 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re* (Ques.) 2392 (ii).

Obstruction to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9935 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4108 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. Fisher) *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, 4065 '(ii).

Pacific Coast Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii), 6230 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec Harbour Improvements, Specification, &c., Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c. (M. for copies*) 5802 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick B. 128 (M.) Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, Letter from Mr. G. W. Stoddart (read) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).

Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).

———(demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean on M. for 2°, 3369 (ii).

——— (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10625; in Com., 10639 (vi).

Ross Rifle Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham (remarks) 3903 (ii).

——— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4546, 4580 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).

Seed Grain Distribution, O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv).

——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 6981 (iv).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5403, 5519; (amt.) 5445 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3767 (ii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2785 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals (repairs) 10306 (vi); Trent (construction) 12225 (vii); (surveys) 10339 (vi).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9257 (v).

Excise—(travelling expenses, &c.) 814 (i).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Immigration (agents) 9854 (v).

Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol, 3996 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 10292 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 13331; (Markham) 13331; (Walkerville) 13333 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Barracks) 7409 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Richelieu) 12039 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11103 (vi).
Railways (extra clerks) 10346; G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10380; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12766 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10129 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.,) 10388 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1413, 1414 and 1415, Applications, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).

—— Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

Trent Canal, Bradford, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

—— Engineer's Rep., Inquiry for, 6925 (iv).

—— Nowmarket, Extension to Devil's Elbow (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).

—— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11939 (vi).

—— Surveys, Inquiry for 6988 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°, 779 (i); in Com., 4581 (iii).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 77 (Mr. Sloan) on Senate Amts., 6190 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6187 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10275 (v).

Winding-Up Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6523 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, and Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2889 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon, Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).

—— Official Administrators, Charges against *re* Settlement of Estates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Yukon Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 4588, 4589 (iii).

—— Public Administrators, Charges against, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

LEONARD, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Bridge Subsidies to Rys. (amt.) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 13310 (vii).

Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ques.) 5653 (iii).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Montreal Directory in Library of House (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3442 (ii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 5654 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

—— Officials interfering in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).

—— Votes of Officers in Municipal Affairs (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).
Penitentiaries— (binder twine) 5522, 5530; St. Vincent de Paul (meat contracts) 5519; (officials) 5538 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *Huron, W.*

Address, The, 242 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press (remarks) 5723 (iii).

Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders (remarks) 9281 (v).

Criminal Code (offensive weapons) Amt. (B. 78) 1° m., 1668 (i).

—— (assaults) Amt. (B. 79) 1° m., 1670 (i).

—— (hunting) Amt. (B. 93) 1° m., 2590 (ii).

—— (motors) Amt. (B. 140) 1° m., 5993 (iii).

Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1284 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty on (prop. res.) 4774 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3923

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1530 (i).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7449 (iv).

LOGAN, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12480 (vii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3512 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 1992 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2460 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4460 (iii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3066 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2417 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10165 (v).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Budget, The 6553 (iv).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169 (iii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

France and Canada SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6195 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7230 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4863 (iii).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648; in Com., 13056 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).

Conciliation Boards, Application *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations Act, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1160 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13012 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9467 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12723 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12340 (vii).

——— counsel fees, payment of (M.) 13578 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4479 (iii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11222 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12827 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7381 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9489 (v).

Phoenix Assurance Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 8603 (v).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4647 (iii).

Railway Act (liability) Amt. (B. 27) 1° m., 430 (i); on Order for 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3783 (ii); in Com., 12602 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4138 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (icebreakers) 2966 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston military buildings) 10909 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Caribou Island) 11225; (Round Hill) 11286 (vi).

Railways — I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (double tracking) 12250; (Moncton, additional line) 12760; (Moncton, car shops) 12250 (vii); (rolling stock) 5558 (iii).

Railways—Railway Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Patent Relief (B. 63) 1°*, 1283 (i).

MACDONALD, E. M.—*Con.*

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2712 (ii).

Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8778 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *Toronto, S.*

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Continuance of (Ques.) 941 (i).

Canadian Naval Stations, Maintenance of, Arrangement with G. B. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

Canadians entering U.S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c. (remarks) 2738 (ii).

——— Letter form Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries (read) 2739 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. (B. 28) 1° m., 508; 2° m., 939 (i).

Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. (B. 29) 1° m., 508 (i); 2° m., 5247 (iii).

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount 1907, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

Dredging Contract, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ques.) 9710 (v).

Drop Letter, One-cent Rate (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Electrical Power exported at Niagara Falls, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Fisheries Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

Foss, C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3500 (ii).

Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ques.) 10731 (vi).

G.T.P., Apptmt. of Engineer at Kenora (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Changes in Engineering Staff (Ques.) 509, 681 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, Appointment of Successor (Ques.) 358 (i).

G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 556 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3700 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4358 (iii).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1128 (i).

Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto, Tel. (read) &c. 185 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Questions, 242 (i).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ques.) 567 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Insurance Bill, Introduction of (Ques.) 9272 (v).

Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals, asked for, 7988 (iv).

Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ques.) 241 (i).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ques.) 897 (i).

Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept. (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

Militia—Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).

Naval Defence, Imperial, Contributions by Canada, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ques.) 1119 (i).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4996 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Printing and Lithographing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada (Ques.) 1506, 1732, 1931 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2397 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8851 (v).

Railway Commission (Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii); in Com., 4985 (iii).

Railway Commission, Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c. (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 569 (i), 2885 (ii).

Smith, Wm. R., Patent Relief (B. 198) 1°*, 12393 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3820 (ii).

Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 5337 (iii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 41) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Manufacture, Regulation *re* Saccharine Standards (Ques.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii).

Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Term of Settlement, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4774 (iii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Murray & Cleveland's Contract *re*, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap) Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 354 (i).

——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western gap) Construction of Entrance, &c. (Ques.) 354, 518 (i), 4587 (iii).

——— Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 95) 1° m., 2974 (ii).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

Yukon Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ques.) 7725 (iv).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8486 (v).

MACLAREN, Mr. A. F., *Perth, N.*

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11255 (vi).

Goderich Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ques.) 184 (i).

International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12870, 13052 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5648 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1718 (i).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3021; in Com., 3035 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9363 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3113 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order, 3083 (ii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge Commission, Rep., Evidence, &c. (M.) to ref. to Special Committee, 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com. (M.) to conc., 13353; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13373 (vii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to (prop. Res.) 2984 (ii).

Shipping Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 313 (i).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5834 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *Huron S.*

Budget Speech by Fin. Min., Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11871 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *York (O.) S.*

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10935, 10941 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4504; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2808 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 433 (i).

Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Business of the House, Precedence on Tuesday (remarks) 2982 (ii).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12845; in Com., 12849 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10718, 10729; in Com., 11635 (vi).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11170 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1692 (i).

Foresters' Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3726 (ii).

——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. to Com., 3362 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protest *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

House of Commons Chamber, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10979 (vi).

I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12787 (vii).

Marconi System, Regulation of Rates, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3031 (ii).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7657 (iv).

Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2939, 3405 (ii).

Ry. Act (demurrage, &c.) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93; on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i); 2° m., 3320 (ii).

——— (tel. cos.) Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 231 (i).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3904 (ii).

Ry. Act (ry. comn.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10783; (amt.) 11602; on M. for 3°, 11613; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11619; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633 (vi).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903 (ii).

Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 8185 (iv).

Standard Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3282 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9851 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 10291 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2965 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi); Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 7678 (iv).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 907 (i).

Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Water Carriage of Goods Bill (remarks) 13415 (vii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12472 (vii).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5380 (iii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9741 (v).

British Columbia Chartered Bank incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 1283 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).

Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ques.) 513 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11384 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13032 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 101) 1°*, 3477 (ii); in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223 (iv).

G.T.P., Supplies to Prince Rupert via Seattle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10376 (vi).

Hindus, Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031, 11062 (vi).

Indian Lands, B.C. Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).

Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c. (Ques.) 4243 (iii).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 719 (i).

——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2087 (ii).

——— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).

Japanese Immigration Restriction and B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1760 (i).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7231; on M. for 3°, 7219 (iv).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227 (iv).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4983 (iii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9086 (v).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 627 (i); Interior (astronomical surveys) 9741 (v).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3187 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865; (Quesnel) 10868; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10871 (vi); N.S. (Antigonish) 7121 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10703 (vi).

Vancouver Bank incorp. (B. 32) 1°*, 606 (i); in Com., 4580 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6183 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9662 (v).

McCARTHY, Mr. L. G., *Simcoe, N.*

Canada Shipping Act (marine engineers) Amt. (B. 17) 2° m., 3414 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11360; in Com., 11382 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1143 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12986 (vii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10762 (vi).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 139 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Birnie and Noble (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3017 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3012 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 17) 1° m., 349 (i).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Buffalo imported from Montana for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Buildings in Man. and N.W. Amounts paid by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Sites (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546 (vi).

'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11133; in Com., 11159, 11177, 11426, 11524, 11957; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 11975 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Game Preserve, Alberta, Buffalo imported from Montana, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6326 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6443 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in West, Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).

Japanese Immigration, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c. (Ques.) 692 (i).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 10527 (vi).

Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of, from U. S. (Ques.) 683 (i).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 688 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 683 (i), 2391 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1376 (i).

S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12605 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9967; (Doukhobors) 9956 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12750 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10979 (vi).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Timber Berths in Man. and N. W. Ters., under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2347 (ii).

Wireless Tel. Station on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ques.) 683 (i).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland, W. (O.)*

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 6073 (iii).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 350 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Issue of Denominations (Ques.) 12414 (vii).

McCOOL, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*

Copper Cliff Postmaster and Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11916 (vi).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, on M. for Sup., 7805 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 12973 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c. (M.) for Copies, 1941 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5438 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); Ottawa (Museum) 1503 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatchewan.*

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11463, 11948 (vi).

Doukhobors, Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6323 (iv).

Keewatin Diocese incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9889 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7658 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 6525; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9068, 9166 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2924 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1363 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c., &c., (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

—— Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. G. H., *Perth, S.*

Address, The, 455 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5130 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5482 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6842, 6928 (iv).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1024 (i).

Patent Medicine B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12623 (vii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2986 (ii).

Senate Reform (prop. res.) 1513 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1458 (i).

Wheat Transportation in N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2211 (ii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*

Address, The, 445 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1732 (i); in Com., 4231 (iii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 891 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2585 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11171, 11420, 11502 (vi).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6735, 6956 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11034 (vi).

Inspection and Sale Act (oats) Amt. (B. 114) 1° m., 4312 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7262 (iv).

Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c., incorp. (B.69) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1358 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3760 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2327 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. P. H., *Bruce, S.*

Agriculture Com.'s Rep. (M.) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) 191 (i).

Budget, The, 6573 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12883 (vii).

G.T. Ry. and C.P.R., Connection at Wingham (remarks) 191 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Address, The, 420 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

Bear River Station Dwelling, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6204 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842 (vii).

Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7246 (iv).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 517 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso, &c. (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Offices (Ques.) 687 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Fishing Licenses, River John, Inquiry for Ret., 10511 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ques.) 3427 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6252 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).

——— Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act, Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

I.C. Ry. Rates, Increase in Winter to P. E. I. (Ques.) 5995 (iii).

Legal Agents for Govt. in P. E. I., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N. S. *re* Regulations (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., N.S., Reps. *re* Undersized Fish (Ques.) 2792 (ii)

Lobster Hatchery, License to E. H. McLennan and G. A. Redmond, Pets., Cor. &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).

Louisburg, Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ques.) 4401 (iii).

McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4002 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892 (iv).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S., &c. (Ques.) 5650 (iii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 182 (i).

Naval Schools, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 10254 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Port Hood Harbour Works, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ques.) 10255 (v).

P.E.I., Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

——— Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

——— Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

——— Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

——— Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4620 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Bear River Station Master's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1737 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Construction re, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3261 (ii).

——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifiations, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 5086 (iii).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).

——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 850 (i).

——— (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10715 (vi).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9806 (v).

Scotch Hill East Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. for Sup., 7732 (iv).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Souris Ry. Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

——— Permission to Build, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3767, 3825 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9770 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9221, 9237 (v).

House of Commons (accommodation) 10490 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5768 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949; (obstructions) 3212; (winter mail service) 3216; (wrecks) 3195 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9092 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10905 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8572 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, militia clothes) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 12027 (vi).

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (claims dept.) 10177 (v) P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12763 (vii).

Tobacco, Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties *re*, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

Tobacco Infractions of Inland Rev. Act in P.E.I., on M. for Sup., 9514 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).

Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c. (Ques.) 9476 (v).

Travelling Expenses of R. A. Wiallard *re* Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3987 (ii).

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6136 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (M.) 10259 (v).

——— Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 5996 (iii).

McLEAN, Mr. P. D., *Centre York.*

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

McLENNAN, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2589 (ii).

Dog Fish Reduction Works at Canso, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 5790 (iii).

Inverness County and Increased Ry. Acommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9546 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 7173 (iv); (Lake Ainslie) 11228; (Margaree) 11229; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268 (vi).

McLENNAN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761; (stations) 12233 (vii).

MARCIL, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co. of N. B. (B. 76) 1°*, 1584 (i).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

C.P.R., Papineauville to Little Nation River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *Elgin, E.*

Aylmer, Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6206 (iii).

Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment (Ques.) 351 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1242 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3604 (ii).

Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing, &c. (remarks) 2766 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 516 (i).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number employed (Ques.) 692 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods B. 149, in Com., 7227; on M. for 3°, 7215 (iv).

Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3924 (ii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ques.) 2390 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5750 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10894 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7493; (Leamington) 7815; (St. Mary's) 7828; (Owen Sound) 7824 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of, &c. (remarks) 8439 (v).

Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 685 (i).

Budget, The, 6113 (iii).

Charlottetown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels (M. for copy*) 6240 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5099 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10723; in Com., 11559 (vi).

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. of Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ques.) 5470 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Express Charges in Mar. Provinces, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 518 (i).

Fisheries Dispute between Dom. and Mar. Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10563 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6250 (v).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1342 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2450 (ii).

——— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10157 (v).

Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I. (M. for cor.) 5475 (iii).

Lobster Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O. (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12798 (vii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. Improved Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 6239 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 10123 (v).

Peat for Fuel, Deposits in Canada, Industry, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging (Ques.) 685 (i).

Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4588 (iii).

Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3895 (ii).

P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ques.) 355 (i).

——— Steam Communication between P.E.I. and C. B. (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12754, 13353 (vii).

——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ques.) 562 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (i).

——— (Ques.) 843 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Mail Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1203 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, Tels., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 4589 (iii).

——— Withdrawal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

——— (remarks) 1207 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction (M. for copies) 3242, 3272 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re* (M. for copies*)6240 (iv).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 12408; on M. for 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim, Progress *re* (remarks) 7100 (iv).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 848 (i).

———Time-Table, Protest *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ques.) 568 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11630 (vi).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3926 (ii); in Com., 4978 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9811 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Returns, Unopposed (remarks) 5914 (iii).

St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1686 (i).

St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1687 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2786 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution *re*, Purchases in P.E.I. (remarks) 3157 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3812 (ii); in Com., 12610 (vii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12754 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1085 (i); (obstructions) 3213; (winter mail service) 3218 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13339 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (New London) 11292; N.S. (Port Hood) 11276; P.E.I. (repairs) 11292; (Rustico) 11293 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10157 (v).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal (St. Mary's).*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6511 (iv).

Monteal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4911 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13393 (vii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 3316 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

G.T.P., Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).

MICHAUD, Mr. P.—*Con.*

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3068 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunsick Ry. Co.'s (B. 128) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *Grey, S.*

Address, The, 148 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3860 (ii).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 5567 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res (Mr. Blain) 5104 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11707; in Com., 11844 (vi), 12944 (vii).

Fruit Inspection *re* Apple Packing, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 2764 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).

Indian Department, Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11068 (vi).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3102 (ii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H McIntyre) 1533 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12620 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12749 (vii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4058 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Owen Sound) 7817; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185 (iv).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2359 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13045 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., on M. Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2194 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 6232 (iv).

Address, The, 535 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3875 (ii).

——— All-Red Line, Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ques.) 10253 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Negotiations, Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re* (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Treaty, Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ques.) 8611 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor. Rep., &c. (M. for copies) 594 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4395 (iii).

Becancour, Blanche. &c., Dredging at during 1907, &c. (Ques.) 3040 (ii).

Bonus System, *re* Immigration (notice of motion) 6288 (iv).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13311 (vii).

B.C. Appeal Court B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 8466 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169, 6174, 6192 (iii), 6409 (iv).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12868 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10724; in Com., 11573 (vi).

Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Co-operative Societies (B. 5) 1° m., 92; on Order for 2°, 583 (i).; on M. for 2°, 4558; in Com., 4564 (iii).

——— (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ques.) 9277 (v).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2544 (ii).

Cumberland Railway and Coal Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. (translators) Notice to ref. back to Debates Com., 9709 (v).

——— M. to ref back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).

——— (remarks) 9889, 10119 (v).

Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, Contractor, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5464 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8116, 8138 (iv).

Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3896 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims pending, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Dredging in Vaudreuil Co., Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10763 (vi).

Fisheries Treaties, Boundaries with U. S. (remarks) 6632 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1397 (i); on M. for 2°, 2221 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4317 (iii).

Frano-Canadian Trade Treaty, Consideration of Proposed Convention, (M.) for Sel. Com., 923 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ques.) 4763 (iii).

See 'Can. and France,' &c.

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Govt. Vessels, Pay of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P., Winnipeg to Moncton, Number of Miles completed, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 6643 (iv).

House of Commons, Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr, Wright) 592 (i).

Hudson, Dredging,, Total Expenditure, 1907 (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ques.) 11703 (vi).

Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-07 (Ques.) 11704 (vi).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 6921 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B.135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5658 (iii); in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Agents in France, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).

——— (notice of motion) 4769 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of *re* Agents, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6663; Amt. neg. (Y. 42; N. 95) 7092 (iv).

Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Par. in Press (remarks) 4834 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6491, 6514 (iv).

I.C.R., Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10012 (v).

——— Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 12774 (vii).

Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for copies of O.Cs., &c., 872 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Recent Entries into B. C. (remarks) 3751 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).

——— from U. S., Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

——— (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River and Fort St. Francois, &c. (Ques.) 3837 (ii).

Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c. (M. for ret.*) 554 (i).

——— (Ques.) 314 (i).

Mail Service, Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Renewal of Contract (Ques.) 5257

Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c. (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Marine, Deptl. Officials, Suspension of *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii).

——— Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Roads, Claim of Govt., &c. (prop. res.) 3465 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c. (prop. res.) 3436; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3452 (ii).

——— Amounts collected and expended, &c. (M. for ret.) 1688 (i).

——— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ques.)1931 (i), 2979 (ii).

——— Rep. of Auditor General (M. for copy*) 2983 (ii).

Nicolet County, Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet Post Office, Contract, Tender, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, *re* answering questions by Govt., 234 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).

Pointe Aux Trembles Wharf, Date of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9267 (v).

——— Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).

——— Tender of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c. (Ques.) 8838 (v).

Quebec Bridge Commission, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. Rep., Evidence, &c., to Special Com., 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to conc. (amt.) 13363; Amt. neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Commission's Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 8608 (v), 10302 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re* (M.) for Sel. Com., 2547 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Co., ref. to in debate on Address, 535 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected (Ques.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Ques. of Priv., Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 7994 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 10688; (amt) 11603, neg. (Y. 36; N. 89) 11608 (vi).

Ry. Act (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10120 (v).

Railway Commissioners' Board, Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8513 (v).

Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5658 (iii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10013 (v).

St. Gabriel de Brandon, Post Office Savings Bank, Opening, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

St. François Port Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Total Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of six Offices, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v).

Seven Islands, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Commissioner Boyer, (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &. (Ques.) 10011 (v).

——— Expenditure *re* Investigation by Messrs. Sauve and Boyer (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer, Inquiry for, 9890 (v).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3805 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery (prop. res.) 3276 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10585 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Canals — Soulanges (investigation) 10304 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9698 (v).

Immigration (agents, G.B.) 9840 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3988 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943 (ii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8877 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12128 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11081 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., *re*

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, 904; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921 (i).

Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of (prop. res.) 3299 (ii).

Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6123 (iii).

Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c. (Ques.) 9276 (v).

Wheat, frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).

Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines (remarks) 9894 (v).

MORIN, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

Bic Wharf, Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 189 (i).

Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10505 (vi).

Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8613 (v).

G.T.P., Contracts, Safeguard Clause, &c. (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).

——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ques.) 8618 (v).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).

I.C.R., Connection with Quebec Central at Levis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).

——— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 189, 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).

——— Riviere du Loup Station Master, &c. (Ques.) 7445 (iv).

Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).

Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4813 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, Lifting of Ruins (remarks) 10303 (vi).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Riviere du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 6462 (iv).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ques.) 5788 (iii).

Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal *re*, &c. (Ques.) 8380 (v).

——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Employment of (Ques.) 8381 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5414; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5448 (iii).

MORIN, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 9875 (v).

Marine—(ice-breakers) 1913 (i).

Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10508 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213; (tidal service) 3216 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings — Ottawa (Museum) 1495 (i).

Public Works—Que. (Montreal post office) 7413; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Levis) 7295 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10179 (v).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings, E.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12476 (vii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4505 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T.Ry. Co. (M. for copies) 2796 (ii).

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) 1°*, 9330 (v).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1190 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1658 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1830; (amt.) 1839; neg. (Y. 50: N. 95) 1882 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11803 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6753 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13271 (vii).

Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1030 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4182 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10743 (vi).

Militia and Marine Stationery Supplies, Purchases *re* Book-keeping (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2163 (ii).

P.E.I.Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2750 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°,4659 (iii); in Com., 10647; on M. for 3° (amt.) 10777; on M. for 3°, 11598; Amt. neg. (Y. 36; N. 77) 11600 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8994 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5854 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4182 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1923 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Watson, Mr. G. H., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds (remarks) 6848 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5798 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amounts, Price, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Boyle Concession, Memorial of Dawson Legislature (Ans.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

Buchanan Townsite, Homestead Entry of Mr. Ramsland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10083 (v).

Buffalo Herd located at Elk Park (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Buffalo Herd for Moose Mountain Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).

Buffalo Herd for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).

Buffalo imported for Game Preserve in Alberta, Payments *re* (Ans.) 847.

Buffalo purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ans.) 896 (i).

Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9776 (v).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian repatriated from U.S. (Ans.) 685 (i).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 513 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 184) 1°*, 10008 (v); 2° m., and in Com., 10545, 10744, 11020 (vi).

Clearwater Lake, Half Breeds' Location, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

——— Squatters' Claims (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).

Clement, W. H. P., Legal Adviser in Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ans.) 5469, 5790 (iii).

Coal and Govt. Lands in Possession of Govt., &c. (Ans.) 843 (i).

Coal Lands, Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ans.) 9278 (v).

——— Royalty Dues, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

——— Leases, Applicants *re* (Ans.) 2395 (ii).

——— Leased by Govt., Original Grantees, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).

——— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

——— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re* (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

——— Timber, &c., Dates of Regulations, O.Cs., &c. (Ans.) 12656 (vii).

Coal Mining Cos. in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Coal Mine Royalties, Sums received in Alberta (Ans.) 12391 (vii).

Colonization Lands, Alienations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4317 (iii).

Colonization Societies in Quebec, Amounts paid (Ans.) 684 (i).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Estates administered (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Trusts and Estates (Ans.) 12050, 12413 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 565 (i).

See 'Yukon.'

Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Cypress Hills Reservation, Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

—— Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1133 (i).

—— Examination of, by Members (remarks) 3853 (ii).

—— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1636 (i).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds (Ans.) 5655 (iii).

See 'Halifax.'

Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent of Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

—— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

—— Name of Agent (Ans.) 5084 (iii).

—— Negotiations *re* Surrender (Ans.) 3849 (ii).

—— Protest *re* Sale of Timber (remarks) 10918 (vi).

—— Sale, Notice in Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 7501 (iv).

—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8659 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey (B. 9) 1° m., 231; 2°, and in Com., 754, 948 (i); on Senate Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 9333 (v); 2° m., 11125; in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi); on Mr. Lake's Amt., 12394; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Lands, Areas disposed of (Ans.) 3431 (ii).

—— Disposed of from 1896 to 1905, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret., 3852 (ii).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 8183 (iv).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10806 (vi).

Doukhobors, Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).

—— Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2219 (ii).

—— Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5017 (iii).

—— Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

—— at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7630 (iv).

Doyle, Mr. P., Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 6923 (iv).

Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ans.) 694 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).

Fence Post Fees on Permits, &c. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 3433 (ii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re* (Ans.) 5475 (iii).

French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).

French Immigrants, Number and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council (Ans.) 11938 (vi).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 203) 1°*, 12594; in Com., 13048, 13208 (vii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ans.) 13062 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ans.) 238 (i).

—— Irrevocable for 21 Years, Applications for, &c. (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

Grazing Ranches, Names of Lessees, &c. (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

Griffith Island, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).

Halifax Frauds, Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

—— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).

See 'Dodds.'

Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).

See 'Immigration,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Hintz, Fred., Homestead Location, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

Holliday, Mr. P., Additional Living Allowance (Ans.) 5475 (iii).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11200 (vi).

Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090, 10101 (v).

Homestead Entries, Granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian (Ans.) 9773 (v).

Homestead Entry for S.W. Quarter-Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ans.) 2167 (ii).

Homestead Entries in Quarter-Section No. 35, History of (Ans.) 4762 (iii).

Homestead Entries on Quarter Section 16, &c., Applications, Inspections, &c. (Ans.) 3432 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, N.E. Quarter-Section 28, Permission *re* Grants (Ans.) 1941 (i).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).

Homesteaders on Sections 15, 16 and 27, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).

Homesteading in Section 18, Extension of Time Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).

Homestead Sale of Township 13 (Ans.) 7206 (iv).

Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

Hough, Mr. J. S., and Hough, Campbell and Ferguson (Ans.) 568 (i).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6394 (iv).

—— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 5657 (iii); in Com., 6429 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ans.) 7500 (iv).

—— O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv).

—— on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8608, 9891 (v).

Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 693 (i).

—— G.B., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).

—— Italy, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

—— Names of those paid Commissions in Europe, &c. (Ans.) 3845 (ii).

—— N.B., Apptmt. (Ans.) 843 (i).

—— Number of Special Agents, Addresses, &c. (Ans.) 180 (i).

—— Special Prizes, &c. (Ans.) 3484 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1311 (i).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6697 (iv).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).

Immigration, Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ans.) 2545 (ii).

Immigration, Co-operation with Govt. of N. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).

Immigration, Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants (Ans.) 5084 (iii).

Immigration, Expenditure for March, 1907-8 (Ans.) 5081 (iii).

Immigration Forms, Number received by Farmers, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Investigation *re* (statement) 4963 (iii).

—— Further Information *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii).

—— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Immigration Frauds at Halifax (remarks) 4835, 5567, 5659 (iii), 6465 (iv).
See 'Halifax.'

Immigration from U. S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

Immigration Officers, Waugh and Perrin, Payments to (Ans.) 514 (i).

Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1287 (i).

Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 9773 (v).

Immigration Regulations, O.C. *re* (remarks) 11019 (vi).

Immigration Relief to Gimli Galicians, Rep. of Mr. Walker (read) in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).

Immigration Returns, on Inquiry for, 1108 (i).

Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3429 (ii).

Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto (remarks) 186, 242 (i).

Immigrants cared for in Toulon Sheds, 1906-7 (Ans.) 892 (i).

Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation (Ans.) 6922 (iv).

Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Causes, &c. (Ans.) 5796 (iii).

Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ans.) 5080 (iii).

Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).

Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ans.) 567 (i).

Immigrant Detention Hospital, Amount expended (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

Immigrants entering Canada, Number, Bonuses paid on, &c. (Ans.) 5256 (iii).

—— Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).

Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

—— Restriction of (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Agents (Ans.) 6923 (iv).

Immigrant Inspection of Ships, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).

Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Indian Lands, Acres sold, Total Receipts, &c., since 1896 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122 (vii).

——— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned, sold, &c., by Indians (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 628 (i).

Indian Lands at New Westminster, B.C., Disposal of, &c. (Ans.) 3037, 3839 (ii).

Indian Lands, Sale of, on Inquiry for Ret., 4495 (iii).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation by Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).

Irrigation (B. 10) 1°*, 231; 2° m., 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); (M.) to withdraw, 2974 (ii).

——— (B. 99) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in Western Provs., Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9990 (v).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B. C., Number, &c. (Ans.) 692 (i).

Japanese entering B. C., Passports, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).

Japanese Immigrants entering from U.S. into Canada, Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Japanese Syndicate purchasing Land in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Alwyn under Irrigation Regulations (Ans.) 7209 (iv).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Area reserved on July 1st, 1896 (Ans.) 13512 (vii).

Land Grants to Rys., Selections, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii), 6920 (iv).

Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Patent issued for E. ½ S.E. ¼ Section 2, Name, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).

Land Patents for Section 8, Twp. 53, Present Owner, Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3430 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Land Patents for Sections 10 and 17, Applicants for (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Land Patents, Section 36, &c., Issue of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

Lands, Section 2, 10, 14, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6 (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 4221 (iii); in Com., 6517 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund (B. 168) prop. Res., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480 (v); 2° m., 10525; in Com., 10526 (vi).

Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Assistance *re* (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ans.) 8444 (v).

Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants (Ans.) 8617 (v).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 688 (i).

McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent, Edmonton (Ans.) 6981 (iv).

McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ans.) 6401 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 10717 (iv); in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).

Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Ret., on Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).

Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co. (Ans.) 5257 (iii).

Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Newspapers, Payments to (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid, Claims, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses paid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 773 (i).

——— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter, &c. (Ans.) 2392 (ii).

Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Assignment of, &c. (Ans.) 11703 (vi).

Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12731 (vii).

Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B. C., Sale to (Ans.) 6002 (iii).

Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10408 (vi).

——— Surveys of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep. (presented) 3834 (ii).

Peace River Timber Limits, Granting of Leases, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 3851 (ii).

Peace River Land Co., Cancellation of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).

——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).

'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, paid, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipments, Weighing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 360 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents, on Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).

Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).

Quarter Sections, 35, 31 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ans.) 8176 (iv).

Railway Land Grants in Man., Alberta, Sask., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Rama Indians Fund, Payments *re* (Ans.) 8611 (v).

Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 5209 (iii).

See 'Buchanan,' &c.

Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5258 (iii).

——— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Rattenbury & Co., Purchasers of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c. (Ans.) 12392 (vii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2309, 2384, 3318 (ii).

——— Questions, &c., ordered by the House, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications *re* Homesteads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9994 (v).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Entry for Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654

——— Squatters' Rights, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ans.) 4763 (iii).

Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).

Rocky Mountain Park, Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).

St. Peter's Reserve, Extinguishment of Title, Issue of Patents (Ans.) 1933 (i).

——— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ans.) 2217 (ii).

——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ans.) 7990 (iv).

Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).

——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale &c. (Ans.) 4761 (iii).

——— (stmnt.) 10402 (vi).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 9280 (v).

——— Sale of Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) 9127 (v).

School Lands Exchange (B. 163) 1° m., 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478 (v).

School Timber and Coal Lands, Average Price, &c. (Ans) 3431 (ii).

Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, &c., on M. (Mr. Lake) for Cor., 3852 (ii).

Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c. (Ans.) 3431 (ii).

Section 32, Report *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1377 (i).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech (remarks) 3041 (ii).

——— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).

——— Distribution of (Ans.) 692 (i).

——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 6981 (iv).

——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv)

——— in N. W., Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2901 (ii).

——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).

——— Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).

Seed Grain Distribution, Purchases from P.E.I. (remarks) 3158, 3752 (ii), 12392 (vii).

——— Corrected answer, 13066 (vii).

Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 8185 (iv).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Register, State Papers and Register 'B,' Custody of, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Six Nations Indians, Refusal *re* Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ans.) 6239 (iv).

Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).

S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

S. A. Volunteers Land Grant Bounty (B. 109) Res. prop., 3316, 3756 (ii); 11938 (vi); in Com. on Res., 3823 (ii) 12595; in Com., 13047; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserves (remarks) 4741 (iii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2784 (ii).

Supply—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries) 616 (i), 9693 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (forest rangers) 10049; (forest reserves) 10060; (homesteads) 10083; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Immigration (agents, G. B.) 9840; (agents in U. S.) 9965; (deportations) 9882 (v); (general expenses) 5753 (iii); (hospitals) 9983; (literature) 9949; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v); (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Indians—B. C. (land sales) 12752 (vii).

Indians — Generally (destitute) 5762; (printing, &c.) 5762 (iii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Indians—N.W.T. (Sioux) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

N.W. Ter. (Govt. salaries) 10117; (school grants) 10117 (v).

Public Works—Telegraphs (towers) 13178 (vii).

Yukon—(Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).

Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'

Swamps Lands in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10106 (v).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ans.) 693 (i).

——— Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).

——— Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).

Tanguay, Mr., Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v).

Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Timber Berth, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ans.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W. T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Berth, No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— Nos. 1220, &c., on Order for Ret. (remarks) 849 (i).

Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications, &. (Ans.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Lands, Sales to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ans.) 1294 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ans.) 181 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ans.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses granted under Mackenzie Govt. (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N.W.T. during 1896-7 (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ans.) 182, 691, 1127 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2486 (ii).

——— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re* (Ans.) 179 (i), 11496 (vi).

Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re* (remarks) 10916 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Reserve, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4741 (iii), 7649 (iv).

Vacant Land Reservations, Instructions to Agents *re* (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Water Power Sales or Leases in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 8378 (v).

Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).

Whitehorse Town Site, Portions sold and retained (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 568 (i).

Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

Yukon Act Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 8604 (v); 2° m., 10528; in Com., 10529; on Senate Amts., 11634 (vi).

Yukon, Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).

——— Finnie-Perron Case, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

——— Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ans.) 7726 (iv).

——— Liquor Permits, Agents, &c., Corrected Answer, 5048 (iii).

——— Lithgow, Girouard and Congdon, Messrs., Apptmt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).

See 'Congdon,' &c.

——— Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 150) 1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518 (vi).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley *vs.* Congdon, Amt. *re* Return (remarks) 1691 (i).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto W.*

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1800 (i).
Dry Docks, Construction, B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii).
Goodwin Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 60) 1°*, 1283 (i).
I.C.R. Audit System (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 10214 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 91 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).
Montague Moore and T. J. Haskett Patent Relief (B. 61) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (iii).
Seed Grain for Northest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1362 (i).
SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10209 (v).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *Northumberland, E., Ont.*

Brighton Wharf, Rep. of Mr. Sing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
—— Repairs *re* (remarks) 5913 (iii).
Cambellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12889 (vii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11820 (vi).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13469 (vii).
Fruit Inspection, *re* Apple Packing, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2761 (ii).
House of Commons Clerks, Changes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
—— Recommendations *re* Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 3899 (ii).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611.
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7248 (iv).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re* (remarks) 5915 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12226 (vii).
Justice—Supreme Court (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4087 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5533 (iii).

OWEN, Mr. C. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10879; (Victoria Immigration) 10879 (vi).
Public Works — Buildings — Ont. (Owen Sound) 7823; (St. Mary's) 7827 (iv).
Public Works — Buildings — Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12133 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11078 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of (remarks) 609 (i).
Woolen Industry, Specific Duty (remarks) 6988 (iv).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Address, The, 505 (i).
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Canadians repatriated from U. S. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of (Ques.) 2593 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3545 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).
Immigrants, Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c. (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6945 (iv).
I.C.R., Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1688 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Services as an Ice-breaker, in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Societies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure, since Confederation (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
—— Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4038, 4172 (ii); Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2941 (ii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *Lambton W.*

Budget, The, 5364 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12859 (vii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1424 (i); on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5910 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett)—(remarks) 6749 (iv).
Erie, London & Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1108 (i).
'Golspie,' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4137 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2955; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12106 (vii); (Tiffin) 5711 (iii).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13411 (vii).

PARMELEE, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*

Printing of Parliament, 5th Rep. of Com. (peresented) 10915 (vi).

PATERSON, Hon. W. (Minister of Customs) *Brant.*

Absinthe and Brandy imported, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, (Ans.) 1112 (i).
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ans.) 3485 (ii).
Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U. S. and other Countries (Ans.) 1511 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) 4163 (ii).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1506 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Customs Ports opened, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).
Budget, The, 5296 (iii).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).
Butter Imports, Quantity, and Countries of Origin (Ans.) 1116 (i).
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B. (Ans.) 6460 (iv).
Cattle exported to U. S. during Years 1900-07, Value &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Cattle Registered, Importations from U. S. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10746 (iv).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9139 (v).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ans.) 6237 (iv).
Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ans.) 4586 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 194) Res. prop., 11233, in Com. on Res., 11312, 1°*, of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).
Customs Brokers, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Customs Defalcations in Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).
Customs Dept., Criticism by Civil Service Rep., 10448 (vi).
Customs Dept., Criticism, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10448 (vi).
Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10133 (v).
Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10791 (vi).
Customs Frauds in Montreal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Customs Inspectors, and Rep. of Civil Service Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9555 (v).
Customs Officers at Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).
Customs Officers at Windsor, Age and Salary (Ans.) 12656 (vii).
Customs Outside Service, Ports, &c., 9220 (v).
Cotton, Raw, Imported from U. S. during 1905-7, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).
Customs, Receipts and Expenditures for 1907-8 (Ans.) 12655 (vii).
Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Detroit River Tunnel, Materials entered free of Duty (Ans.) 10254 (v).
—— Material imported, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).
—— Duties on Construction Materials (Ans.) 1117 (i), 3841 (ii).
—— (statement) 13524 (vii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12951 (vii).

Dredging Companies, Insinuations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7792 (iv).

Fish Exportations from Man., to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ans.) 4240 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1257 (i); on M. for 1°, 3507, 3567; in Com. 3588 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 852 (i).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

—— Dismissal from Customs Service (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

See 'Customs Defalcations.'

French Books, Reduction of Customs *re* French Treaty (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 689 (i).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2249 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4226 (iii).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value. &c. (Ans.) 8177 (iv).

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Horses and Cattle imported from U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11703 (vi).

Imports and Exports, Sept. 30 and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 350 (i).

—— Values from June to Dec., 1907 (Ans). 1113 (i).

Imports from France for last five years, &c. (Ans.) 1124 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Value, &c., for 1897-8 (Ans.) 13063 (vii).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ans.) 898 (i).

Literature distributed through Customs and Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9104 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 8442 (v).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4067 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).

Opium, Amount of Duty received, Pet. from B. C. *re* Prohibition (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Pacaud, Benj., Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

Pepin, J. E., Emplymt. at Customs Office in Windsor (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Pork, Fresh, Imported for Home Consumption (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Port, South Bar, C. B., Number of Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Posters, Prohibition *re* Indecent Ones, Tariff *re* (Ans.) 6462 (iv).

Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. McDonald (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

Pulp Wood exported to U. S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).

Quebec Bridge Material, Total Amount of Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4977 (iii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils imported from G. B. in 1904-5-6-7 (Ans.) 1506 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Port, Quantity of Farm Produce entered, &c. (Ans.) 898 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2932 (ii).

Sugar Imports for 1898, Total Amount (Ans.) 13065 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 637 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536; Miscellaneous (Guarantee Cos.) 9577; (cruisers) 9578; (legal expenses) 9578; (printing, &c.) 9577; Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9442 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2964 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v); Ont. (Brantford) 7465 (iv).

Trade and Nav. Returns (presented) 7 (i).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ans.) 8616 (v).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ans.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Wallace, Michael J., Employment in Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 7500 (iv).

Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2196 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Address, The, 449 (i).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3873 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).
Civil Service Commission's Report, Inquiry for, 90 (i).
Coal Lands, Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, &c., Payments *re* (Ques.) 10512 (vi).
Corry Building, Total Rental by Govt., Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 11938 (vi).
Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1818 (i).
Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ques.) 8175 (iv).
—— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 7500 (iv).
—— Sale of Timber, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ques.) 10512 (vi).
G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2256 (ii); in Com., 12073 (vii).
Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 3851 (ii).
Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).
Postal Stamps, Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Public Works Dept. Expenditures, on M. for Sup., 4868; (amt.) 4886; Neg. (Y.43; N. 99) 4959 (iii).
Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637 (vi).
Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re* (Ques.) 183 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4140 (ii).
Post Office (inspection) 9115; (mail service) 9119 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military) 10971 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10978 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (mint) 1453 (i); (rents, &c.) 10999; (telephones) 11012 (vi).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).
Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2310 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c. (explanation) *re* Mr. McDonald's letter, 2679 (ii).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).
Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).
Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10559 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis) 11211; (Round Hill) 11283 (vi).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *Hastings, W.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4851 (iii).
Belleville City, Flood Investigation by Govt. (remarks) 3319 (ii).
—— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4744 (iii).
Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).
—— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ques.) 1737 (i).
Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ques.) 6237 (iv).
—— Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).
—— Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).
—— Total Revenue, for 1903-7, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).
Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
—— (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage, &c. (remarks) 7933 (iv).
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8552, 8609, 9066 (v).
—— on Order being called for 2°, 681 (i).
Bell Rapids P. O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8883 (v).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connection (remarks) 1437 (i).
Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission (Ques.) 10011 (v).
Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).
—— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288, 7447 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11892 (vi).
Fruit Marks Act Prosecutions, Violation *re* Apples, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead (Ques.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

PORTER, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, Records of Payments, of Scale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (milk) Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1283 (i); on Order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1031 (i).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ques.) 9272 (v).

—— Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9372, 9390 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8862 (v).

Section 32, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

SUPPLY—

Post Office (clerical assistance) 8883 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8525 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10967 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11078 (vi).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11072 (vi).

Trent Valley Canal Contracts, Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i).

POWER, Mr. W., *Quebec, W.*

Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s (B. 73) 1°*, 1584 (i).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amendment (prop. res.) 4248 (iii).

Banking Systems, Par. in 'Financial Post,' Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

—— Ques. of Privilege *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).

See 'Wheat.'

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. E. B. Walker, Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power (remarks) 13084 (vii).

—— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12201 (vii).

—— Opening (remarks) 12660 (vii).

—— Payment of Dues on Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*

Deep Waterways Commission, Damming St. Lawrence River at Long Sault (remarks) 13146 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s (B. 127) in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231 (iv); on Senate Amts., 12772 (vii).

—— (B. 211) M. to suspend Rule, 12836 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).

London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

'Montcalm,' Str., Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1899 (i).

Old Age Pension Scheme (M.) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).

—— Progress *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

—— (remarks) 7722 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine—(ice-breakers) 1899 (i).

Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid *re* (Ques.) 173 (i).

—— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2204 (ii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Chute à Blondeau) 12094 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W. (Minister of Public Works) *St. John City and County.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4723 (iii).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anse. St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).

Bell Memorial Association (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11207 (vi).

Bell River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 685 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).

—— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8557, 9067 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Bic Wharf, Materials supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5943 (iii).

Booms in International Streams, Regulation (B. 105) 1° m., 3654 (ii).

Brighton Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) 5913 (iii).

Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iv).

Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Buildings, Construction of, Papers laid on Table, 12771 (vii).

Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Campbellton Wharf, Contract *re* Piling (Ans.) 8612 (v).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

C.P.R., Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).

Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10517 (vi).

Cement Testing Laboratory, Cost. &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 11250 (vi).

—— Purposes of Vote (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).

'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ans.) 12651 (vii).

Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).

Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ans.) 5202 (iii).

Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 7937 (iv).

Chicoutimi Boom and Pulp Co.'s Payments, &c. (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Taylor) 13204 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).

Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

Clerk of Works *re* Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).

Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 695 (i).

Clinton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 4832 (iii).

Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8380 (v).

Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Colchester Point, Pier, Essex County, Amt. expended (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Corry Building, Total Annual Rental, Taxes, &c. (Ans.) 11938 (vi).

Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ans.) 9277 (v).

Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 12650 (vii).

Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).

Deep Waterways Commission, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) *re* Progress (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ans.) 1736 (i).

Deschambault Wharf, Tenders, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 5465 (iii).

Documents, Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).

—— Production in Committees, 1428 (i).

—— Taken from Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 2308 (ii).

Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

Dredges, registered in Canada (Ans.) 11497 (vi).

Dredging at Becancour, Blanche, &c., during 1907 (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).

Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 8839 (v).

Dredging at Port Arthur and Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8618 (v).

Dredging Contract, O.C. *re*, on Inquiry for, 6927 (iv).

Dredging Contracts at Midland, &c., Advertisements for Tenders (remarks) 7195 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments (Ans) 9711 (v).

—— O.C. *re* (remarks) 6853 (iv).

—— O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6745-6816 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 1737 (i).

Dredging Contracts (remarks) 7105 (iv).

—— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* (remarks) 9773 (v).

Dredging in Ont. and Que., for 1907-8, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 10008 (v).

Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims Pending, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).

Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular (read) in Com. of Sup., 12043 (vi).

Dredging Tenders, on Inquiry for Ret., 8696 (v).

Dredging Work at Nicolet River, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Drill Halls, Ret., on Inquiry for, 4834, 5659 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ans.) 6461 (iv).
——— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13279
Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).
Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvements (Ans.) 6399 (iv).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days working (Ans.) 7199 (iv).
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c. (Ans.) 1510 (i).
——— Explanation *re* Purchases, 5658 (iii).
——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7643 (iv).
Floods at Chatham and Belleville (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4745 (iii).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 8613 (v).
Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12652 (vii).
Garthby, Govt. Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ans.) 3844 (ii).
Gatineau Point Bridge, Amount contributed by Govt. (Ans.) 355 (i).
Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i).
Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Report *re* Estimated Cost (remarks) 12053 (vii).
——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 8378 (v).
——— Rep. of Surveys, on Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3423 (ii).
Govt. Employees, and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).
Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).
——— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).
Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ans.) 6463 (iv).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 13059 (vii).
G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale (B. 89) M. for Com. on Res., 2221; 1°*, 2260 (ii); in Com., 12060 (viii).
See 'Major's Hill Park.'

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8130, 8745, 9462 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Imputing Motives,' 8134 (iv).
G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).
Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Hackett Dock, Purchase of (Ans.) 7730 (iv).
Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 7212 (iv).
Higgin's Shore Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 695 (i).
Hillsborough Bridge Return, on Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).
——— Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).
——— Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi), 13340 (vii).
See 'Postal,' 'Restaurent.'
Howard's Cape, Wharf, Pet. *re* Investigation (Ans.) 11702 (vi).
Hudson, Dredging, 1907, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4587 (iii).
Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i), 5698 (iii).
Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 631 (i).
Inspectors of Public Works, Apptmts. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ans.) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5998 (iii).
I.C.R., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13489 (vii).
——— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).
——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4451 (iii).
Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Jesus River, Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ans.) 6980 (iv).
Juvenile Delinquents, B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12406 (vii).
'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ans.) 13063 (vii).
Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).
Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12098 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ans.) 8176 (iv).

Lafferty, Thos., Payment for Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).

Lake Megantic, Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re* (Ans.) 9472 (v).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Major's Hill Park and G.T.Ry. Co.'s Hotel, Sale (B. 89) prop. Res., 1584 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12799 (vii).

Matchedash Bay, Dredging done at Fesserton, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

Medicine Hat, Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

Midland and Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Milford Haven Wharf, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 182 (i), 8172 (iv).

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Montmorency Falls, Walls, Length, &c. (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 6922 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).

N. B. Inland Water Wharfs, Construction Policy (Ans.) 5465 (iii).

N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3663 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7134 (iv).

Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditures from 1896-1908 (Ans.) 12775 (vii).

—— Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4588 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Nicolet Post Office, Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

—— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Notre Dame du Portage Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied Govt. (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Ont. and Quebec Dredging, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 9276 (v).

Order, Ques. of, Withdrawal of word 'grafter,' 10994 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. at Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Petawawa Dock, Tenders *re* Improvements (Ans.) 685 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Return (remarks) 7108 (iv).

—— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5725 (iii).

—— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

—— Papers laid on Table, 10402 (vi).

—— Statement as to Missing Letters (remarks) 9716 (v).

Pictou Post Office, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost (Ans.) 10518 (vi).

Pinette Harbour, Pets. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 685 (i).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3898 (ii).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau (Ans.) 8839 (v).

—— Date of Contract (Ans.) 9268 (v).

—— Tenders, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1734 (i)

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 697 (i).

Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements (Ans.) 4403 (iii).

Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4828 (iii).

Port Hood Harbours, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ans.) 10255 (v).

Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3424 (ii).

Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).

Port Vernon Bridge, Completion of Works, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Postal Service in House of Com. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).

P.E.I., Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1686 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).

P.E.I., Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iv).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Public Works Dept., New Apptmts. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).

——— Employees at Hamilton, Delay in Pay (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).

——— Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661 (iii).

——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).

Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Robitaille) for Ret., 3853 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).

Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10649 (vi).

Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4588 (iii).

——— correcting answer, 5658 (iii).

Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Reinhardt, Paul, Emplymt. in Provincial Elections, Hull (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10988 (vi).

Representation from the Mar. Provs., Ques. of Priv., 9892 (v).

Restaurant of House of Com. and Senate, Joint Com. (M.) 13224 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2385, 3581 (ii).

Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary as Port Physician (Ans.) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).

Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

Rimouski Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn' (Ans.) 7727 (iv).

Rimouski Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10013 (v).

Rivard, Mr. S., Apptmt. as Supt. of Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3689 (ii).

Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

——— Wharf, Total Amount of Dredging (Ans.) 6462 (iv).

Ruscomb River Works, Estimate of Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids Improvement Co., Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ans.) 238 (i).

St. Anicet Wharf, Expenditure by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).

St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Removal of Rock, &c. (Ans.) 6918 (iv).

——— Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 6641, 6919 (iv).

St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Pay List, &c. (Ans.) 1116 (i).

St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).

St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 11497 (vi).

St. John River, Snags, Removal of, Tender *re* (Ans.) 3478 (ii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Payments to *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 8890 (v).

St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 896, 1121 (i).

St. Laurent Wharf, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).

St. Mary's Post Office, Total Cost (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Saguenay and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid for Use of Boom, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal, &c. (Ans.) 8380 (v).

——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8381 (v).

See 'Chicoutimi.'

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8563, 9068 (v).

Scotch Town Wharf, Application (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5425, 5520 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5207 (iii).

Skinner's Cove, Boat Channel, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10012 (v).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 567, 891 (i).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 1939 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended (Ans.) 4764 (iii).

'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Commission, &c. (Ans.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, (Ans.) 2392 (ii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564, 5787 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 638 (i), 12917 (vii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12737; (schools) 13172 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5766 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—(Ass't. Dep. Minister) 5698 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 13338 (vii); (Cranbrook) 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10864 (vi); (Fernie) 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Quesnel) 10867 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vancouver) 10868 (v), 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii); (Victoria) 10883; (Victoria, immigration) 10874; (William's Head) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farms, repairs) 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii); (furniture) 11007; (immigration, repairs) 11008; (post office fittings) 11007; (quarantine stations) 11008; (rents, &c.) 10981; List read, 10998; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953, 10974; (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); Emerson) 8534 (v), 13335 (vii); (Neepawa) 8536 (v), 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Souris) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg immigration) 8573 (v); (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi); (Winnipeg P. O.) 8575; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8566 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Fredericton) 13328; (Grand Falls) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328; (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John) 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7110; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7144; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, military) 7143; (Halifax, quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326; (Parrsboro) 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfville) 13327 (vii); (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Arnprior) 7454; (Belleville) 7678; (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Brantford) 7455; (Dom. renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7473 (iv), 13331; (Guelph) 13331 (vii); (Guelph, armoury) 7678; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7696 (iv); (Harriston) 13331 (vii); (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi); (Leamington) 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331; (Listowel) 13331 (vii); (London, magazine) 7705; (London, military) 7706; (Markham) 7709 (iv), 13331; (Mitchell) 13332; (Mount Forest) 13331; (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Owen Sound) 7817 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii); (Peterborough) 13332 (vii); (Port Arthur) 7825 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Renfrew) 7825 (iv); (St. Mary's) 7826 (iv); (Sarnia) 7829 (iv), 13333; (Seaforth) 13332 (vii); (Simcoe) 7830 (iv), 13333; (Sudbury) 13333 (vii); (Tilsonburg) 13333 (vii); (Uxbridge) 13333 (vii); (Walkerville) 13333 (vii); (Waterloo) 13333 (vii); (Welland) 7830 (iv); (Whitby) 7833 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (deptl. buildings) 1505 (i), (eastern block) 1504 (i); (elevator attendants) 11011 (vi); (grounds) 11012 (vi); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii); (House of Commons, addition) 1486 (i); (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (lighting) 11011 (vi); (Major's Hill park) 11015 (vi); (mint) 1451, 1474 (i);

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Cen.*

(museum) 1489 (i), 13477 (vii); (new deptl. building) 5701 (iii); (observatory) 1450, 1485 (i); (post office) 5705 (iii); (printing bureau, motors) 7817 (iv); (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii); (repairs, furniture. &c.) 10981 (vi); (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329 (vii); (Chicoutimi) 7279 (iv); (Cookshire) 7281 (iv); (Dominion, renewals) 7286 (iv); (Dundee) 7286 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Grand Mere) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7289, 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Lachute) 7293 (iv). 13329 (vii); (Lake Megantic) 7294 (iv); (Levis) 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Magog) 7306 (iv); 13329 (vii); (Marieville) 7306 (iv); (Megantic) 13330 (vii); (Montreal, barracks) 7407 (iv); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423 (iv); (Montreal, military) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5703 (iii); (Montreal, postal station) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, post office) 7410 (iv); (Montreal, station C) 7419 (iv); (Nicolet) 7428 (iv); (Plessisville) 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Point St. Charles) 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Quebec Citadel) 7430 (iv); (Que. Dominion arsenal) 7435 (iv); (Quebec, drill hall) 7431 (iv); (Quebec, hospital) 7433 (iv); (Quebec, immigrants) 7432 (iv); (Quebec, warehouse) 7432 (iv); (Roberval) 13330 (vii); (St. Henri) 7439 (iv); (St. Hyacinthe) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, post office) 7444 (iv); (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv); (St. Therese) 13330 (vii); (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii); (Westmount) 13331 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 8576 (v); (Calgary) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 5706 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii); (Estevan) 8581 (v), 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8582 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moose Jaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Prince Albert, penitentiary) 8601 (v); (Regina) 8602 (v); (Saskatoon) 8602 (v), 13337 (i); (Strathcona) 13338 (vii); (Wetaskiwin) 13338 (vii); (Yorkton) 8603 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 10883 (vi); (Dawson) 13339 (vii); (maintenance) 11005 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson river) 13352 (vii); Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12143 (vii); Ont. and Que. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Spillumcheen) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11694, 12032 (vi); (graving docks) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140 (vii); (Lake Dauphin) 12141 (vii); (St. Andrew's rapids) 5701 (iii), 12145 (v); Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 13344 (vii); (Buctouche) 11679 (vi); (Campbellton) 13344 (vii); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Caraquet) 11685 (vi); (Dorchester) 13344 (vii); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Harvey) 13344 (vii); (Leonardsville) 13344 (vii); (Lorneville) 13344 (vii); (Lower Newcastle) 11696 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi), 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (vi); (St. Andrews) 12011 (vi); (St. John) 11698 (vi); (St. John, harbour) 12011 (vi); (St. John, improvements) 5708 (iii); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345 (vii); (Shippegan) 12027 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207 (vi); (Baddeck) 11219 (vi); (Barachois) 11224 (vi); (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224 (vi); (Big Lorraine) 11224 (vi); (Breton Cove) 11224 (vi); (Cape St. Mary) 11224 (vi); (Caribou Island causeway) 11224 (vi); (Charlos cove) 11225 (vi); (Church Point) 11225 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13340 (vii); (Glace Bay) 11228 (vi); (Hall's Harbour) 11228 (vi); (McPherson's cove) 11229 (vi); (Margaree) 11229 (vi); (Middle River) 11230 (vi); (New Glasgow) 11257 (vi); (Oyster Pond) 11258 (vi); (Parker's Cove) 11258 (vi); (Parrsborough) 11259 (vi); (Poirierville pier) 11260 (v); (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi); (Port Hastings) 11265 (vi); (Port Hilford) 11267 (vi); (Port Hood) 11268 (vi); (Port Joli West) 11279 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi); (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); (Round Hill) 11282 (vi); (Skinner's cove) 11290 (vi); (Sydney wharf) 11230 (vi); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090 (vii); (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (Blanche River) 12090 (vii); (Blind River) 12091 (vii); (Bronte) 12092 (vii); (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Burlington) 12092 (vii); (Chute a Blondeau) 12092 (vii); (Cobourg) 12095 (vii); (Colborne) 12095 (vii); (Collingwood) 12096 (vii); (Georgian Bay surveys) 13326 (vii); (Goderich) 12101 (vii); (Goderich, breakwater) 13350 (vii); (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii); (Juniper Island) 13350 (vii); (Lakefield) 13350 (vii); (Little Current) 13350 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii); (Magnetawan) 13350 (vii); (Meaford) 12103 (vii); (Michipicoten) 13350 (vii); (Midland and Tiffin) 12105 (vii); (Petawawa) 12133 (vii); (Peterborough) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144 (vii); (Port Burwell) 12135 (vii); (Port Colborne) 12146 (vii); (Port Credit) 12102 (vii); (Port Hope) 12135 (vii); (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii); (Rainy River) 12136 (vii); (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Ron-

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

deau) 12137 (vii); (Rossport) 12137 (vii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 12137 (vii); (Severn) 12137 (vii); (Smeeth and McGillicuddy) 13350 (vii); (Southampton) 12137 (vii); (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii); (Temiskaming Lake) 13350 (vii); (Tiffin) 13351 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5709 (iii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii); (Victoria) 12137 (vii); (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (McPherson's cove) 11292 (vi); (New London) 11292 (vi); (repairs) 11292 (vi); (Rustico) 11293 (vi); (Souris) 13341 (vii); (Summerside) 13343 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028 (vi); (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029 (vi); (Baie St. Paul) 12029 (vi); (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan, river) 12036 (vi); (Berthier) 12029 (vi); (Bic wharf) 12030 (vi); (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Cap St. Ignace) 12030 (vi); (Chateauguay) 12030 (vi); (Chicoutimi) 12030 (vi); (Clarke City) 12031 (vi); (East Templeton) 12031 (vi); (Escoumains) 12031 (vi); (Father Point) 12031 (vi); (Grand Mechins) 12031 (vi); (Grande Riviere) 12031 (vi); (Lake Aylmer) 12032 (vi); (Lake Megantic) 12032 (vi); (Lake St. Francis) 12033 (vi); (Lake St. John) 12033 (vi); (Lavaltrie) 12033 (vi); (Les Eboulements) 12033 (vi); (Lotbiniere) 12033 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 12034 (vi); (Malbay) 12034 (vi); (Matane) 12034 (vi); (Montmagny) 12034 (vi); (Nicolet) 12034 (vi); (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034 (vi); (Peribonka) 12035 (vi); (Petite Decharge) 12034 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi); (Pointe aux Trembles) 12035 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 12144 (vii); (Richelieu) 12037 (vi); (Rimouski) 12035 (vi); (Riviere du Lievre) 12037 (vi); (Riviere du Loup) 12036 (vi); (Riviere Maskinonge) 12037 (vi); (Riviere Ouelle) 12037 (vi); (St. Alphonse) 12041 (vi); (Ste. Anne des Monts) 12042 (vi); (St. Francis) 12041 (vi); (St. Francois) 12042 (vi); (St. Ignace de Loyola) 12042 (vi); (St. Jacques) 12041 (vi); (St. Jean des Chaillons) 12042 (vi); (St. Jean Orleans) 12042 (vi); (St. Laurent) 12042 (vi); (St. Louis) 12040 (vi); (St. Maurice River) 12041 (vi); (St. Omer) 12042 (vi); (St. Pierre les Becquets) 12042 (vi); (St. Simeon) 12042 (vi); (Saguenay) 12040 (vi); (Sorel) 12042 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Varennes) 12042 (vi); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska, lock) 12041 (vi); (Yamaska, river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Lesser Slave Lake) 5719 (iii); (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii); (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096 (vi); (cement testing) 11078 (vi); (clerical assistance) 11099 (vi); (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (engineering branch) 11093 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii); (International Commission *re* Red River) 11118 (vi); (monuments) 11118 (vi); (technical books) 11100 (vi); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi); (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731 (iii); (B. C. Cape Beale Lines) 5732 (iii); (cable service) 5731 (iii); (Chicoutimi) 13179 (vii); (Marconi) 12143 (vii); (operating) 13178 (vii); (Yukon) 13179 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii).

Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Tache, J. C., Emplymt. in Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Tenders, Lists of Papers *re* Advertisements (read) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).

Tiffin, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Tignish Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3229 (ii).

Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 682 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Contract Price, Extras, &c. (Ans.) 9712 (v).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap), Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 354 (i).

——— Construction of Entrance (Ans.) 355 (i).

——— Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Date, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 518 (i), 4587 (iii), 10014 (v).

——— Entrance, Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works *re* (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv., 9343 (v).

Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ans.) 3429 (ii).

Uniforms and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9571 (v).

Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4587 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Vautelet, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).

Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).

See 'House of Commons,' &c.

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

Victoria Beach Pier, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Welchpool Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv).

Western Block Extension, Total Expenditure, Area, &c. (Ans.) 512 (i).

Westville Public Building, Total Cost (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure *re*, on M. (Mr. Blain) for Cor., 5476 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tenders, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 6461 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).

——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

Yarmouth, Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).

Yukon Telegraphs, Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 512 (i).

——— Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1934 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Emplymt. of Political Officers (remarks) in deb. on Technical Education, 3292 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4504 (iii).

Beauharnois Canal, Lease of Water Power (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).

Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8553 (v).

Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).

Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 188 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt., B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12853, 13052 (vii).

Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).

Catharine C., Incomplete Return (remarks) 5727 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11566 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5891 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5627 (iii).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

Cypress Hills, Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence River Dam (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

——— Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13151 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1875 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12941 (vii).

Doukhobors, Religious Fanatics, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12161 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3798 (ii).

Gilmore, Edith May Relief (B. 164) 1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6269 (iv).

Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3292 (ii).

G.T.Ry., Connections at Prescott (remarks) 433 (i).

Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c. (Ques.) 6236 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration *re* (remarks) 1739 (i).

Indian Lands at New Westminster, Sale of (Ques.) 3037, 3839 (ii).

I.C.R., Delays to Maritime Express, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).

——— Number of Tons of Steel Rails, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock in Service on Sundays, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock, Purchase of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Trains breaking down, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).
——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c. (M. for ret.) 6242 (iv).
——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4469 (iii).
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9476 (v).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl., Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4004 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 7327 (iv).
——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7247 (iv).
Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ques.) 10791 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Collision with C.P.R. Steamer, Par. in 'Montreal Gazette' (remarks) 8086 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Contract *re* Cement, &c. (Ques.) 7199, 7499 (iv).
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment of (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
——— Return Inquiry for, 5490 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6227 (iv).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 609 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to (Ques.) 6002 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).
Petition. (M.) to introduce, 1682 (i).
Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co., &c. (Ques.) 1348 (i).
Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3894 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1739 (i), 2740 (ii).
Public Accounts Committee, Meetings, &c., Adjournments, &c. (remarks) 1439 (i).
——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4495 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Public Works Dept., Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4890 (iii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quebec Troops, Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3929 (ii).
Ry. Passenger Ticket Act Amt. (B. 90) 1° m., 2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3404 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting (Ques.) 8613 (v).
Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).
See 'Documents.'
Returns unopposed, *re* I. C. R. (remarks) 5914 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8516 (v).
St. Lawrence Power and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3009 (ii).
See 'Deep Waterways.'
Salmon Licenses, Leases &c., in B.C. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8560, 8610 (v).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5458 (iii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12598 (vii).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1929 (i).
Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (seed grain) 5500 (iii).
Canals—Galops (Upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).
Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5669 (iii).
Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12197; (Port Colborne) 12216 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5681 (iii); (widening) 12211 (vii).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); Interior (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii).
Marine (ice-breakers) 1909 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii); (customs dues) 12155; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (properties) 12148; (provisions) 12150;

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(R. M. College) 12153; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942, 2950; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13253 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953 (vi); (Neepawa) 8544; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7111 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7463; (Dom. renewals) 7479; (Glencoe) 7497 (iv); (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 1450; (deptl. buildings) 1505; (House of Com., additions) 1486; (mint) 1451, 1474; (museum) 1490; (observatory) 1485 (i); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7292; (Lewis) 7294 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (St. Andrew's Rapids) 12145 (vii).

Public Works — Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Digby) 11226; (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12134; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Midland and Tiffin) 12125; (Petewawa) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Colborne) 12146; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Stanley Island wharf) 5720 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. Quebec harbour) 12144 (vii).

Public Works — Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11090; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11116; (engineering branch) 11094 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay survey) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (Moncton car shops) 12250 (vii); (Pictou) 5561; (rolling stock) 5549 (iii); (St. John, increased accommodation) 12257 (vii); (train service) 10223; (Windsor Branch) 10146 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357; (Ry. Commission) 10361 (vi).

Tenders, Advertising, *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4702, neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

Timber Lands, Sale of to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 9774 (v).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., &c., on M. to adjn. House, 5905 (iii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3463 (ii).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L., *Quebec County.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4514 (iii).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Experimental Farm, Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade *re* Establishment, &c. (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

French Language, Par. in 'Le Soleil,' on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1212 (i).

Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13059 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6976, 6989 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7453 (iv).

Meat and Canned Food Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7237 (iv).

Militia Dept., Quebec, Hours for Masons, &c. (Ques.) 10790 (vi).

Montmorency Falls Retaining Walls, Width, &c. (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3450 (ii).

Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures for the last fifty years (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Printing Supt., Apptmnt. of a Frenchman (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8850 (v).

Public Works Dept., New Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 13061 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

——— Names of Jurymen, &c. (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13389 (vii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures by Govt. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.) 3853 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Deputy Minister of Public Works *re* French Canadians, 8465 (v).

Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition (Ques.) 6983 (iv).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10606 (vi).
Excise (methylated spirits) 821 (i).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 909 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Address, The, 267 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12453 (vii).
Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4285 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8691 (iv); on M. for 3°, 13257 (vii).
Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1719 (i).
G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).
I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4486 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Accounts, Payments to Mr. Falconer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4120 (ii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi).
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5847 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4046 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1068 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Porter's Lake) 11264 (vi).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Address, The, 485 (i).
Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser, &c. (Ques.) 5795 (iii).
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds' Rights, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Customs Collectors in Man., Additional Fees charged, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1183 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8012 (iv), 11762 (vi); in Com., 13005 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 759 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11168, 11422 (vi).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9953 (v).
Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7633 (iv).
Fish Exportations from Man., five years to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ques.) 4240 (iii).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act, Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13211 (vii).
G.T.P., Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5802 (iii).
——— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions (Ques.) 1937 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6347 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).
Immigration, Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
Indian Schools, Prosecutions *re* Riots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).
Internal Economy Board, H. of C., Minutes, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).
Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of (notice of motion) 3477 (ii).
See 'Seed Grain.'
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12803 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address, 495 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13222 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Polling Divisions, made by Judges (remarks) 13141 (vii).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty from 1905-8 (Ques.) 8441 (v).
Military Stores of Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
'Montague,' Dredge, Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9488 (v).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Number, Total Receipts, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5258 (iii).

—— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads, Letter from Mr. Seaman (read) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

—— Entry by Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

—— Timber Reserves, Squatters' Claims, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

—— Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

—— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

—— Title, Extinguish of, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Land Grants, Patents, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).

Seed Grain in N. W., Distribution of, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leeh (remarks) 3040 (ii).

—— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Seed Grain for N.W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P. (remarks) 1442 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2909 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1373 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3815 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9769 (v).

Customs—Miscellaneous (guarantees) 9577; Inspectors (salaries) 9550 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10046; (forest rangers) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9860; (deportations) 9883 (v); (general expenses) 5754 (iii); (hospitals) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9952 (v).

Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 5737 (iii); (rifle and artillery grants) 12152 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2775 (ii).

N.W. Ters. (school grants) 10118 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10889 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8519; (Neepawa) 8536; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10962 (vi); (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, P.O.) 8575 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582; (Saskatoon) 8603; (Yorkton) 8603 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ques.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Cutting by Saw-mill Owners, Applications *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2614 (ii).

Timber Permits to Saw-mill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 179 (i).

Town Site, Section 32, Man., Erection of Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1125, 1348 (i).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

ROSS, Mr. A. C., *Cape Breton, N., and Victoria.*

Cement, Sydney, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11219; (Digby) 11226 (vi).

ROSS, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1283 (i).

Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) M. to adjn. debate, 4312 (iii).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 606 (i).

B.C. Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905 (M. for ret.) 3435 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order 12089 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10747 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendments, Ques. of Order, 9282 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10138 (v).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Customs Outside Service, in Com. of Sup., Members remarks checked, 9451 (v).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N. W. M. Police Force (Ques.) 6001 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1172 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1632, 1653 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8185 (iv); in Com., 11877, 11932 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13252 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11176 (vi).

Edmonton, Dunvegan and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 754 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry. Co., Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1512 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, Ques. of Order, *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1298 (i).

Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 630 (i).

Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

Japanese Immigration Restriction, B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1744 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2066 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies, 855, 877 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 732 (i).

Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 754 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11244 (vi).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9916 (v).

——— Ques. of Order, 10023, 'Bourinot' quoted, 10030 (v).

Obstruction Tactics, &c., Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 5337 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).

Order, Points of, 'Bourinot' *re* Discussions on, 4103 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4955 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13401 (vii).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4986 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, Ques. of Order, 10663 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

Resignation as Member *re* Chinese Question (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).

Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 891 (i); in Com., 5409, 5519 (iii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3773 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 625 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9244; Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).

Legislation (voters' lists) 10508 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4099 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7293 (iv).

Timber Berths, Leasing of, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2287 (ii).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. *re* Amts., 908 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4520 (iii).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8200 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11170, 11458, 11521; (amt.) 11943; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 11970; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 58) 11974 (vi).

Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* Closing (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Fish Hatchery, Lake Winnipeg, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13210 (vii).

Homestead Entries granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian, &c. (Ques.) 9773 (v).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).

Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5084 (iii).

Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Immigration from U. S., Total Amount expended (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c. (Ques.) 3434 (ii).

Land Patents for Sections 10, and 17, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 9475 (v).

Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 2977 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13220 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1683 (i).

'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on order for Copy of Rep. (wthdn.) 850 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ques.) 1940 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4976 (iii).

——— (demurrage) B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3366 (ii).

Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c. (M. for copies*) 1689 (i).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1367 (i).

Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Squatters on Forest Reserves in Turtle Mountain (remarks) 4739 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10074; (surveys) 10007 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9866; (deportations) 9882 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8540; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10964 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2655 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11389 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*

Dredging Contracts, Supplies, &c. (remarks) 7106 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13264 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13298 (vii).

G.T.P., Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.) 600 (i).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12364 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com on Res., 13291 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12198; (Port Colborne) 12221 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (piping) 10195 (v).

Transportation Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12221 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2188 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *Oxford S.*

Budget, The, 5616, 5957 (iii).

Canada Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 1°*, 753 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4563; in Com., 4564 (iii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10835 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10560 (vi).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1550 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12439 (vii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission (remarks) 1435 (i).

Budget, The, 5338 (iii).

Imperial Pulp Co., Denial re Managing Directorship, Par. in Montreal 'Star,' Ques. of Priv., 3578 (ii).

SIFTON, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, Govt. Aid (M.) to adjn., 1349 (i).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).
Budget, The, 6615 (iv).
Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red,' &c.
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12854 (vii).
Coasting Privileges, prop. Res. (Mr. Black) withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).
Debates of the House, Average Cost per Column (Ques.) 3479 (ii).
Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce, 508 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 31) 1°*, 562 (i); in Com., 5248 (iii).
Fisheries Com., Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of (prop. res.) 1691 (i).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).
Fishery Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).
I.C.R., Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re* (M. for papers*) 5800 (iii).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3027 (ii).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) 3680 (ii).
Northwest and Gold Dredging Co., Leases, assigned, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).
Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ques.) 8381 (v).
Presbyterian College, Halifax (B. 154) in Com., 7667 (iv).
Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority *re* (uQes.) 12775 (vii).
Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons Registered, &c. (Ques.) 2790 (ii).
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (contingencies) 10503 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4016, 4169 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10298 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2957; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761 (vii).

SLOAN, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*
British Columbia Bank incorp. (B. 59) 2° m., 1469 (i).

SLOAN, Mr. W.—*Con.*
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Schr., Seizure, &c.: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 350 (i).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 726 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox,' on M. for Sup., 3934 (ii).
——— (notice of motion) *re* Discussion, 3156 (ii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 2160 (ii); in Com., 4545; on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 1108 (i).
Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ques.) 10301 (vi).
Yukon Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1934 (i).

SMITH, Mr. E. D., *Wentworth.*
Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).
Budget, The, 5375, 5388 (iii).
Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6203 (iii).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3523; in Com., 3595, 3645 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).
Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).
Militia Food Supply, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4979 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Excise (travelling expenses) 815 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5774 (iii).
Militia (stores, &c.) 5739 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1477; (museum) 1498 (i).

SMITH, Mr. G., *Oxford, N.*

Address, The, 407 (i).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1555 (i).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2866 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrest *re* Picketing (remarks) 9027 (v).
Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10548, 10745 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11373 (vi).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9192 (v).
Coal Land Leases, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).
Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4685 (iii).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Dom. Interference (remarks) 1738 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).
—— Transfer to Canada (Ques.) 1293 (i).
Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations *re* with Mr. Bastedo, Reports *re* (remarks) 6849 (iv).
G.T.P. Workmen Accidents, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ques.) 567 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6449 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6729, 7097 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11029 (vi).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ques.) 7196 (iv).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C. (Ques.) 6642 (iv).
—— Natal Act, Cor., &c., with Lt. Gov., B.C. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of (prop. Res.) 699 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2081 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 874 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).
Mail Service in B.C., Better Arrangements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com., 12053 (vii).
Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2419 (ii).
Railway Act (working hours) Amt. (B. 157) 1° m., 6843 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 6919 (iv).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 9889 (v).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10066 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 5740 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland), *Essex, N.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) Remarks, 530 (i).
Adjournment of the House, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4495 (iii).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) Irrelevancy of Debate, 4730 (iii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) Members addressing Hse. from their Seats without rising (remarks) 10922 (vi).
Banking System, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) Members remarks checked, 2307 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111, on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).
Belleville City Floods, Investigation *re*, Members remarks checked, 3319 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., on Qes. of Order (Mr. German) 2809; (ruling) 2810 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex., 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 10656 (vi).
—— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).
Brantford Stove Works Strike (remarks) 9027 (v).
Cigarette Restraint B. (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13045 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11363, 11535, 11645 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Discussion *re*, Ques. of Order (ruling) 5627-8 (iii).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 680 (i).
Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9282 (v).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) (ruling) 8461 (v).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, Members remarks checked, 1195 (i), 2305 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster)—(ruling) 11717 (vi).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 13247 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3° (ruling) 11977 (vi), 12394 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.C., Rule *re* Producing, 6927 (iv).

——— Ref. to Matters before Committee (ruling) 6749 (iv).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 6843 (iv).

Eclipse Mfg. Co., Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 7470 (iv).

Electoral Districts, Certificates of Election (notification) 890 (i).

Electoral District of Nicolet, Certificate of Election (notification) 1283 (i).

Electoral District, Vacancies, Issue of Writs (notifications) 2 (i).

Election, New Members, Certificates of Election (notification) 2 (i).

Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments (presented) 1 (i).

Fire Extinguishers Ret., Members remarks checked, 4833 (iii).

——— Irrelevancy of debate, 7776 (iv).

French Language, Pet. *re*, Ques of Order, 8886 (v).

Govt. Grounds, Conditions *re*, Members remarks checked, 1741 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 89, Members remarks checked, 2254 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley)—(ruling) 8136 (iv).

G.T.P. Supplies via American Routes, Member's remarks checked, 9026 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25, in Com., on Ruling to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10491 (vi).

Huron, South Riding, Certificate of Election (notification) 2541 (ii).

——— Vacancy, &c. (notification) 890 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1299 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) Member's remarks checked, 13137 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Indian Lands in Algoma, *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram (remarks) 13532 (vii).

Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 8 (i).

Japanese Immigration, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt. (ruling) 1763 (i).

Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted by Member (ruling) *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Officials, Member's remarks checked, 6633

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr .Fisher) on M. for 3°, Member's remarks checked, 7217 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227 (iv).

Members introduced, 3 (i).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. Estimates (read) 12503 (vii).

Moir, Private, Shooting, &c., Member's remarks checked, 7322 (iv).

Montmagny, Electoral District (Notification) Vacancy, 9263 (v).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher), Appeal to the Speaker, 4070; (ruling) 4071; Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on Amts. (ruling) 9503 (v).

Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the Hse. (remarks) 8896 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, &c., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9925 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 10024 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) to Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross)—(ruling) 10025, 10031 (v).

Opening of Parliament, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1 (i).

Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6741 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, re answering Questions by Govt. (ruling) 234 (i).

Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting in Ottawa, Com. from Senate (read) 13581 (vii).

Petit Rocher Wharf, Discussion *re* (ruling) 9717 (v).

Petition, on M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to introduce, 1682 (i).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., Member's remarks checked, 3164 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry. Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 12629 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of (remarks) 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Member's remarks checked, 4496 (iii).

Priv., Ques. of (Mr. A. Lavergne) Member's remarks checked, 7993 (iv).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 13580 (vii).

——— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 3085 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 9890 (v).

Public Works, Dep. Minister and French Canadians, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) Member's remarks checked, 4910 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 4958 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 13401 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 13402 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures (remarks) *re* Question, 3847 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators (remarks) 6061 (iii).

Ques. of Order, *re* Accepting Minister's Stmnt. (ruling) 9352 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Member's remarks checked, 2382 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) (ruling) 2383 (ii).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid)—(remarks) 9774 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) *re* Representation of Mar. Provs. (remarks) 9892 (v).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden)—(ruling) 11618 (vi).

——— on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602 (vi).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) ref. to deb. in Senate (ruling) 577 (i).

Railway Commissioners' Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Ry. Connections at Brockville, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) Remarks checked, 9 (i).

Returns, Retention of by Members, on Ques. of Priv., Member's remarks checked, 4667 (iii).

Seed Grain Distribution, Member's remarks checked, 6635 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Seed Grain Distribution, Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech, Discussion ruled out of Order, 3041 (ii).

Speech from the Throne (read) 3 (i).

Supplies purchased for Govt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5830, (ruling) 5831 (iii).

——— Member's remarks checked, 5837 (iii).

SUPPLY—

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (salaries) 10491, 10501 (vi); (salary, increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) Member's remarks checked, 1064 (i).

Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Timber Berths, on M. for Original Documents (remarks) 2984 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order, *re* Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turrig)—(ruling) 11304 (vi).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolution *re* Moral Reform Associations, Member's remarks checked, 11302 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Barker) (ruling) 923 (i).

Vacancies in Electoral District (notification) 2 (i).

Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ (notification) 569 (i).

York, Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 1018 (i).

SPEAKER, DEP. (Mr. C. Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11828 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, Member's remarks checked, 5025 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) ref. to Speaker, 8135 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3717 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Member's remarks checked, 11290 (vi).

Lord's Day Act, Violations *re* Horse Racing, Member's remarks checked, 3753 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., Discussion *re* M. to adjn., 3656 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

Ocean and River Service, Irrelevancy of debate, 2943 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 10993 (vi).

SPEAKER, DEP.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch Ry. B. 202, Member's remarks checked, 12632 (vii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Talbot) *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Member's remarks checked, 4222 (iii).

Restaurant Com., Joint, 1st Rep. (presented) 13510 (vii).

Royal Mint, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup. (ruling) 1461 (i).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Prov. (remarks) 6854 (iv).

Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup. (ruling) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 9250 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *Grey, E.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855, 3880 (ii).

Anglo-American Treaties, Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°. 5763 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13307 (vii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ques.) 3848 (ii).

Banking Act Amts., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4272 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Banking Systems, Criticisms of Newspaper Report, Ques. of Privilege, 2308 (ii).

Battlefields of Quebec, Tercentenary at Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4388; in Com., 4415, 4511; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2810 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2994 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Bonusing System, on Notice of Motion (remarks) 6290 (iv).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Budget, The, 6595 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6171, 6173 (iii); in Com., 6408 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6872 (iv).

Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in the Senate, Ques. of Priv., 5047 (iii). *See* 'Employees.'

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10749, 11021 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5114 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721; in Com., 11366, 11536, 11635 (vi), 12184 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

—— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5901 (iii).

—— Report (remarks) 5628, 5633 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).

Colonization Lands, Alienation of, Inquiry for Ret., 3752 (ii), 4317 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Statement of Members, Ruling *re*, 8462 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10487 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1147, 1194 (i).

—— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1782 (i).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Copp) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 13244; (amt.) to M. for 3°. 13255 (vii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11466 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10815, 10820 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5027 (iii).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7639 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6755 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266; in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5479 (iii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13470 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7774 (iv).

Fisheries Treaty, Boundaries with U. S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6739 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8294 (v).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3618, 3636 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (remarks) 945 (i).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12556 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (remarks) 6287 (iv).

——— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence (remarks) 6917 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, Interference *re*, on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8552, 8744, 9461 (v).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8836 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Investigation *re* Charges of Major Hodgins, on 1st Rep. of Com., 8515 (v).

——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2241 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224; on M. for 3°, 4536 (iii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Neglect of Duty as Inspector at Halifax (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hindus in B. C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

Hogs saughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ques.) 6000 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) 6302 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1299 (i).

Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. Walker and Mr. Smith (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Immigants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475, 6482 (iv).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Employees, Circular from Genl. Manager *re* Municipal Politics (read) 2304 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Councils (remarks) 2309 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections, Circular *re* (remarks) 2884 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768, 953 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2133 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration, B. C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1759 (i).
Lands set apart for Settlement since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res. 8481 (v).
Lands Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6518 (iv).
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10953 (vi).
MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7177 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt. (remarks) 6985 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Book-keeping, &c., ref. to Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8454 (v).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020; in Com., 3035 (ii).
Meaford Harbour B. 158 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8510 (v).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6895, 7238; on M. for 3°, 7218 (iv).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 1505 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (remarks) 12546 (vii).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3451 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9495 (v)
Niagara, St Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5067 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4631 (iii); in Com., 12054 (vii).
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Ministerial Speeches (remarks) 10126 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Order Paper, Differences in English and French Editions (remarks) 6740, 6850 (iv).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2837 (ii).
Patent and Proprietary Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10552 (vi).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10412 (vi).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3979 (ii).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Inquiry for missing Papers (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9722 (v).
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (remarks) 10513 (vi).
Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).
Prescott Lighthouse Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3097 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7191 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 2394 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co., Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3376 (ii).
Railway Commission (asst. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3903 (ii); in Com., 8512 (v).
——— on M. to introduce, 3751 (ii).
——— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11630 (vi)
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13285 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies, Bridge Subsidies (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ques) 6000 (iii). 6232 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2988 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv), 8562, 9068 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).

School Lands Exchange B 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470; in Com., 8478 (v).

Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2781 (ii).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adn., 1361 (i).

Seed Grain Distribution, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).

——— (remarks) *re* Purchases, 3158 (ii).

Seed Wheat, Delegation *re* (remarks) 1740 (i).

Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Station, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Shipping Rings, Combination *re*, Cor., &c. (read) 5916 (iii).

Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5416 (iii).

Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom. Fruit Inspector Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).

——— (M. for copies) 2398 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3761, 3832 (ii), 12595 (vii).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5865 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (exhibitions) 10569, 10597 (vi); (seed branch) 5502 (iii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5664 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12217; (surveys) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9740 (v).

Excise (methylated spirits) 820; (travelling expenses) 815 (i).

Experimental Farms (salaries) 12549 (vii).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10503 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 13169 (vii).

Indians—N.B. (schools) 13171 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5757 (iii).

Justice (Exchequer Court) 5505 (iii).

Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3986 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10290 (v); (pay and allowance) 12546 (vii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2773 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 5765 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2948, 2949; (naval schools) 3222; (obstructions) 3214; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3184, 3195; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings — Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8535; (Neepawa) 8541; (Selkirk) 8550; (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax customs) 7168; (Shelburne) 7177; (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).

Public Works—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7692; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston, artillery park) 7702; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704; (Leamington) 7705; (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7715 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Major's Hill Park) 11015; (rents, &c.) 10983; (repairs, furniture, &c.) 10981 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings — Que. (Cookshire) 7281; (dominion arsenal) 7435; (Farnham) 7288; (Montreal barracks) 7407; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station C) 7422; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (St. John's military) 7440; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Humbolt) 8586; (Maple Creek) 8601; (Medicine Hat) 8601; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601, 8602; (Regina) 8602 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12114 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079 (vi).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143 (vii).

Quarantine (Public health) 5505 (iii).

Railways—Generally (extra clerks) 10342 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10188; (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10358 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi).

Senate—(salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Supply, Conc., 5499 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2864 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Torrens Land Title Fund, (remarks) 10917 (vi).

Trent Canal, Newmarket (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) 6122 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for copies, 2177 (ii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10536 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9655 (v).

—— Clements, W. H. P., Apptmt. as Legal Adviser, O.Cs., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

—— (Ques.) 5650 (iii).

Yukon—Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for, 10623, 10689, 11016 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8483 (v).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

—— Successor to Dr. Brine, &c. (Ques.) 1735 (i).

Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ques.) 6237 (iv).

—— O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ques.) 8184 (iv).

Doyle, P., Immigration Agents, Superannuation of (Ques.) 6923 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Captains' Residences, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3241 (ii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).

I.C.R., Compensation *re* Horses Killed at Truro (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees, Increased Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

—— Ice Contract (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

—— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ques.) 10733 (vi).

—— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax to Sydney Division, &c. (Ques.) 12773 (vii).

—— Pictou Branch, Answer to Question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

—— Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 10733 (vi).

—— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10789 (vi).

—— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

—— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 10734 (vi).

—— Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).

—— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ques.) 12052 (vii).

—— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

—— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ques.) 1936 (i).

—— Truro Ry. Station, Sanitary Condition, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).

Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Militia, Apptmts. of Generals, Names and Qualifications (Ques.) 5086 (iii).

Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ques.) 11298 (vi).

Pictou P. O. Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 10518 (vi).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).

Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ques.) 9271 (v).

Ry. Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10012 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).

Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174 (vii).
Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v).
Dom. Lands (Rocky Mountain Park) 9991 (v).
Marine (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7117; (Halifax, customs) 7161; (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Westville) 7179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Henri) 7439; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Pictou) 5559; (rolling stock) 5551 (iii); (salaries) 10180 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).
Tatamagouche, Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 11701 (vi).
Tenders, Advertisements for (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 9711 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, Payments *re* (Ques.) 7204 (iv).
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ques.) 3429 (ii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ques.) 3480 (ii).
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).
Westville, N.S., Public Buildings, Total Amount of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9474 (v).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Address, The, 383 (i).
Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4297 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality of Imports into Can. (Ques.) 6232 (iv).
Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10104 (v).
Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).
Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).
Cypress Hills Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8387 (v).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11143; in Com., 11183, 11489, 11531 (vi).
Doukohobors Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9958 (v).
Fence Post Fees, Memorial from Union of Man. Municipalities, &c. (Ques.) 10258 (v).
Grain Commission, Emplymt. of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).
——— Report (Ques.) 180 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Grain Commission Report, Inqiury for, 609 (i).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13048, 13209 (vii).
G.T.P. Ry., Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).
Heath Point, Purchase of Cement from A. E. Walberg, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10495 (vi).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6379 (iv).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ques.) 6402 (iv).
Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13050 (vii).
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12811 (vii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).
Obstructions *re* Supply, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9932 (v).
Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).
St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 5797 (iii).
St. Laurent Harbour, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Seed Grain for Man. Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).
Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1357 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2930 (ii).
Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).
Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c (Ques.) 567, 891 (i).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii)
Supply (seed grain) B. 96, in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi), 12890; (fumigating stations) 12881; (seeds) 12891 (vii); (seed branch) 5503 (iii).
Customs — Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577; (salaries) 9571 (v).
Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10051 (v).
Immigration (agents) 9880; (agents in U. S.) 9964; (deportations) 9882; (hospitals, Winnipeg) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9950 (v).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12729 (vii).
Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5760 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4212 (ii).
Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2771 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).
Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8521; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8539; (Selkirk) 8547 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11011; (rents, &c.) 10983 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140; (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10199 (v).

Swamp Lands in Manitoba, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake, Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ques.) 693 (i).
—— Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
—— Settlement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for, 1906-7 (Ques.) 892 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Turriff) 11307 (vi).
——on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
—— Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ques.) 3843 (ii).
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 568 (i).

STEWART, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*

Alexander, Mrs. Mary, Relief (B. 177) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13572 (vii).
Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to, *re* Govt. Inspections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
British-Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).
Cannon, Mrs. Catherine Ann, Relief (B. 175) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10728; on M. for 2°, 11350; in Com., 11354, 11567 (vi), 12189 (vii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Stewart) 6813 (iv).
General Chemical Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 174) 1°*, 9126 (v).

STEWART, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 891; 2° m., 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).
G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12070 (vii).
Paulding, Mrs. Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief (B. 176) 1°*, 9126 (v).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Alberta Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 44) 1°*, 891 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12481 (vii).
Campaign Literature (French) sent by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).
Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6191 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Ques. of Order, 7598 (iv).
Civil Service System, Ques. of Order, Member reading speech, 9175 (v).
Documents quoted by Ministers, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4575 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13255 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266 (vii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Approval, and Imp. Treaty (Ques.) 12655 (vii).
French Language Pet. *re*, Ques. of Order, 8887 (v).
German Development Co., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 1741 (i).
G.T.P. Construction, Accidents *re* (remarks) 6850 (iv).
Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4459 (iii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolishing of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

Obstruction Tactics, Ques. of Order, 9223 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers, 4221 (iii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4958 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc. in Rep., 13366 (vii).
——— Rep., Ques. of Order, 13402 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, &c. (remarks) 8385 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10579 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4042 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1902 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1090 (i).
Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10899; Ont. (Kingston) 10912 (vi); Ottawa (museum) 1502 (i); Que. (Knowlton) 7293; (Levis) 7296; (Montreal, post office) 7413 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (ques. of priv.) 3578 (ii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 9250 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *Leeds.*

Accounts, Sums, &c., remaining unpaid by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., History of Northern Cruise, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Bate & Co. and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4390; in Com., 4519 (iii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Boiler Inspections, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act by Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Service, Connections, &c. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
——— (remarks) 432 (i).
——— Charges against Ry. Commission, 1429 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'
Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).
Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10517 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vii).
Chicoutimi Public Expenditures, Ques. of Order, 13203 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367, 11558 (vi), 12184 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5909 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5626 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Ry. Bridge (remarks) 11120 (vi).
Cowie, F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5649 (iii).
See 'Govt. Steamers,' &c.
Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1, 1908 (Ques.) 10791 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8900 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).
Doukhobors, Letter *re* Manner of Living at Yorkton (read) 5751 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6794 (iv).
——— Quebec Harbour (remarks) 7100, 7104 (iv).
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of accepting Apptmt. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).
——— Date of Communication of Apptmt. (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
——— (M. for papers*) 5086 (iii).
Falconer, Mr. K., Payments to *re* Bookkeeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3999 (iii).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13468 (vii).
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1510 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
——— File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7782 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4832 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5659 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 899 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1860 (i).
Gananoque Lights and Buoys, Apptmt. of Keeper, &c. (Ques.) 8383 (v).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3630 (ii).
Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6266 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Govt. Steamers, Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
See 'Cowie.'

G. T. Ry., Connections at Brockville (Ques. of Privilege) 9 (i).
See 'Brockville.'

G.T.R. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2222 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimates *re* Cost (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ties purchased in U. S. (remarks) 1448 (i).

——— Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Branch, Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &c. (M. for ret.*) 935 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Retraction of Remarks by Fin. Min., 5784 (iii).

House of Commons, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi).

——— Rules for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 594 (i).
See 'Postal.'

'Hurona'-'Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 358 (i).

Kingston Military Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).

Lacas, E., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979, 1039 (i).

Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Judgments undelivered, Action of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (remarks) 10791 (vi).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt. in Geodetic Survey (Ques.) 1349 (i).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ques.) 11701 (vi).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

'Montcalm' Ice-breaker, Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1897 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8441 (v).
See 'Govt. Steamers.'

Montreal 'Gazette' Building, Amount paid for, &c. (Ques.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9499 (v).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9919 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10333 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal (remarks) 10123 (v).

Orangeville Post Office Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, Appeal to the Chair *re* Chairman's Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, &c., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).

——— Inquiry for, 6464, 7107 (iv).

Postal Service, H. of C., Delays, &c. (Ques.) 570 (i).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) in Com. on Res., 12409 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3122 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3387 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii).

Ry. Connections: *See* 'Brockville,' &c.

Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 10301 (vi).

——— Emplymt. in Quebec Provincial Elections, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Su,., 10986 (vi).

Returns, Inqiury for, 2738 (ii).

Riviere du Loup Wharf Dredging, &c. (remarks) 6462 (iv).

Ross Rifles, Number in Use in Canada, Total &c. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).

——— Provisions *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3010 (ii)

St. Louis, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2780 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904, 2920 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1366 (i).

Senate, Cost of, Outside of Indemnities (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

Sorel Irregularities, Final Rep. (remarks) 10795 (vi).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition of Services (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3782 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

—— Expenditure *re* Wreck Investigations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture, &c. (dairying, &c.) 10397; (exhibitions) 10570; (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi).
Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Murray (houses) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).
Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).
Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii).
Canals (statistical branch) 10320 (vi).
Canals—Trent (construction) 12225; (improvements) 12227 (vii).
Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).
Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1885 (i).
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 621 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 978; Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613 (i).
Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9223, 9253; Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540 (v).
Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii).
Immigration (general expenses) 5751 (iii).
Justice (Penitentiaries) 12265 (vii).
Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773, 5780 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4755 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1894 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); (observatories) 12262 (vii); (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).
Militia (pay and allowance) 12147; (properties) 12148; (Quebec cliffs) 12148; (salaries and wages) 12147; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).
Miscellaneous (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 1049 (i), 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2968; (wrecks) 3150 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5530; (maintenance) 5512 (iii).
Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891; (experimental farms, repairs, &c.) 10904 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7116; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax, customs) 7166; (Shelburne) 7174; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7465; (Dom. renewals) 7482; (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Renfrew) 7826 (iv); (R.M.C. Barracks) 10907 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi); (mint) 1451; (observatory) 1450 (i); (rents, &c.) 10986 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Farnham) 7288; (Knowlton) 7291; (Lachute) 7293; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11689 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Breton Cove) 11224; (Cape St. Mary) 11224; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Digby) 11227; (Glace Bay) 11228; (Hall's breakwater) 11228; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Port Hood) 11278; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Tancock island) 11230 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Stanley Island wharf) 5720; (Tiffin) 5721 (iii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Rustico) 11293 (vi).
Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 11118 (vi).
Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10391 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 12238 (vii); (private car of N.T.R.) 10186; (supplies) 10195 (v); (Truro) 12232 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10389 (vi).
Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 12262 (vii).

Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2664 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Marine Dept., Minister's, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

—— *re* Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

U.S. Training Ships through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ques.) 5788 (iii).

—— (M. for copies) 5800 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6135 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2191 (ii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P., *Grey, N.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5102 (iii).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2459 (ii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1732 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Registrar of Grey County, 11302 (vi).

Returning Officers in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12109 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolutions from Moral Reform Associations (remarks) 11302 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue) *Victoria City, B.C.*

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3868 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5473 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5787 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6213 (iii).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10750 (vi).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Cirkel, Franz., Remuneration *re* Report of Geological Survey *re* Graphites (Ans.) 7935 (iv).

——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7202 (iv). *See* 'Graphite,' &c.

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ans.) 515 (i).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Cosgrove, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Dowling, Dr., Leave of Absence from Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

——— Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5206 (iii).

Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ans.) 360 (i).

Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10792 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Geological Survey Dept., Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908 (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

——— Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Geological Survey Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11232 (vi).

Gooderham & Worts, Distiller, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 5081 (iii). *See* 'Cirkel,' &c.

Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. by Excise Dept (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. (B. 143) 1°*, 6142 (iii); in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

———Seizures in Cornwall, Toronto, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

——— Violations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* (Ans.) 6639 (iv).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Accountants, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4109 (ii).

Medicine Patent Bill, *re* Apptmts. to Com. (remarks) 10689 (vi).

Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Criticism of, in Press (Ans.) 6056 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection (B. 146) Res. prop., 4963 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2° m., 10551; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 10553 (vi); in Com., 12622 (vii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govt. Legislation *re* (Ans.) 356, 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

——— Committee of Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Peat Deposits in Canada, Development of (Ans.) 515 (i).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Port Hope Inland Rev. Collectorship, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 895 (i).

Sugar Manufacture, Saccharine Standards, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Excise (inspectors' salaries) 813; Inland Revenue (salaries) 645, 646; Mines (salaries) 646 (i).

Excise (customs duty) 817; (distilleries) 814; (methylated spirits) 820; (provisional allowances) 818; (tobacco stamps) 816; (travelling expenses, rent, &c.) 814 (i).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (oil borings) 13162; (specimens) 12261; (technical officers) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4109 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874; (Victoria, immigration) 10874 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3298 (ii)

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act (Ans.) 179 (i).

—— Infractions of Inland Revenue Act, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9523 (v).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9240 (v).

Tobacco Manufactures, Total Amount of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 363 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 920 (i).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10277 (v).

Windsor Ferry, Expiration of Franchise (Ans.) 1940 (i).

THOMPSON, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4281 (iii).

Budget, The, 5405 (iii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 757 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Mint, Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3954 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3919 (ii).

Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada, Notice of Discussion, 3172 (ii).

Yukon—Finnie-Perron Case, Information *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

—— (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon, Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ques.) 894 (i).

—— Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

—— Mail Service, Nontransmissable, &c. (remarks) 5136 (iii).

—— Money Transmission, Rates *re* (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

THOMPSON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Yukon, Morality, Correspondence, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

TISDALE, Hon. D., *Norfolk.*

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) in Com., 9962 (v).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4444 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1027 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12792 (vii).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4821 (iii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Nicolet, Govt. Expenditure, for 1878-1896; 1896-1908 (Ques.) 12775 (vii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134) 1°*, 5649 (iii).

Blackhall, Mrs. Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1730 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater (remarks) 7110 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4920 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9795 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia, E.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11357 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11170, 11418, 11533, 11947 (vi).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6373 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7016 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13135 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals, 1927 (i).

Ry. Act (construction) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 91 (i); Discussion *re*, 3404; 2° m., 3406 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3359 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Timber Leases, Denial of Stmnt. of Mr. Ames, 8697 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4233 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3765, 3831 (ii); in Com., 12605 (vii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8595 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2290 (ii).

——— Opening of Tenders, Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster, 11303 (vi).

——— Papers used in Debate, on Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).

——— Par. in 'Toronto News,' Ques of Priv., 5077 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c. (Ques.) 238 (i).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4562 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Immigration Agents in Italy, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).

Immigration Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ques.) 2545 (ii).

Montreal P. O. Building, Settlement of Strike (remarks) 8608 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., and Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 803 (i).

Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

Public Works, Hours of Labour (B. 97) 1° m., 3157 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. J. C., *Montreal, St. Anne's.*

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 2214 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3537 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschene, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Brockville Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Desaulniers, Mr. Gonsalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ques.) 1121, 1290 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

International Boundary Line, Representations *re* Buildings on (Ques.) 356 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4933 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13381 (vii).

St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe, Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

——— Rep. of Engineer (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12898 (vii); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dundee) 7286 (iv).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of (Ques.) 9270 (v).

WARD, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 3466 (ii).

WARD, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*

Blunden, Frederick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5211 (iii).

Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).

Gillis, Release from Penitentiary (Ques.) 510 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 960 (i).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1028 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission (remarks) 7387 (iv).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).

Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmt. of Collector, &c. (Ques.) 895 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8860 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3832 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (damages) 10308 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9704 (v).

Militia (customs dues) 12156; (pay and allowance) 12147; (provisions) 12151; (R. M. College) 12153 (vii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8529 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Hope) 12135 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10339 (vi).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2520, 2652 (ii).

WATSON, Mr. R. J., *Parry Sound.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1982 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *Renfrew, N.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report *re* (Ques.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1970 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10314 (vi).

——— Rep. *re* Surveys (remarks) 11827 (vi).

G.T.P., Supplies, Contract *re* District No. 3, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

McInnes, W. B., Inquiry for Ret., 6061 (iii).

Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ques.) 7199 (iv).

Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops (Ques.) 5791 (iii).

——— Payment *re* Painting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).

WHITE, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*

Petawawa Dock, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10716 (vi).

Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept., &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4205 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5742 (iii); (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).

Public Works — Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10901 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Petawawa) 12134 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).

———Tenders, Original Documents (M for ret.) 2983 (ii).

WILMOT, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.*

Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ques.) 6642 (iv).

Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf (Ques.) 7937 (iv).

G.T.P., Nationality of Messrs. Foley, Welsh & Stewart, Discrimination against Canadians (Ques.) 7936 (iv).

Immigration Agents in N. B., Apptmt. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Live Stock, N. B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).

Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Office, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

N.B. Inland Waters, Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c. (Ques.) 5465 (iii).

Scotch Town, N.B., Wharf, Application (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. N. F., *Russell.*

Budget, The, 6610 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2218 (ii).

Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4500 (iii).

British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).

Budget, The, 6082 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11353; in Com., 11365, 11661; (amt.) 11930 (vi).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5016 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13260; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3625 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

Governor General's Expenditure since 1892 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).

Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Immigrant Detention Hospitals, Amount expended (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Agent M. C. Dunne, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agent Miller, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses (Ques.) 180 (i).

Immigrant Agents in G. B., Names, Salary, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

——— Reps. received from (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

——— Agents in Ont., &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).

——— Special Agents in G. B., Salaries, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2398 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3300 (ii).

Immigration and Commercial Agents, Rets., Inquiry for, 1108 (i).

Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re* (M. for copies*) 2171 (ii).

I.C.R., Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11240; in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 806 (i).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10709 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 984; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8880 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10878; (Victoria, immigration) 10878 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11007 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6186 (iii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Cavalry Brigade Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 9273 (v).

Church of England Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society, incorp. (B. 75) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Customs Duty on Militia Uniforms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2584 (ii).

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* Building (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 1125 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, 5th Regiment, B.C., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ques.) 8442 9273 (v).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, Proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3167 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1290 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ques.) 7992 (iv).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).

Rifles, Purchase of from other Cos. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

Ross Rifle Co., Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).

—— Contracts *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 6235, 8176 (iv), 8442 (v).

—— (M. for copy*) 5476 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Bonus Loans, Service of Govt. Employees, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

—— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

—— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

—— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).

—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3237 (ii).

—— Evidence before Pub. Accounts, Inquiry for Rep., 5914 (iii).

—— Imp. Govt., Cor. with *re* Defects, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5210 (iii).

—— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Dept. of Militia, 8902; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 8953; Amt. neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).

—— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).

—— Military Associations, &c., Rep. from, *re* Efficiency (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).

—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

—— Number reported unfit for Use (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

—— Payments for since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ques.) 7209 (iv).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9333 (v).

—— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).

—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ques.) 3237 (ii).

—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ques.) 365 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Target Practice, Suspension by N.W.M. Police (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

—— Tests in England, Reps. *re* (remarks) 8170 (iv).

Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ques.) 9273 (v).

Sutherland Rifle Sight, Contract *re* Additional Number (Ques.) 5257 (iii).

—— Number, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 569 (i).

—— Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9567 (v); Marine (ice-breakers) 1897 (i).

Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt. (Ques.) 356 (i).

WRIGHT, Mr. A. A., *Renfrew, S.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res (Mr. Blain) 5131 (iii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5228 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).

—— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment (prop. Res.) 584 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4646 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii); Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10695 (vi).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Address, The, 396 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4175 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5108 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8271 (iv), 11716; in Com., 11869 (vi), 12935 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3613 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2018 (i).

Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11057 (vi).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation of Mrs. A. M. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10849 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753; N.B. (salaries) 12738; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4175 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10875; (Victoria, immigration) 10875 (vi); Ont. (Glencoe) 7491 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).

ZIMMERMAN, Mr. A., *Hamilton, W.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6179 (iii).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ques.) 6924 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3612 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4333 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

—— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12558 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3745 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7228; on M. for 3°, 7216 (iv).

Militia Uniforms, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9569 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5066 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 664 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9569 (v).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1901 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii), 10294 (v).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10902 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v); Ont. (Owen Sound) 7818 (iv); Ottawa (mint) 1472 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS.

Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).

——— remaining unpaid by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).

Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Employmt. of Political Officials: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3292 (ii).

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5798 (iii).

Address The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne: moved (Mr. Hall) 9; seconded (Mr. Lanctot) 17.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 23; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 40; (Mr. Foster) 66; (Mr. Fielding) 94; (Mr. Cockshutt) 123, (amt.) 147; Neg. (Y. 95; N. 56)274; (Mr. Miller) 148; (Mr. Clements) 194; (Mr. Fisher) 213; (Mr. Lewis) 242; (Mr. Clarke) 254; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 263; (Mr. W. Roche) 267; (Mr. Barr) 276; (Mr. Lalor) 292; (Mr. Elson) 304; (Mr. Crawford) 316; (Mr. Armstrong) 335, 366, (amt.) 380; (Neg. Y. 54; N. 103) 505; (Mr.. J. J. Hughes) 380; (Mr. Staples) 383; (Mr. Wm. Wright) 396; (Mr. Geo. Smith) 407; (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 412; (Mr. A. A. McLean) 420; (Mr. Kemp) 434; (Mr. W. McIntyre) 445; (Mr. Perley) 449; (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 455; (Mr. Lake) 459; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 476; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 485; (Mr. Paquet) 505; (Mr. Barker) 519, (amt.) 530; (Neg. Y. 50; N. 96) 552; (Mr. Fielding) 531; (Mr. Monk) 535; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 544; (Mr. Haggart) 548 (ii).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 554 (i).

Administrative Buildings, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Admiralty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4402 (iii).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amts. paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 936 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

See 'Tenders,' &c.

Agricultural Committee, 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Mackenzie) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

——— Dep. Minister O'Halloran's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12878 (vii).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645, 671 (i), 10569 (vi), 12879 (vii).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).

——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

——— Cable *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).

Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importation from U. S., from 1901-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).

Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).

Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
——— Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
——— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
——— in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
——— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
——— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c: (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).
Hogs slaughtered, Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).
Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 1506 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
See 'Marine.'
Alberta and B. C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 192'
Alberta Development Co., Control of Coal Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3037 (ii).
Alberta Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Alberton Fire Damage Claims: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. Lefurgey) 1209 (i).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry: prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3853 (ii).
Alexander, Mary, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
See 'I. C. R.'
Alien Act: *See* B. No. 130.'
Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians: Pet. (Mr. Boyce) read in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).
See 'Immigration,' &c.
Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
All-Red Line: prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12414; Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 108; N. 48) 12499 (vii).
——— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10253 (v).
——— Negotiations, Canadian Representative in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 353 (i).
——— Omission of, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28 (i).
——— Route, Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 948 (i).
——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 947 (i).
All-Red Route, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 87 (i).
——— Remarks *re* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12162 (vii).
——— Statement *re* Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 366 (i).
——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6460 (iv).
——— Mr. White's Duties in England: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 694 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 608 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).

Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 8439 (v).
Anglo-American Treaty, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i), 6985 (iv).
—— Further Information: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7447, 7834 (iv).
—— Information *re* Presenting (Mr. R. L. 8516 (v).
—— Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9715 (v).
—— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Sproule) 10120 (v).
—— Treaty submitted to Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6926 (iv).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Anglo-Canadian Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).
—— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).
—— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by Imperial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11705 (vi).
See 'Franco-Canadian.'
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., Reps., &c.; M. for copies (Mr. Monk) 594 (i).
See 'Japanese,' &c.
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Anuities by Govt. for Old Age: *See* 'B. No. 120.' *See* 'Old Age,' &c.
Anse à la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Anse St. Jean Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Anthracite Coal, Qantity imported from U. S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salary of Judge: M. to withdraw Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 7992 (iv).
See 'Justice,' &c.
Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 353 (i).
Apples, &c., Marking of: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Architects of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Architectural Institute of Canada: M. (Mr. Ethier) to Refund Fees, 11234, 11404 (vi).
Architects on Public Works Payments, &c.: Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Architectural Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6057 (iii).
Archives Fittings, Furnishings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 671 (i).
'Arctic, Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).
—— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Army and Navy Veterans at the Tercentenary: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448 (iv).
See 'Que. Tercentenary.'
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Arthabaskaville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Artz, J. G., Apptmt. of. Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13578 (vii).
Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Ashcroft-Dawson Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment: Notice of Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4221; M. 4314 (iii).
Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Immigration Act.'
Asiatic Labour in B.C., Rep. in Victoria 'Times': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
See 'Japanese,' &c.
Assaults on Women, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13573 (vii).
Assurance Fund of Saskn. and Alta.: *See* B. No. 168.'
Astronomical Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9737 (v).
Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1450, 1485 (i).
Atlantic, Que. and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Atlantic Steamers, Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii). *See* 'Post Office,' &c.
Aud. Gen.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Vol. i): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Auditor General's Salary: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii). *See* 'Banks,' 'Finance,' &c.
Australia, G. B. and Canada Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i). *See* 'Can. and Australia.'
Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2218
Australian Representative from Can. in 1901, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 2168 (ii).
Automobiles injuring Persons: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
Autonomy Act, Validity of: Return, Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).
Baie St. Paul, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Co., N.B., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).
——— Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i). *See* 'Cold Storage,' 'New Brunswick,' &c.
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
Balsam Lake and Gull River, Ret. Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii). *See* 'Canals, Trent.
Bank Act, (additional circulation), Amt. *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banks, Govt. Assistance *re* Grain Blockade: *See* 'No. 159.'
Bank of Hamilton, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Banking System: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (iii). *See* 'Can. Bank of Commerce.'
Bank of Vancouver: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Bank of Winnipeg: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure, Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Barachois de Malbaie Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223 (vi).
Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5205 (iii).
——— Survey *re* Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5473 (iii).
——— Payments *re* Survey of Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5787 (iii).
Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Amts. paid to *re* Supplies: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3234 (ii).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battlefields: *See* 'Can. Patriotic,' &c.
Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 219.'
Battlefields: *See* 'Quebec.'
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bayfield, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv). *See* 'Grand Bend,' &c.
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Bear River Station Dwelling House, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2161 (ii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
——— Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
———Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Employment of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).
—— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
—— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).
—— Water Power, New Lease, Copy of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090, 13344 (vii).
Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
See 'Dredging,' &c.
Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).
—— Dredging, Commencement of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7212 (iv).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).
—— Sir C. H. Tupper's Travelling Expenses: Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Belgian Syndicate, Royal Commission, and Chap. 138, R.S.C., Judges as Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13569 (vii).
Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).
Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).
—— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).
Belleville Floods, Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 3319 (ii), 4744 (iii).
Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6237 (iv).
—— Total Revenue, Expenditure for 1903-7: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2592 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 2983 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4408 (iii).
Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).
——M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 5211 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 7506 (iv).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co. Bill, on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 681 (i).
Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).
Bell Memorial Association, Grant by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).
See 'Brantford.'
Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208, 5466 (iii).
Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, Use of by R. C. Clergy: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 12411 (vii).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
—— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 13587 (vii).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 3 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 90 (i); 2°m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 91; 2°, 570; in Com., 583; 3°*, 583 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 91 (i); 2°m., 3406 (ii).

Bill (No. 5) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 92; 2°m., (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii); 2°m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, South York).
1°, 93; 2°m., 938 (i), 3320, 3363 (ii).

Bill (No. 7) To incorporate the North Empire Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Adamson).
1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 8) Respecting the Tobique Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to 'Fraser Lumber Company, Limited.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 9) Respecting Surveys of Public Lands of the Dominion and the Surveyors entitled to make such surveys (Mr. Oliver).
1° 231; 2° and in Com., 754, 948; 3°*, 953 (i), Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Bill (No. 10) To amend the Irrigation Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 231; 2°, 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); wthdn., 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 11) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, S. York).
1°, 231 (i).

Bill (No. 12) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Maclean, Lunenburg).
1°, 313 (i); 2°, 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. McColl).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*; 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 16) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., 1894; 3°, 1929 (i).

Bill (No. 17) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. McCarthy, N. Simcoe).
1°, 349 (i); 2°m., 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Kennedy).
1°, 350; 2°, 938 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Bole).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 680 (i); in Com., 2787; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.—(Mr. Porter).
1°*, 430; 2°m., 681, 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 9066 (iv).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1894 (i).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 2788; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226; M. to ref. back to Com., 3228; in Com., 3362, 3621, 3692, 3793 (ii), 4224; 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash.)
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 27) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Macdonald.)
1°, 430 (i); 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246; 3°*, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 28) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°, 508; 2°, 939; in Com., 940 (i); 3°*,3014 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 508 (i); 2°, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 30) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Ethier).
1°, 560 (i).

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Sinclair).
1°*, 562 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 606; 2° m., 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4582 (iii).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 779 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 779; in Com., 1894; 3°*, 1931 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Travellers Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) To incorporate the Canada Weather Insurance Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford).
1°*, 753; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5174 (iii).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*,754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059; in Com., and 3°*, 1895 (i).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227; 3°*, 6231 (iv).

Bill (No. 41) To incorporate the Standard Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6184 (iii).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 827; 2°, 1741 (i).

Bill (No. 43) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Barr).
1°, 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Bill (No. 44) To incorporate the Alberta Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Talbot).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Monk).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°*, 891; 2°, 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230; 3°*, 4230 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) To incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5109; 3° m., 5519 (iii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Copp).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 4231; 3°*, 4231; Sen. Amts., 5785 (iii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 52) Respecting a Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud.—(Mr. Gordon).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5762 (iii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 1108; 2°, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Bank of Hamilton Pension Fund.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 1207; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting a certain Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 941; in Com. on Res., 1213; 1° m., 1215, 1384 (i); 2°, 2221, 3493; in Com., 3577, 3581, 3636 (ii); 3° m., 4317, 4372 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) To incorporate the Chartered Bank of British Columbia.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting Patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—(Mr. Osler).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 61) Respecting Patents of Montague Moore and Thomas James Heskett.—(Mr. Osler).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5175 (iii).

Bill (No. 63) Respecting Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Porter).
1°, 1283 (i); on order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1284 (i).

Bill (No. 66) To amend the House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Borden).
1°, 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577; 3°*, 4579 (iii).

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate the Ruthenian Catholic Mission of the Order of Saint Basil the Great in Canada.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3194 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting the Standard Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to 'the Standard Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. Maclean, South York).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Power).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

Bill (No. 75) To incorporate the Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. Worthington).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2790 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick.—(Mr. C. Marcil).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Offensive Weapons.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1668 (i).

Bill (No. 79) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Assaults on Women and Children.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1670 (i).

Bill (No. 80) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Alcorn).
1°, 1671 (i); 2°, 5228 (iii).

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4231; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Adamson).
1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4996, 5049; 3°*, 5077 (iii); Sen. Amts., 10511 (vi).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Telford).
1°*, 1732 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 84) To incorporate the Dominion Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1859 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).
1°, 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).

Bill (No. 86) To incorporate the Northern Empire Railway Company.—(Mr. Caron).
1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2346 (ii); in Com., 4545; 3°*, 4545; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—(Mr. Walsh, Montreal, Ste. Anne).

1°*, 2214; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953; 3°*, 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 89) To authorize the Sale to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, of a portion of Major's Hill Park, in the City of Ottawa, as a Hotel Site.—(Mr. Pugsley).

Res. prop., 1584 (i), 2221; in Com. on Res., 2258; 1°*, 2260 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 12061; 3°*, 12084 (vii).

Bill (No. 90) To amend the Passenger Ticket Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

1°,2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).

Bill (No. 91) To amend the Act respecting the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2542 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to the Speedy Trial of Indictable Offences.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2543 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) To amend the Criminal Code and punish homicide while hunting.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2590 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 2780; 1°, 2°, and in Com., 2782; 3°*, 2785 (ii).

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to conspiracy in restraint of trade.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2976 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the hours of labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).

1°, 3157 (ii).

Bill (No. 98, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Blain).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) To amend the Irrigation Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4671; 3°*, 4674 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).

1°*, 3316 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) Respecting the Fort William Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 3477 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223; 3°*, 6225 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 102) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 3477; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

Bill (No. 103, from the Senate) Respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 104, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5492; 3°, 5495 (iii).

Bill (No. 105) To regulate the placing and maintaining of Booms in International Streams.—(Mr. Pugsley).

1°, 3654 (ii).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).

1°, 3655 (ii).

Bill (No. 107 from the Senate) Respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 5386; 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 108 from the Senate) Respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 3316; in Com. on Res., 3756, 3805; 1°* of B., 3834 (ii); Res. prop., 11938; in Com on Res., 12595; 2°, and in Com., 12595, 13047; 3°, 13207; Sen. Amts., 13524 (vii).

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, Elias Frank and Isidore Frank.—(Mr. Béland).

1°*, 3896 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4996 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Canadian Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Res. prop., 3579; in Com. on Res., 3901; 1°, 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4529 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) To amend the Railway Act as respects the Constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1°*, 3933 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510; 3°*, 8514 (v).

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Land Titles Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4221 (iii); 2° m., 6517; in Com., 6518; 3°*, 6520 (iv).

Bill (No. 114) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°, 4312 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 115) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835, 7939, 7998; on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8076, 8089. 8138, 8185 (iv), 8296, 8332, 8387, 8619 (v), 11707; Amt. wthdrn., and in Com., 11796; in Com., 11827, 11885 (vi), 12919, 12984; 3° m., 13229; 3°*, 13258; Sen. Amts., 13579 (vii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4576 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8501; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4576; 2°, and in Com., 4994; 3°*, 4995 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones, and the Jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4658 (iii); 2°, 10625; in Com., 10636, 10658; 3° m., 10777, 11124, 11590; ref. back to Com., 11633; 3°*, 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 119) To encourage the Construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 4314; in Com. on Res., 4675; 1°*, 4689 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6911 (iv); in Com., 10761; 3°*, 10771; Sen. Amts., 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 120) To authorize the Issue of Government Annuities for Old Age.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Res., 4689; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 10848 (vi), 12053; 3°*, 12054; Sen. Amts., 13316 (viii).

Bill (No. 121) To amend the Supreme Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4826; 2°, and in Com., 5497; 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To make better Provision for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada, in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890. —(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°*, 4867 (iii).

Bill (No. 123, from the Senate) To amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, and in Com., 5495; 3°*, 5497 (iii).

Bill (No. 124, from the Senate) For the relief of Andrew Walker.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 5336; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company. —(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To change the name and head office of the Anglo-Canadian Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°*, 5256; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pringle).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231; 3°*, 6231 (iv); Sen. Amts., 12773 (vii).

Bill (No. 128, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Michaud).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225; 3°*, 6227 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) To incorporate the London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°*, 5256 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 11990 (vi); 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 131, from the Senate) Respecting the Occidental Fire Insurance Company. —(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv); 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) To incorporate the Standard Accident and Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) To amend the Boards of Trade Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 5337 (iii); 2°, 11987; in Com., 11987 (vi), 12393; 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Marcil).

1°*, 5649; 2°, 5763; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5657 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6429; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 136) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1908, and the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 5919, 5955; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9069; 3°*, 9070 (v).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 5913; 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141; 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 140) To amend the Criminal Code respecting injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°*, 5993 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) To incorporate the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 6054; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 7724; 3°*, 7724 (iv).

Bill (No. 142) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 6054 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6520; 3°*, 6523 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 5161; in Com. on Res., 6118; 1°*, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 144) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6523; 3°*, 6525 (iv).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 3493; in Com. on Res., 6161, 6191; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6408; 3°*, 6429 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) Respecting Proprietary and Patent Medicines.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 4963; in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2°, 16551 (vi); in Com., 12622; 3°*, 12628 (vii).

Bill (No. 147) To repeal the Canned Goods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6870; 3°*, 6890 (iv).

Bill (No. 148) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, 6900; in Com., 6900 (iv), 10553; 3°*, 10569 (vi).

Bill (No. 149) To amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6890; 3° m., 7215; ref. back to Com., 7227; 3°*, 7257 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518; 3°*, 10526 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Crawford).

1°*, 6287; 2°, 6561; in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 8741, 9066, 9377, 9461; 3°*, 9472 (v).

Bill (No. 152) Respecting Signal Dues at Halifax.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 6457 (iv); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9166; 3° m., 9167 (v).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. Sinclair).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7667; 3°*, 7669 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Bank and Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 157) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 6843 (iv).

Bill (No. 158) Respecting Meaford Harbour.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 7195 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 8510; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 159) Respecting a certain Issue of Dominion Notes.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10795; 3°*, 10848 (vi).

Bill (No. 160) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, 10919; in Com., 10933; 3°*, 10952 (vi).

Bill (No. 161) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Beauparlant).

1°, 7307 (iv).

Bill (No. 162) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 7931 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10703; 3°*, 10716 (vi); Sen. Amts., 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 163) To authorize the exchange of certain School Lands for other Dominion Lands.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478; 3°*, 8480 (v).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith May Gilmore.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 165) Respecting the Court of Appeal of British Columbia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1°, 8466 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10862; 3°*, 10863 (vi).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act in so far as the same affects the Province of Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 8604 (v); 2°, 10690; in Com., 10691; 3°*, 10693 (vi).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) Respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).

1°*, 8603; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 168) To authorize the payment to the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta of part of the Assurance Fund under the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480; 1°*, 8481 (v); 2°, 10525; in Com., 10526; 3°*, 10528 (vi).

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8604 (v); 2°, 10528; in Com., 10529; 3°, 10545; Sen. Amts., 11634 (vi).

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) Respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool).

1°*, 8694; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 171) Respecting the Government Guaranteed Bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 8835 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10771; 3°*, 10777 (vi).

Bill (No. 172) To incorporate the Dominion Power Company.—(Mr. Hall).

1°*, 9021; 2°*, 9168 (v).

Bill (No. 173) To restrain the Use of Tobacco by Young Persons.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 9021 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) Respecting certain patents of the General Chemical Company.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate) For the relief of Catherine Ann Cannon.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) For the relief of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) For the relief of Mary Alexander.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°* 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) Relating to the Water-Carriage of Goods.—(Mr Johnston).

1°*, 9330 (v); M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) To incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 9330; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 11460 (vi).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Respecting the Crown Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tisdale).

1°*, 9330; in Com., 9962; 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 181) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 9333 (v); 2°, 11125; in Com., 11158, 11408, 11460, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi), 12394; 3°*, 12399; Sen. Amts., 13522 (vii).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) For the relief of Hattie Spratte.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 9889; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 10119 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12851, 13052; 3°*, 13223 (vii).

Bill (No. 184, from the Senate) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10008 (v); 2°, 10545; in Com., 10546, 10743, 11020; 3°*, 11022 (vi).

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal.—(Mr. Johnston).

1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 186) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 10510; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Black).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2° m., 13506; in Com., 13507; 3°*, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12559, 13207; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 189) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 11300; in Com. on Res., 11351; 1°, 10717; 2°, 11315; in Com., 11362, 11535, 11634 (vi), 12163; 3°*, 12189; Sen. Amts., 13520 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) Respecting Juvenile Delinquents.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399; 3°* 12406 (vii).

Bill (No. 191) Respecting the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 10952; in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°* of B., 10953; 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; 3°, 12054 (vii).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate) To incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).
1°*, 11120; 2°*, 11460 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12594 (vii).

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Timber Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 11120 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12408; 3°*, 12408 (vii).

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Paterson).
Res. prop., 11233; in Com. on Res., 11312; 1°* of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).

Bill (No. 195, from the Senate) To incorporate the Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman).
1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 196, from the Senate) For the relief of Arthur James Townsend.—(Mr. Copp).
1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Sale and Marking of Manufactures of Gold and Silver, and Gold and Silver Plated Ware.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12554; 3°*, 12559 (vii).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of William B. Smith.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 12393; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 199) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Crude Petroleum.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12406; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°, and in Com., 12644; 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 200) Respecting the Salary of the Superintendent of Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 201) To assist in maintaining an Independent and Efficient service of Telegraphic news from Great Britain for Publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12408; 2°, 12644, 12837; in Com., 12848; 3°*, 12851 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 202) To authorize the Construction of a Branch Line of the Prince Edward Island Railway from Harmony, on the Souris Branch to Elmira.—(Mr. Graham).
Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 1°* of B., 12409; 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631; 3°*, 12643 (vii).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act as regards Grain.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 12594; 2°, and in Com., 13048, 13208; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 204) To amend chapter 38 of the Statutes of 1907, in amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 12549; 2°, and in Com., 13046; 3°*, 13047 (vii).

Bill (No. 205) To Prohibit the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Opium for other than Medicinal Purposes.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 1°* of B., 12551; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12851; Sen. Amts., 13523 (vii).

Bill (No. 206) To amend the Judges' Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1°* of B., 12554; 2°, and in Com., 13048; 3°*, 13051 (vii).

Bill (No. 207, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company, Limited.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 12649; 2°, 12649; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 208) Respecting the office of the Auditor General.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12644; 1°* of B., 12645; 2°, and in Com., 12645; 3°*, 12645 (vii).

Bill (No. 209) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12645; 1°* of B., 12649; 2°, and in Com., 13053; 3°*, 13207 (vii).

Bill (No. 210) To amend the Northwest Territories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°*, 12650; 2°, and in Com., 13051; 3°*, 13052 (vii).

Bill (No. 211) To amend the Act of the present session intituled 'An Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. Pringle).
1°*, 2°*, 12773; in Com., and 3°*, 13224 (vii).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Criminal Code, and to repeal section 415 of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 12919; 2°, and in Com., 13316; 3°*, 13320 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 213) Respecting Aid for the extension of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13066; M. for Com. on Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1°* of B., 13282; 2°, and in Com., 13419; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 214) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13069; in Com. on Res., 13282; 1°* of B., 13285; 2°, and in Com., 13420; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 215) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the Lines of Railway therein mentioned. —(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13071; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1°* of B., 13315; 2°, and in Com., 13478; 3°*, 13490 (vii).

Bill (No. 216) Respecting the Canadian Patriotic Funds Association.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

1°*, 2°, and in Com., 13320; 3°*, 13321 (vii).

Bill (No. 217) Respecting the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; 1°* of B., 13417; 2°, and in Com., 13491; 3°*, 13493 (vii).

Bill (No. 218) To authorize the sale or other disposal of certain Ordnance Lands in the Cities of Toronto and Montreal.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 13226; in Com. on Res., 13417; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13418; 3°*, 13419 (vii).

Bill (No. 219) Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°, 13495; 2°, and in Com., 13501; 3°*, 13506 (vii).

Bill (No. 220) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; in Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13579; 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Binder Twine Bounty, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

Binder Twine in Kingston Penitentiary, Sale and Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P. O. Addresses: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9715 (v).

—— Seizures, and Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blackhalls Estate, Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Blairmore Townsite: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Clements) 6465 (iv).

Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).

—— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 241 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 432 (i).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902

—— Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 133.'

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

—— Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).

See 'Canals—Trent.'

Boiler Inspection Insurance Co., Payments to Mr. R. Stewart: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Boivin, Cote & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12650 (vii).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).

Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).

Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3230 (ii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Bonusing System *re* Immigration: Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 6288 (iv).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Booms in International Streams: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244, 5083 (iii).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 5476 (iii).

Borden, Sir Frederick, and Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'New Brunswick.'

Boundary Delimitations, Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Bounties on Crude Petroleum: *See* 'B. No. 199.'

Bounties on Lead: *See* 'B. No. 191.'

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

See 'Lead,' &c.

Bounties, Total Amount paid by Govt since 1906: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 895 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1130 (i).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13226 (vii)
Boyle Concessions, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Brantford Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).
Brantford Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrests *re* Picketing: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 9027 (v).
——— Cor. with Justie Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 10016 (v).
Brantford Telephone Monument: on Conc., 13567 (vii).
See 'Bell.'
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).
Bridge Strengthening, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Rys.: Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com. on Res., 13310 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
B.C., Chartered Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
B.C., Court of Appeal: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
B.C., Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Fishing Licenses issued to Packers' Association: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (v).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
B. C. Telegraphs, Claims of C. P. Ry. *re* Cape Beale Lines: in Com of Sup., 5732(iii).
British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).
British Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204 (iii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 3897 (ii).
———Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 3234 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. House, 186 (i).
——— Connection with C.P.R.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1690 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1689 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
See 'Travelling Expenses.'
Brome County, Number of Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 6241 (iv).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
——— Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
——— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 686 (i).
Buchanan Townsite, Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10079, 10083 (v).
——— Homestead Entry by Mr. Ramsland: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10082 (v).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 5137 (iii).
Debate:—(Mr. Foster) 5260; (Mr. Paterson) 5296; (Mr. Cockshutt) 5314; (Mr. Sifton) 5338; (Mr. Bergeron) 5357; (Mr. Pardee) 5364; (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5375, 5388; (Mr. Thompson) 5405; (Mr. M. S. Schell) 5616, 5957; (Mr. W. Jackson) 5959; (Mr. Armstrong) 6046, 6062; (Mr. Guthrie) 6011; (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6097; (Mr. U. Wilson) 6082 (iii); (Mr. Loggie) 6553; (Mr. Mackenzie) 6573; (Mr. Sinclair) 6615; (Mr. Sproule) 6595; (Mr. N. F. Wilson) 6610 (iv).
See 'Financial Review,' &c.

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).
Budget Speech: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 519, 559 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).
Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 10011 (v).
Buffalo imported for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).
Buffalo purchased for Park Reserves, Authority for Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).
Buffalo Herd, Location at Elk Park, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208 (iii).
—— Name of Purchaser: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5795 (iii).
—— Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (ii), 10102 (v).
Buildings B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Buildings, Cost of Construction: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).
——Construction of: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Buildings, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).
Buildings, Man. and N. W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).
Buildings, Man. and N. W. T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
—— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
—— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Burlington Channel, Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).
—— Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
—— Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).
Business of the House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).
—— Precedence *re* Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 430 (i).
—— Precedence on Tuesday: Remarks: (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2982 (ii).
—— Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2939 (ii).
Business of the House, Public Bills, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).
—— Remarks on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Butler, Mr. M. J., Dep. Min. of Rys., Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12755 (vii).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 2162 (ii).
Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).
Cabinet Changes: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24; (Mr. Foster) 80; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 44 (i).
Cabinet Ministers and Govt. Contracts, &c.: *See* 'Cold Storage,' &c.
Cable Service in St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Calgary P.O., and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).
Calgary Town Sites: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).
Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4769 (iii).
Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Public Works, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 65 (i).
Campaign Literature sent out by Depts.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).
Campbellton, Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v)
—— I.C.R. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).
—— Tenders *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).
—— Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 941 (i).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
Canada and China, Japan, &c., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12391
See 'Franco-Canadian.'

Canada and Germany Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13081 (vii).
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'
Can. Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'Bill No. 187.'
Canada Temperance Act: M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13493 (vii).
Canada Weather Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subventions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5080 (iii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Can. Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111, 219.'
Canadian Battlefields: *See* 'Battlefields,' &c.
Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Canadian Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'
Canadians entering U. S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 2738; Letter of Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries: Read, 2739 (ii).
Canadian Naturalization and British Rights: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii).
Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers: Remarks (Mr. Bristol) 11121 (vi).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Can. Northern Ry. Extension, Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Can. Northern Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309, 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B No. 45.'
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
——— Papineauville and Little Nation River Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
——— Plaster Rock Branch Line Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
——— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsldy: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vii).
Can. Patriotic Funds Association: *See* 'B. No. 216.'
Canadians repatriated from U. S., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Canadian Timber used in Govt. Works: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).
Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
Canada and U. S., Boundary Treaties: Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7834 (iv).
——— Trade Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i).
See 'Anglo-American.'
CANALS—
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).
——— Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).
——— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
——— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Extra Remuneration: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).
——— Generally, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10325 (vi).
——— Remuneration *re* Sunday Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Staff and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
——— Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi).
——— list of officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
——— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
——— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
See main heading.
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com of Sup., 5672 (iii).
——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613, 9476 (v).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canal, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
——— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer: Ques. (Mr. Bergaron) 6407 (iv).
——— Report of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
——— Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Trent Canal, Balsam Lake Section, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Bobcaygeon Dam, Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
——— Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
——— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
——— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
——— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
———Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
———ret. incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii).
——— Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
——— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Newmarket Canal Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
———Newmarket Canal Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi), 12225 (vii).
——— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
——— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
——— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
——— Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Contract Power Co., Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*
Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
———Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
——— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
———Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
———Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
——— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
——— Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (iii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Resignation of John R. Scott: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6058 (iii).
——— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3846 (ii).
———Cor. *re* Regulations, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 557 (i).
——— Names of Counties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Canned Goods Act: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Cannon, Catherine Ann, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6646 (iv).
——— Successor to Dr. Brine: Ques. (Mr Stanfield) 1735 (i).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3236 (ii).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
'Carlotta G. Fox,' Schr., Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10517 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c.
'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6641 (iv).
Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).
'Catharine C.,' Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5727 (iii).
Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in Senate: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 5047 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).
———Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).
———Cable, *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Armstrong) 13081 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6460 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S. during 1900-7, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1507 (i).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).
Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Cattle registered, Importation from U.S. from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).
Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).
Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Cement Testing Laboratory: in Com. of Sup., 11078 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 11206, 11250 (vi).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Census Map, Publishing of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4406 (iii).

Census (complete) of the N. W. Provs., Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 3422 (ii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 12651 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).
Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5652 (iii).
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 11495 (vi).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Charlotttown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
Charlottetown Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5655 (iii).
Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 517 (i).
—— Specifications, &c., *re* Construction: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3241 (ii).
Chartered Bank of B. C.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Charwomen, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Cheese Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
—— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
—— Public Works, Expenditures, &c: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 8894, 9266 (v), 10515 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 754 (i).
Church of England, Missionary Society, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5087; Amt. (Mr. Macpherson) to adjn. Debate, agreed to (Y. 61; N. 51) 5133 (iii).
—— on M. to resume adjn. debate: Remarks Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5246, 5251 (iii).
Cigarettes, Legislation *re*, Res. of W.C.T.U. of Brampton: Read (Mr. Blain) 7278 (iv).
Cigarettes: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 12390 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
—— Payment *re* Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Rep. of Geological Survey *re* 'Graphites': Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
See 'Graphite.'
Civil Servants, General Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'
Civil Service Bill, Correction in 'Hansard' *re* Increases: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11494 (vi).
—— and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).
—— Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11124 (vi).
—— Resolutions *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13168 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 5723 (iii).
——— Govtl. Action, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr R. L. Borden) 3317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5491 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 938, 1740 (i), 2787 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Perley) 90 (i).
——— Issue of Commission of Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6466 (iv).
——— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassel's Powers: (amt.) to Com. of Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7506, Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).
——— Instructions to Judge Cassels: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).
——— O.C. to Mr. Justice Cassels *re* Investigations: M. to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
See 'Cassels,' &c.
——— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
——— Number distributed: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6060 (iii).
——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5882 (iii).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5620 (iii).
——— Translation into French: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 558 (i).
Civil Service Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Civil Govt.: *See* 'Supply.'
Civil Service List: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 93 (i).
Civil Service System, Reorganization of: Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9132; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 72) 9218 (v).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) M. to drop, 6242 (iv).
Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
——— Squatters Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Clement, Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
See 'Yukon.'
Clerical and Temporary Clerks, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Office: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Clerk of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Closure Rule: *See* 'Obstruction.'
Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8380 (v).
Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in possession of Gov.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 843 (i).
Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5469 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5468 (iii).
——— held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 5476 (iii).
——— Names and Addresses of Agents *re* Applications: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5789 (iii).
Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).
Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9278 (v).
——— Royalty Fees, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11019 (vi).
Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3434 (ii).
Coal Land Leases, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2395 (ii).
Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3480 (ii).
——— Leased by Govt., Names of Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3232 (ii).
——— Leased, Sold or Assigned, since March, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
Coal Lands in N.W.T., Leases granted, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 5087 (iii).
Coal Lands, O.Cs., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 4246 (iii).
——— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10512 (vi).
——— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
——— Sale through J. W. Bettes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6242 (iv).

Coal Lands, sold by P. E. Lessard: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
——— Sale by McGivern & Hayden: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Coal Lands in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
——— Section 13, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3851 (ii).
Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12656 (vii).
Coal Mining Privileges in Section 11, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Coal Mine Royalties in Alberta, Sums received: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12391 (vii).
Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10257 (v).
Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5470 (iii).
See 'Shipping,' &c.
Coasting Privileges, Prop. Rys. withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4586 (iii).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6237 (iv).
Cobourg Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
——— Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colchester Election, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 39 (i).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notifiation (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier,, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).
Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1685 (i).
——— Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 236 (i).
——— Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1937 (i).
See 'Butter,' 'Cheese,' 'Brockville,' &c.
Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4223, 4407 (iii).
See 'N.B. Cold Storage,' &c.
Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6403 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Colonial Conference, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 41 (i).
See 'Intercolonial,' &c.
——— Travelling Expenses, ref. to in Com. of Sup. on Marine Estimates, 3985 (ii).
——— Travelling Expenses of Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 998, 1040 (i).
See 'Travelling Expenses.'
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Colonization Lands: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 3752 (ii).
Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Commercial Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Guthrie) 5794 (iii).
Commerical Treaty with Italy: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).
Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 1295 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).
Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2382 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 2383; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2383 (ii).
Committees, Organization of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 507, 560 (i).
——— Sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
See 'Pub. Accts.'
Companies Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3482 (ii).
Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instructions *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10111 (v).
——— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
See 'Yukon.'

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Cookshire Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland County: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3841 (ii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 11913 (vi).
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2389 (ii).
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident to Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
——— Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).
——— Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
——— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Cotton Strikers, Montreal, Commission Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Court of Appeal, B.C.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cowie, Mr. F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5649 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Cowly, and Highwood, Railway Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Credit by False Pretences: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9281 (v).
Criminal Code (assault) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
——— (homicide while hunting) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
——— (injuries by motor vehicles) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
——— (libel) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
——— (offensive weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78.'
——— (speedy trials) Amt. *See* 'B. No. 92.'
——— (trade restraint) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
——— (trading stamps, credit) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Statistics: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
Crossings of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Crown Bank of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Crown Life Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Crude Petroleum Bounty: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 7731 (iv)
Customs Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
CUSTOMS :
Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).
Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5203, 5466 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Cotton, Raw, Imports from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Customs Dept., Apptmts. and Civil Service Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
——— Criticism of Civil Service Commission: (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
——— Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 10133 (v).
——— Inspectors, Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9536 (v).
——— Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
——— Outside Service, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 9226, 9430 (v).
——— Printing, Stationery, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
——— Salaries, Payments of, Speech of Hon. Mr. Paterson, *re* Obstruction: Remarks (Mr. Owen) to Com. of Sup., 9894 (v).
Customs and Excise Revenues from June 1st to 15, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10791 (vi).
Customs Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12655 (vii).
Customs Statistics, and Trade and Commerce Rets., Dupliate Printing: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Bordon) in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr Foster) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).
Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i).
——— Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
——— Ques (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).
——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).
——— Material imported for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4583 (iii).
Detroit River Tunnel and Customs Tariff on Material from U.S.: M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).
——— Explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii).
Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).
Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii). *See* main heading.
Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).
——— Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9442 (v).
French Books, Reductions of Customs *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).
German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Guarantee Cos.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
Halifax Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).
Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).
Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).
Imports and Exports, Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
——— ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).
Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).
Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i). *See* main heading.
Man. Customs Collectors, Brokerage Fees charged, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
Montreal Customs Frauds, Penalties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).
Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Customs Officers, Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6980 (iv).
Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C., *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).
Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Prince Rupert Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Revenue Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Seizures for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Cockshutt) 4588 (iii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 7730 (iv).
Windsor Customs, Pepin, J. A., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
——Customs Officers, Ages, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12655 (vii).
—— Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Cypress Hills Timber Reserve, Preservation of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3841 (ii).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Stmnt. of Mr. Foster: Read (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8460; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 8460; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 8461 (v).
Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Dairy Products: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204, 5473 (iii).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
—— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Debates, Official Reports of, Analytical Index: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).
—— Average Price per Column: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3479 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Apptmt. of French Supt. of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Distribution: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3486 (ii).
Debates Committee, Correction of Clerical Error in Res. of House (Mr. Gervais) 824 (i).
—— 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 2590 (ii).
—— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 6979 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep., Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 12504 (vii).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Amt. (Mr. Gervais) on M. to adopt, 13224 (vii).
—— 4th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 8835 (v).
—— Conc. without Notice: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Monk) *re* conc., 9709, 9889, 10119 (v).
See 'Hansard.'
Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
—— Falling Due, 1908: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Deep Waterways Commission, Proceedings *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11205 (vi).
—— St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 13142 (vii).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11101 (vi).
Demurrage on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).
Deptl. Buildings, Mackenzie Avenue: in Com of Sup., 1505 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1121, 1290 (i).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5464 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

Detroit Tunnel, Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i), 4583 (iii).

——— M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).

——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).

——— explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii). *See* 'International.'

Devil's Elbow, Canal Work: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Grant: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8184 (iv).

Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force: Ques. (Mr. D. Ross) 6001 (iii).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).

Diocese of the Synod of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2562 (ii).

Distilleries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).

Divorce of Mary Alexander: *See* 'B. No. 177.'

Divorce of Catherine Ann Cannon: *See* 'B. No. 175.'

Divorce of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell: *See* 'B. No. 139.'

Divorce of Edith May Gilmore: *See* 'B. No. 164.'

Divorce of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding: *See* 'B. No. 176.'

Divorce of Hattie Spratte: *See* 'B. No. 182.'

Divorce of Arthur James Townsend: *See* 'B. No. 196.'

Divorce of Andrew Walker: *See* 'B. No. 124.'

Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).

Dockyards, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).

Documents in Departments, Access to Originals by Members: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 1132; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).

Debate:—(Mr. Oliver) 1133; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1137; (Mr. Foster) 1135; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1140; (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1143; (Mr. Sproule) 1147; (Mr. Brodeur) 1149; (Mr. Bennett) 1151; (Mr. Lennox) 1155; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1160; (Mr. Barker) 1162; (Mr. Galliher) 1170; (Mr. D. Ross) 1172; (Mr. Haggart) 1175; (Mr. Devlin) 1177; (Mr. Bergeron) 1180; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1183; (Mr. Northrup) 1190; (Mr. Sproule) 1194; (Mr. Ames) 1195 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of, &c., Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 1617, 1622; Agreed to, 1668 (i).

Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1623; (Mr. Foster) 1628; (Mr. D. Ross) 1632, 1653; (Mr. Oliver) 1636; (Mr. Barker) 1655; (Mr. Northrup) 1658; (Mr. Bristol) 1663; (Mr. Boyce) 1666 (i).

Documents, Original, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 1766 (i).

Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1775; (Mr. Haggart) 1778;; (Mr. Sproule) 1782; (Mr. Lennox) 1786; (Mr. Barker) 1793; (Mr. Bristol) 1797; (Mr. Osler) 1800; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1801; (Mr. Fielding) 1805; (Mr. Lancaster) 1814; (Mr. Perley) 1818; (Mr. Broder) 1825; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1827; (Mr. Northrup) 1830; (amt.) 1839; Neg. (Y. 50· N. 95) 1883; (Mr. Lake) 1839; (Mr. Alcorn) 1843; on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to adjn. debate (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1844; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1847; (Mr. Foster) 1851; (Mr. Crocket) 1861; (Mr. Blain) 1871; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1875; (Mr. Armstrong) 1878 (i).

Documents, Original, Custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7810 (iv).

——— Detention, &c., Par. in Press. Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Clements) 6010 (iii).

——— Examination of by Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 3853 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2794 (ii).

——— Production of Originals, Announcement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1425 (i).

——— Production in Committees: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1427 (i).

——— Production of on Order from Hse. · Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1617; Agreed to, 1667 (i).

——— Production of to Members: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1766 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1927 (i).

——— and Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2305, 2308 (ii).

——— Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2305 (ii).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii).

See 'Halifax.'

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Operation at: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii)

——— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).

Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i).

See 'Clarke's,' &c.

Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

Dokis Indians Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).

——— Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).

——— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).

——— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).

——— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).

——— Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M..for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).

——— Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv), 12154 (vii).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 50.'

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3238 (ii).

Dom. Buildings, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).

——— Ont., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (iv).

——— Que., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).

——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Buildings.'

Dom. Coal Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (v). *See* 'Coal,' &c.

Dom. Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 2° m., 7835.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 7859; (Mr. Greenway) 7880; (Mr. Alcorn) 7890; (Mr. Bole) 7939; (Mr. Boyce) 7949; (Mr. Conmee) 7982, 7998; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8012; (amt.) 8076; (Mr. Crawford) 8076, 8089; (Mr. Monk) 8116, 8138; (Mr. Devlin) 8143; (Mr. Lake) 8150; (Mr. D. Ross) 8185; (Mr. Schaffner) 8200; (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8242; (Mr. W. Wright) 8271; (Mr. Dugas) 8282 (iv); (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8296 (v); (Mr. Foster) 8321; (Mr. Burrows) 8357; (Mr. Staples) 8387; (Mr. Carvell) 8401; (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8423; (Mr. Galliher) 8619; (Mr. Armstrong) 8645; (Mr. Oliver) 8659; (Mr. Bergeron) 8681 (v); (Mr. Miller) 11707; (Mr. Conmee) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11727; (Mr. Boyce) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11739; (Mr. Alcorn) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11753; (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11755 (vi).

In Com., 11796 (vi).

Ballot Papers, Fraudulent Marking (sec. 20) 11890; Amt. (Mr. White) 11890; Amt. (Mr. Porter) 11892 (vi), 13013; Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 13022, 13027; Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 13025; Amt. (Mr. Borden) 13026; (Mr. Crocket) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 13036; Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 13037 (vii).

Boards of Registration (sub.-sec. 4) 12995 (vii).

Canvassing by Aliens (sec. 25), Amt. (Mr. Lake) 11898 (vi).

Contributions for Political Purposes (sec. 28) Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11927; Amt. (Mr. Wilson) 11930; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 11931 (vi).

Contributions, Statement (sec. 18) 11884; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11884 (vi).

Conveyances of Voters (sec. 23) 11894; Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11896; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11897 (vi).

Conveyances, paying for (sec. 10) 11829; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11835 (vi).

Corrupt Practices, Amt. (Mr. Fowler) 13044 (vii).

Enumerators, Posting of Notices (sec. 6) 11824 (vi).

Lists transmitted by Clerk of Crown in Chancery (sec. 1, sub.-sec. 8) 13004 (vii).

Manitoba Lists, Transmission (sec. 1, subsec. 10) 13009 (vii).

——— Polling Divisions (sec. 1, subsec. 2) 13005 (vii).

Nomination Papers, Address of Candidate (sec. 3) 11815; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11816; Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 11820; Amt. (Mr. Ames) 11820, 11827 (vi), 13010 (vii).

Ontario, Unorganized Territories (sec. 1) 11796 (vi), 12919 (vii).

Persons on General List, omitted from Special List (sec. 13) 11865 (vi), 13009 (vii); Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11881 (vi).

Polling Divisions (sec. 6) 13001 (vii).

Posters, Names and Addresses (sec. 26) 11922; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11922 (vi).

P.E.I., Oath (sec. 16) 11882 (vi).

Returning Officers, Instructions to (sec. 11) 11845 (vi); Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13032 (vii).

Voters' Lists Preparation (subsec. 5) 12998 (vii).

Yukon Enumerators (sec. 5) 11823, 11829 (vi), 13013 (vii).

3° m., 13229; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13230; Neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13251; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 13255; Amt. (Mr. Foster) 13257; 3° Agreed to, 13258 (vii).

Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 555 (i).

Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7721 (iv).

Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).

Dom. Guarantee Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. Nos. 127 & 211.'

Dom. Govt. Employees, Interference at Election: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9 & 181.'

Dom. Lands, Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10038 (v).
——— Area disposed of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
Dom. Lands and Exchange of School Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Dom. Lands, Sales of, during 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
——— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Dom. Lands Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9987, 9996 (v).
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
See 'Finance.'
Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
Dom. Notes, Issue of : *See* 'B. Nos. 159 & 160.'
Dom. Notes, Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Dominion Police Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
Dom. Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
Dom. Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Dominion Power Co.'s Bill, Inquiry for (Mr. Cockshutt) 10919 (vi).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
Doukhobors, Condition of: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Foster) 2218 (ii).
——— Destitute Condition at Fort William (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).
——— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).
——— Manner of living, Letter from Yorkton: Read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
——— Prisoners at Fort William, Release of by Justice Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 6847 (iv).
——— Religious Fanatics: Par. in 'Press' (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).
——— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept.: Ques.: (Mr. Lake) 6983 (iv).
Doukhobors, Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. of Bard of Trade: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7620; Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 7621 (iv).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dowling, Dr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5206 (iii).
——— Emplymt. by German Development Co.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5564 (iii).
——— Leave of Absence from Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Templeman) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).
Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).
Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
——— and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 687 (i).
Dredges registered in Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11497 (vi).
Dredging Companies, Contracts, Investigations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5924 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
——— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
——— advertisements *re* tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Bennett) 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
——— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
——— Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).
——— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).
——— Tenders *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773 (v).
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).
Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular Letter: Read in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pugsley) 12043 (vi).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).
Dredging in Ontario and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).
Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 2896 (ii).
Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).
Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).
Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).
Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Drop Letter, One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Drug Contracts with Bole Drug Co.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bole) 5562 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5513 (iii).
Drury, R. L., O.C. *re* Apptmt. to Japan: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4963 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4769 (iii).
Dry Docks, Construction of: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
——— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
——— O.Cs. &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Dundee Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act and Dom. Interference: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 1738 (i).
——— Tel. from Sec. of State: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1859 (i).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1861 (i).
Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 694 (i).
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464, 6843 (iv).
Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
Eastern Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).
East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
——— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
Eclipse Manufaturing and Office Specialty Co., Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and B.C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 68 & 213.'
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).
Eight Hour Day for Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to South Africa: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2792 (ii).
Election Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'
Election in N.B., Interference of Dom. Govt. *re* Patronage: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 3043 (ii).
See 'N. B.' &c.
Election of New Members, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Elections, Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Election Writs, Issue of: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
——— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Electrical Power exported from Niagara Falls, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 360 (i).
Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Empire and Ascension Day Adjnmt.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8894 (v).
Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Salaries, Religions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5206 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).
Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).
——Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).
—— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Essex County, Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).
Estimates, Basis of Appropriations *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5919 (iii).
—— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5661 (iii).
—— Discussions on Resolutions: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
—— Insufficient Votes *re* Public Works, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5923 (iii).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Exchange of Schools' Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Excise Collectors, Payments for Customs Collections: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Excise, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 813 (i).
—— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
—— Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii). *See* 'Anglo-French.'
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10904 (vi).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
—— Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
—— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
—— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
—— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Express Charges in Mar. Provs., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 518 (i).
Expropriation of Lands by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Facilities and Increased Accommodations, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 7200 (iv).
Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Payments: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10516 (vi).
—— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5078 (iii).
—— Payments to *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8890 (v).
—— Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Falconer, Mr. K.: *See* 'Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping.'
Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Custom Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).
Farnham Post Office, Alterations: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
—— Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 846 (i).
Fence Posts Fees, Memorial from Union of Manitoba Municipalities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 10258 (v).

Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
——— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
FINANCE:
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii).
——— Independent Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amendments: Prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4248 (iii).
——— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt., for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13226 (vii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Debt. of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
See 'Loans.'
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
——— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
FINANCE—*Con.*
Finance, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i), 12914 (vii).
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
——— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
Financial Stringency, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 35 (i).
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607 (i).
See 'Wheat.'
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11501 (vi).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233, 314 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
——— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
——— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
——— Sums expended, Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
——— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
——— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
——— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
—— Dates of last Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237, 564 (i).
—— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
—— Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
See main heading.
Receiver General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 2173 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
See 'Grain.'
Fire caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1510 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 1690 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 4832 (iii).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7663 (iv).
—— File, Cor., quoted by Minister, custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Original Papers (Mr. Foster) 8901, 9281 (v).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 3433 (ii).
Fisheries Act (jurisdiction of officers) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'

FISHERIES:
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).
—— Expenses of Sir Charles H. Tupper: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).
—— Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Licenses issued to Packers' Ass'n.: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (iv).
—— Grants to Japanese: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 7445 (iv).
—— Negotiations, Instructions to Mr. Bastedo: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
—— Reports *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 6849 (iv).
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).
—— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).
Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i).
Fisheries Committee, Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1691 (i).
Fisheries Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
—— Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction with Provinces, Conference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3235 (ii).
—— Instructions to Agent: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3429 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2395 (ii).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
—— Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4247 (iii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Fisheries Negotiations, &c., Between U.S. and Canada: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).

—— Boundary between Can. and U.S.: Information *re* (Mr. Sproule) 6632, 6739 (iv).

—— Regulations, Violation of: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).

—— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).

See 'Noble.'

Lake Winnipeg Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).

—— Fisheries, Legislation *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2389 (ii).

Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1683 (i).

Leases, Sessional Papers No. 207: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).

Licenses granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).

—— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6398 (iv).

Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. T. Chisholm) 559, 697 (i).

—— Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2896 (ii).

Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10256 (v).

—— Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).

—— Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).

—— Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).

—— Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).

—— Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).

—— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).

—— Overseers in Lunenburg, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Lobster Fishing, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 6644 (iv).

—— P.E.I. Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii).

Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).

Man., Fish Exportations from, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4240 (iii).

Mar. Provs., Fisheries, Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).

Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).

Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7446 (iv).

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).

See 'Georgian Bay.'

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan) 3934 (ii).

—— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).

Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).

Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).

Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).

Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).

River John Licenses, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10511 (vi).

Salmon Licenses, Leases, &c., in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).

—— Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).

—— Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).

—— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).

Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).

Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).

Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).

Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).

Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
——— Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8294 (v).
Floods at Chatham, Damages, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 4742 (iii).
Fog Signal Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11497 (vi).
Forbes, Mr Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*,899 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860 (i).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
Foresters, Ancient Order of: *See* 'B. No.62.'
Foresters, Order of, Charges in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bennett) 6005 (iii).
Forest Rangers *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Forest Reserves, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8613 (v).
Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Franco-Canadian SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 941 (i).
——— Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (Mr. Foster) 943 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., Stmnt., 1213 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Discussion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3754 (ii).
——— *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying Benefits of Minimum Tariff, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 851 (i).
——— Consideration of Proposed Convention: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 923 (i).
——— Correction *re* Travelling Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (Mr. Ames) 1424 (i).
——— Delay in Approval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 12655 (vii).
——— Delay due to Canadian Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13534 (vii).
——— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i).
——— Distribution to Members: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 605 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12351
——— Favoured Nation Clause, Foreign Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Favoured Nation Clause: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 514 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
——— and German Surtax, Effect of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Information in Detail asked for (Mr. Foster) 1585 (i).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 570 (i).
——— Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 178 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
——— Papers to be Distributed (Mr. Fielding) 848 (i).
——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 93 (i).
——— Ratification by French Senate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13083 (vii).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28; (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 43 (i).
——— Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8 (i).
——— U.S. Exports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
——— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).
See 'Customs Defalcations,' &c.

Fredericton Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Free Transportation of Members by SS. Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Books, Reduction of Customs Duties *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Language, Legislation *re*, Par. in 'La Presse': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8291 (v).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1209 (i).
French Language, Pet. *re*: Read (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8886; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 8886 (v).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
French Translation of Govt. Statutes and Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
See 'Debates.'
French Treaty, Taking Effect: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8614 (v).
French Treaty: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7202 (iv).
See 'Graphite.'
Frozen Wheat, Shipments from Man., Inspection under Seed Act: M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn. House, 825 (i).
Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2166 (ii).
Fruit Inspection in Closed Packages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 2981 (ii).
Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2754 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apple Packing: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).
Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 516 (i).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Fushimi, Prince, Expenditure *re* Visit: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
Gaetz Brothers, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments for Buffalo imported from Montana: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).
Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).
See 'Lake Aylmer.'
Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).
Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1120 (i).
——— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 515 (i).
Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 654, 668 (i).
General Chemical Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Geological Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6402 (iv).
——— Technical Officers, Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13574 (vii).
——— Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11231 (vi).
Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Georgian Bay Canal; Plans, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. McCool) 1941, 1992 (i), 5228 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Scheme: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 12053 (vii).
——— inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 12836 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, Final Report of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
——— Final Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. White) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 1739 (i).
——— Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145 (vii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
—— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
German Development Co.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10579 (vi).
See 'Dowling.'
German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Gilmore, Edith May, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Girard, Eugene Francois, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11634 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).
Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Glucose, Quantity imported from G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6980 (iv).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Goderich Harbour, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c,: Ques. (Mr Bristol) 9712 (v)
—— Remarks (Mr. Maclaren) 9779 (v).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 123 & 197.'
Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
See 'Yukon.'
'Golspie, Str., Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Goodwin Car Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Govt. Business: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7834 (iv), 12049, 12163 (vii).
—— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10258 (v), 10303, 10403, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).
—— M. for Precedence on Mondays (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6287 (iv).
—— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6917 (iv).
—— Ry. Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12504 (vii).
Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 13207 (vii).
—— Suppl. Estimates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 11016 (vi).
Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Northrup) 558 (i).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) 1741 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sproule) 2890 (ii).
Govt. Officials as Political Partizans in Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).
Govt. Ownership, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 75; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Govt. Rys. Act: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
—— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
—— Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
—— Maintenance and Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
—— Number purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
—— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
—— Purchase of Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).
—— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3288 (ii).
Governor General's Expenditure since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3581 (ii).
Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Grain Blockade in the West: *See* 'B. No. 159.'

Grain Commission, Names of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3486 (ii).
Grain Commission's Report: Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr .Staples) 180 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Staples) 180, 609 (i).
Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607
See 'Wheat,' &c.
Grain Standards Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Grand Bend, &c., Pier, Delays in Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4408 (iii).
——— Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).
Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (ii).
See 'Public Works—Wharfs,' &c.
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).
Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
G.T.P. Ry. Co., Guaranteed Bonds: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:
Accidents to Employees: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6655, 7447 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr Talbot) 6850 (iv).
——— Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 10624 (vi).
Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. D. Ross) 1512 (i).
Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 895 (i).
Bond Issue, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8440 (v).
Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 12051 (vii).
See 'Hodgins.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Commissioners' Rep., Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).
——— Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13226 (vii).
Commission issued to Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9716 (v).
Construction, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10393 (vi).
——— Inclusive of Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9265 (v).
——— Inquiry for Figures (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10916, 11939 (vi).
——— M. to Lay Statement on Table (Mr. Graham) 12049 (vii).
——— Total Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii), 9265 (v), 11407 (vi).
——— Statement (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii)
——— Reply to Mr. Borden's Statement (Mr. Graham) 12662 (vii).
Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. T. Schell) 600 (i).
Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6458, 6636 (iv).
Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6234 (iv).
Contracts, Safeguard Clauses in Govt. Contracts: M. for Copies* (Mr. Morin) 2398 (ii).
Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5563 (iii).
——— Recent Estimate of Cost: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5259 (iii).
Eastern Limit, Mountain Section, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 9265 (v)
Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5802 (iii).
Engineering Staff, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 509, 681 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 853 (i).
——— Resignation of Mr. Hodgins: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 516 (i)
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 558 (i).
See 'Hodgins.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9266 (v).
G.T.P., and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: Ques (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hodgins, Major, Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
——— Retirement of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 366 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* Classification, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6844, 6925 (iv).
——Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7213, 7320 (iv).
—— Statement from Hon. Mr. Parent: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6985; Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7097 (iv).
—— Investigation *re*, 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Geoffrion) 8515 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12265; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) Minority Rep., 12291 (vii).
—— Counsel Fees, Payment: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 13578 (vii).
Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10390 (vi).
La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8607 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 8894 (v).
Liquor, Prohibition Zone, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2024
Location, Conference in Montreal *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7809 (iv).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
Madawaska Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. Michaud) 12661 (vii).
Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1937 (i).
—— Deductions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9473 (v).
Medical Officer Parent, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8618 (v).
Miles under construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 165 (i).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Montreal Branch Line Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Mountain Division, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Nationality of Contractors: Discrimination against Canadians: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7936 (iv).
Payments to Mr. A. Brunet: in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi).
Policy *re* Police Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7997 (iv).
Port Arthur Branch Line Subsidy: in Com on Res., 13303 (vii).
Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 516 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Protests *re* Land Acquisitions: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 6640 (iv).
Rails purchased, Name of Manufacturers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 10738, 10790 (vi).
—— Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 12775 (vii).
—— corrected answer (Mr. Graham) 13065
Rails for Eastern Division, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9263 (v).
Return: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6288 (iv).
Route, Financial Reasons for Change of Route: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 8089 (iv).
Sections B. and F., Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 5211 (iii).
Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 356 (i).
Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 9025 (v), 10375 (vi).
Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2171 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1932 (i).
—— Contractor for District No. 3: Ques. (Mr. White) 1120 (i).
Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
Ties purchased from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1443 (i).
Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2386 (ii).
——Number of Miles completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6643 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 935 (i).
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
G. T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
——Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.R. Hotel Site at Ottawa: *See* 'B No. 89.'
G.T.Ry. Hotel: *See* 'Major's Hill.'
'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5081 (iii).
See 'Fritz Cirkel,' &c.
Gratuities to Marine *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
Gravenhurst Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13062 (vii).
Grazing Lands Reservations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3850 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Wood, Fleck and Finnie: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3479 (ii).
Grazing Lease of H. Rivière, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13060 (vii).
Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Townships 12 to 19: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7210 (iv).
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
G. B. and U. S. Treaties: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8694 (v).
See 'Anglo-American.'
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1508 (i).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup.,7289 (iv).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. Maclaren) 184 (i).
Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 431 (i).
Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3844 (ii).
Hackett Dock, Purhase of at Amherstburg: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7730 (iv).
Halifax Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).
—— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7211 (iv).
Halifax Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (iv).
Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).
—— Disbandment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
—— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
—— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
—— Retraction of Remarks of Minister of Finance: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5784 (iii).
See 'Esquimault.'
Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).
Halifax Immigration Frauds. Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).
—— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
See 'Immigration.'
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
—— Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).
Halifax Platform *re* Conservative Speeches, ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 47; (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).
Halifax Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island: in Com. of Sup., 7171 (iv).
Halifax, Signal Dues at: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Halifax Southwestern Ry. (Tusket Wedge) Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 13296 (vii).
Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6236 (iv).
Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Hamilton Bank, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Hamilton, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Hamilton Radial Electric B. 25: in Com., *re* Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).
Haney, M. J., Claims *re* P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12762 (vii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 9128 (v).
See 'Debates,' &c.
Harbottle, N. F., Employmt. in Excise Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7730 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— N. B., Members' Remarks checked: (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 11290 (vi).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— P. E. I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connection: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.,' &c.
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13314 (vii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymt. as Returning Officer: Remarks (Mr. Avery) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3430 (ii)

——Political Interference, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5791 (iii).

Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4765 (iii).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).

—— Purchase of Cement from A. E. Wallberg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).

Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase in Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 10737 (vi).

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration, &c.: Remarks (Mr J. D. Reid) 1739 (i).

—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 3042, 3690 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &s.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2170 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).

—— Total Expenditure *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).

Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii)

—— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Foster) 5482 (iii).

—— Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr Foster) 4407 (iii).

See 'Immigration.'

Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6238 (iv).

See 'Homesteads,' &c.

Hodgins, Major: *See* 'G.T.P.'

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).

—— Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2081 (ii).

Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).

—— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector, &e.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).

Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of Additional Living Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii)

Homestead Application of Mr. John Haddock: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).

Homestead Cancellations: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v)

Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by Mr. R. Cruickshanks: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 698 (i).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).

Homestead Entries granted for Quarter 10-17-17, W. of 4th Meridian: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9773 (v).

Homesteaders for Sections 15, 16 and 27, &c., Issue of Patents: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7503 (iv).

Homestead Entry for s.e. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2167 (ii).

Homesteading on Section 18, Extensions *re* Time Allowance: Quese. (Mr. Ames) 8381 (v).

Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).

—— n.e. ¼ Sec. 28, Permission *re* Grants: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1941 (i).

—— N.W. Quarter Section 35, History of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4762 (iii).

—— Records of Payments of Sale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Porter) 1294 (i).

See 'Hintz.'

Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Homestead Entries: *See* 'Land Patents.'

Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).

—— Sale of in Township 13, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7206 (iv).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).

Hoppins. Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).

Horses and Cattle, Imports to U.S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c., *re* Coal Mining Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 698 (i)

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364, 568 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 3319 (ii).
House of Commons Act (election writ) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Estimates: in Com of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Colchester Electoral District, Ceretificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Committees sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
—— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, Nationalities, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members in New Wing: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
—— Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1486 (i).
—— Civil Service Bill, and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
—— Clerks, Changes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Owen) 4247 (iii).
—— Employees, Recommendations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3899 (ii).
—— Increase of Salaries: in Com. of Sup 13562 (vii).
—— Delays in Mails: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 11939 (vi).
—— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i)
—— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
—— Delay, &c.: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 12044 (vi).
—— Salary Increases to Sessional Clerks: in Sup., Conc., 13578 (vii).
—— Ventilation and Cooling: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10978, 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
House of Commons and Senate, Cost, &c., Outside of Indemnities: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4760 (iii).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
——Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission, Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
Legislation, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Library of Parlt. Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
—— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
—— Montreal Directory: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).
Members, New, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, Bourinot quoted, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).
—— Appeal to Speaker from Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
—— Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i), 4495 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
—— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. A. Wright) 584 (i)
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
Speaker's Expenses, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i)
——— Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
——— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
Stanstead By-Election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Spaker) 569 (i).
Voters' Lists, Manitoba: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).
——— Manitoba Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).
——— Provincial: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks (Mr. Burrows) 13066 (vii).
Watson, Mr., K.C., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
York Electoral District: Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Register of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4403 (iii).
Hudson Bay Patrol System: in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction: M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (vii).
——— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
See 'Railways.'
Hudson, Que., Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Hunting, Killing of Persons, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 358 (i).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1128 (i).
——— River St. Lawrence and Gulf: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 166 (i).
Ice-breakers for Govt. Service: in Com. of Sup., 2941, 2949 (ii).
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1734 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Immigration: *See* 'Chinese,' &c.
Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Immigration Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
IMMIGRATION:
Agents in G. B. and France: in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).
——— Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2169 (ii).
——— Reps. received from, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 557 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Agents, Special, Salaries, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2398 (ii).
Agents in East Elgin, Number employed: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 692 (i).
——— Italy, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4584 (iii).
——— Kent County, Ont., on M. for Sup. (Mr. Clements) 3172 (ii).
——— payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3041 (ii).
Agents, Names, Addresses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 180 (i).
——— Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3844 (ii).
Agents in N.B., Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 843 (i).
Agents, Special Prizes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3484 (ii).
Agents in U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Japanese.'
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Bonuses, Abolition of: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6663, 6945, 6989 (iv).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 4769 (iii), 6288 (iv).
Bonuses, Abolition of: on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i), 3300 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1293; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1299 (i).
——— Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1287 (i).
——— Increase to Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3429 (ii).
Bonuses. Par. in 'Canadian Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 7453 (iv).
B.C., Immigration, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 9890 (v).
British Subjects, Regulations *re*, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N.S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Detention Hospitals, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5081 (iii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii).
See 'Halifax.'
Doukhobours bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
——— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. *re* (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321 (iv).
——— Religious Fanatics: Par. in Press (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).
Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).
Dunne, M. C., Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
Expenditure from March, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 5080 (iii).
Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5084 (iii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Gimli Galicians, Relief to (Mr. Oliver) Rep. of Mr. Walker read: in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).
Halifax Immigration Frauds, Par in Press: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4834 (iii).
——— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
——— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5567 (iii).
——— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6465 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Robertson: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).
——— Restitution *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
——— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4963 (iii).
Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).
Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Foster) 5488 (iii).
——— Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Hindus, Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 5476 (iii).
—— Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto: Tel. read (Mr. Macdonell) 185 (i).
Immigrants at Chatham, Deportation of Five Families: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 6922 (iv).
—— Names and Causes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5796 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5080 (iii).
—— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 177 (i).
Immigrants Destitute, Stranded in Toronto: Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Macdonell) 242 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 429 (i).
Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates of Farmers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1513 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).
Immigrants landed in Canada June, 1907, Number deported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3339 (ii).
Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid on, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5256 (iii).
—— Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
—— Reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6921 (iv).
—— Stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 567 (i).
—— Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re*: Ques (Mr. Lennox) 7500 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8171, 8607, 8696 (v).
Immigration Act, B.C., Natal Act, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 567 (i).
Immigration, Circular issued to Immigrants *re* Fraudulent Powers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 606 (i).
—— Co-operation with N.B. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
—— Deportations: in Com. of Sup., 9882 (v).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. O. Smith, &c.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Sproule) 5491 (iii).
Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3847 (ii).
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
Immigration, General Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6402 (iv).
Immigration and Commercial Agencies Rets.: Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 1108 (i).
Immigration Literature: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).
—— Contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).
Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 2171 (ii).
—— Regulations, O.C. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Immigration from U.S., Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).
Japanese Immigration: *See* main heading.
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr Monk) 4244 (iii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
London Immigration, Central Board, Moneys paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2545 (ii).
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Alcorn) 4773 (iii).
Miller, Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
—— Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Relief to Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 9983 (v).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
—— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
U. S. Labourers: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
U.S., Total Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii)
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Waugh, James S., Distribution of Immigrants, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gordon) 1690 (i).
——— Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
Waugh and Perrin, Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Winnipeg Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 511 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1513 (i).
See 'Colonial.'
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Imperial Pulp Co., Denial *re* Managing Directorship: Par. in Montreal 'Star': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sifton) 3578 (ii).
Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1939 (i).
Imports and Exports ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).
——— Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).
Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).
Independence of Parlt. Act, Violation of *re* R. Stewart, M.P. for Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
INDIANS:
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Halfbreeds' Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
Destitute Indians, Relief, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).
Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Dokis Indian Reserve, Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).
——— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).
——— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
Dokis Indians, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).
——— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
Indian Affairs: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
——— Extravagant Management of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 11022 (vi).
——— Generally, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).
——— Tel. from Mr. Sifton read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13416 (vii).
——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram, 13528 (vii).
Lands in Algoma, Withdrawal from Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2396 (ii).
Lands in B.C., Provincial Rights: Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5078 (iii).
Lands at New Westminster, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3037, 3839 (ii).
Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
Lands, Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Land Sales: in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
Man. and Sask. Indians, Investigation of Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 6919 (iv)
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Muskoday Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
N. B., Agents Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12736 (vii).
——— School Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Peter's Reserve Title, Extinguishment of, Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
——— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Six Nation Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Swan Lake Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
——— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
——— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Yeomans, Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
Ingonish Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Inland Revenue Act (excise duties, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
INLAND REVENUE:
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Excise, Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4964 (iii).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 6 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645 (i).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Seizures, 1906-7, in Cornwall, Toronto, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 3846 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 3851 (ii).
——— Seizures in Cornwall, &c., Names of Officers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 4247 (iii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1903: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Revenue Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Seizures, at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
——— (dairy products, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
——— (grain) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
——— (oat standards) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Inspection of Staples: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
Inspection of Steamboats: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Inspectors of Food Products, Number, Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Institute of Architects of Can.: See 'B. No. 88.'
See 'Architects.'
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*: Personal Explanation *re* Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Mr. Foster) 1860 (i).
——— Introduction of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9272 (v).
——— Discussion *re* (Mr. Foster) 1107 (i).
——— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals asked for (Mr. Macdonell) 7988 (iv).
——— Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 6059 (iii).
——— and Political Campaign Literature: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 10792 (vi).
——— Rep.: Ques. of Priv. *re* Stmnt. of Sir Frederick Borden, 9337; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 9352, 9461 (v).
——— Total Expenditure, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt. of: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).

Insurance, Supt.'s Salary: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13225 (vii).
——— Expenses of Ministers: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13511 (vii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R. Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
Accidents, Letter *re*: Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 6985 (iv).
Advertising for Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Amqui Station, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10012 (v).
——— Vote *re* Construction, Amount Expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12774 (vii).
Answer to Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 13415 (vii).
Antigonish Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Audit System: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 10214 (v).
Book-Keeping System, Correction of Par. in St. John 'Daily Telegraph': (Mr. Graham) 5260 (iii).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Campbellton Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
Cars sent to U.S., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).
Cars in Service on Sundays: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Circular *re* Delay in Payment of Salaries: Read (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
——— Par. in St. John Press: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Fowler) 10016 (v).
Claims Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3480 (ii).
Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9472 (v).
Claims for Damages to Property or Personal Injury, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 6002 (iii).
Claims for Damages, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).
Claims Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10176 (v).
Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1688 (i).
Collection of Revenues: in Com. of Sup., 5693 (iii).
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Compensation *re* Horses killed at Truro: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
Concrete Pipes, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6640 (iv).
Dartmouth Branch Line Ry., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Delays to 'Maritime Express': Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8614 (v).
Deterioration of Service: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).
Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 12236, 12250 (vii).
Earnings and Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13510 (vii).
Employees, Apptmts. in N.B. during Jan. and Feb., 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii).
——— Circular from Genl. Mgr. *re* Municipal Politics: Read (Mr. Sproule) 2304 (ii).
——— Circular *re* Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2884; on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).
——— Employees and Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2309 (ii).
——— Increased Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2981 (ii).
——— Provident Fund Act, Names on List: ues. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4582 (iii).
——— and Quebec Provincial Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9777 (v).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
Extension to Great Lakes, Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2435 (ii).
Extension Policy, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 73 (i).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Crocket) 2558 (ii).
Gross Earnings for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Halifax Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
——— Civic Elections in Halifax, Interference of Employees: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).
Halifax to Sydney Division, Transfer: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12773 (vii).
Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re*: M. for Paper* (Mr. Sinclair) 5800 (iii).
Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3233 (ii).
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
See 'Que. Central.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ice Supply Contract: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5259 (iii), 7446 (iv).
Increased Accommodations: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry., Change of Name, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6243 (iv).
Lac Saumon Station, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
Legal Costs to Mr. MacIlreith: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
Legal Services: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10190 (v).
Locomotives: in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Moncton, Additional Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1509 (i).
——— Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
——— Tenders *re* Leasing: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5800 (iii).
Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 565 (i).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
N.B. Elections and I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
Newcastle Station, Inspector of Works: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13511 (vii).
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
North Sydney Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Notices printed in French and English: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7936 (iv).
Number of Men employed in N.B., for Jan., Feb., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Daniel) 6241 (iv).
'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and Ending of Running, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 6054 (iii).
Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c., for Travelling Expenses, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 2982 (ii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Issue of Pass: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Oxford and Pictou Branch, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vii).
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2387 (ii).
Petit Rocher Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Pictou Branch, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 12661 (vii).
Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
——— Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10789 (vi).
Piping: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10195 (v).
Private Car for Mr. Schreiber, Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Quebec Central Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 189 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Rails, &c., Number of Tons of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 9269 (v).
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5995 (iii).
Receipts and Expenditures: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 10514 (vi).
Revenue from Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5471 (iii).
Ricard, Mr., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
——— Station Master, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 7445 (iv).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
——— Purchase, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
——— Statement *re* Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Graham) 5697 (iii).
Running of Official Cars on Limited Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5474 (iii).
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5466 (iii).
Stationery Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10181 (v).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10734 (vi).
Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9712 (v).
——— Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Sunday Cars, Instructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 10734 (vi).
Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 10188 (v).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation: in Com., of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
——— Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i).
Ties delivered, Changes *re* Inspection: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12052 (vii).
Trains breaking down, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
——— Explanations *re* Delays, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6242 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10159 (v).
Transportation Question, Statement, on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).
Trois Pistoles Station, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Truro, Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6233 (iv).
——— Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1936 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
——— Sewerage Frontage: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5800 (iii).
——— Station, Unsanitary Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7211 (iv).
William, Thos., Emplymt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (iii).

INTERIOR:
Clearwater Lake, Squatters' Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Interior, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
——— Deptl, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
Squatters' Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
See 'Immigration,' 'Indians,' &c.
Internal Economy Board of H. of C., Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line: Representations *re* Buildings on: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 356 (i).
——— Correction of Answer (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 519 (i).
International Commission, Red River of the North: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material: Ques. (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).
See 'Detroit.'
Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Interprovl. Ry. Bridge Co. of N.B.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 4244 (iii).

Irrigation Act: *See* 'B. No. 10, 99.'
Irrigation in West, Investigation *re* Measurements: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Japanese Colony in the West, Application from C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 7196 (iv).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 4243 (iii).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C.: Ques. Mr. R. Smith) 6642 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
Japanese Immigration and Natal Act, Cor. with Lt.-Gov. of B.C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 2170 (ii).
See 'Dunsmuir.'
Japanese Immigration, Cor. *re* Limitations, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 94 (i).
—— Debate in Japanese Diet, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4737 (iii).
—— from U.S., Deportations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3900 (ii).
—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 947 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 692 (i).
—— O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 854 (i).
—— Restriction of: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 699; (Mr. Macpherson) 719; (Mr. Sloan) 726; (Mr. D. Ross) 732; (Mr. Kennedy) 748 (i).
—— M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 854 (i).
—— Parliamentary Control of (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2025; Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2043; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 100) 2158 (ii).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets: (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration, Recent Eentries into B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3751 (ii).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 32; (Mr. Foster) 77; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
—— Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table (Mr. Lemieux) 1550 (i).
—— Restriction, B.C. Legislation: on M. for Sup. (Mr. D. Ross) 1744 (i).
—— Result of Mission: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 1585 (i).
—— Riots, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
—— Statement of Postmaster General: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208, 1424 (i).
—— Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1928 (i).
See 'Anglo-Japanese,'
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5201 (iii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt.-Gov. of B.C., Cor., &c., sent to by Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Judges' Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
JUSTICE:
Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).
Ancoin vs. The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salaries, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 8185 (iv).
Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Drysdale, Hon. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
—— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Exchequer Court, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
—— Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*, 899 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
—— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2981 (ii).
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
See 'Quebec.'
Judges Salaries, Applications *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Justice, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Bureau) 185 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4768 (iii).
—— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of, O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 12265 (vii).
—— B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
—— Generally, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).
—— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. by Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
—— Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
—— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
—— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
—— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Supreme Court Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents: *See* B. No. 190.'
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3036 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3850 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Keewatin, Synod of the Diocese of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13587 (vii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
Kingston, Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
—— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
—— withdrawal of vote: in Com. of Sup., 7814 (iv).
—— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Koenig, Capt., Duties, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept.: Res. of Town Council Sydney: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9580, 9710 (v).
Labour, Deptl. Rep: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 841 (i).
——— (Japanese Investigation) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 1583 (i).
———Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 605 (i).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
'Labour Gazette': in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Labour Organization *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Labour, Unemployed, Protection to: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10735 (vi).
Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 979 (i).
——— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5672 (iii).
——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5082 (iii).
Lacoste, Sir Alexandre, Amount of Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1934 (i).
Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7936 (iv).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
——— Crew during Winter: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snag in St. John River: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privilege *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Lake Aylmer Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake François Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M.C., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin, under Irrigation Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7209 (iv).
Lands, Dom.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3235 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N.W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
——— Selection and Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii).
Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5083 (iii).
Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3234 (ii).
Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of Quarter Section 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3432 (ii).
Land Patent for E. ½ S. E. ¼ Section 2, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 2169 (ii).
——— S. E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 2171 (ii).
Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3430 (ii).
——— Sections 10 and 17, Applicants *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9475 (v).
——— Sections 36, &c., Issue of: Ques (Mr. Lake) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii)
Land Sales in N.W., Purchasers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3835 (ii)
Lands set Apart for Settlement since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule), 2796 (ii).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
See 'Railways,' &c.
Lands, Surveys of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Land Titles Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 113 and 168.'
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr. Monk), 4244 (iii).
——— Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
Lavaltrie, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lead Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Lead Production by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11407, 11705 (vi).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of: Notice of Motion (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3477 (ii).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes), 10014 (v).
——— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provinces, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sandfield) 4768 (iii).
——— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
Legislation, House of Commons, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf, Contract *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
'Le Soleil,' Par. *re* Voting of French Members: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bergeron) 7992 (iv).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7993 (iv).
Lesser Slave Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup, 13336 (vii).
Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
——— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).
Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Levis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Levis Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Herron) 8867 (v).
Liability of Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Libel Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
——— Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Life-Saving Stations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 2972 (ii).
Life-Saving Stations, Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Lighthouses, Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9476 (v).
See 'Canals—Rideau.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12262, 13323 (vii).
Lighthouse-Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
——— Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11299 (vi).
Light-Keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7729 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vii).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
See 'Militia.'
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1286 (i).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1506 (i).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13359 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin), 2397 (ii).
Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 12894 (vii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot), 1506 (i)
Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 9475 (v).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster), 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. .Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster), 13582 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafs : *See* 'Dom. Loans,' 'Finance.'
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c.: M. for Ret.* Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
——— Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 314 (i).
——— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 314 (i).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey), 10256 (v).
Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin), 4404 (iii).
Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
——— Overseers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).
Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean), 6644 (iv).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii)
Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11935 (vi).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Moncton: in Com. fo Com of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
London Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10094 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7304 (iv).
Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing: Remarks (Mr. Elson) 3753 (ii).
'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7198 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3428 (ii).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 230 (i).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11695 (vi).
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9504 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10259 (v).
See 'Pulp.'
Lumber manufactured in N. W. Provs., Royalty Payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3835 (ii).
Lunenburg Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G. T. P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
——— Storage of Refuse of Montreal Harbour Property: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11936 (vi).

MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 12220 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6985 (iv).
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr Herron) in Com of Sup, 9110 (v)
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road, P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).
McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 688 (i).
McGee, Hon. T. D'Arcy, Monument *re*: Remarks (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6288 (iv).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McGuire, Hon. Thos., Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5794 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. White) 6061 (iii).
McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6981 (iv).
McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii)
McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry: Ques (Mr. Lake) 6401 (iv).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Magdalen Islands Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Magee, Hon. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
——— lost in C. P. R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).
——— Mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii).
Mail Service beteen Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).
Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Mail Service in N. B. and N. S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).
Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Subsidy to France: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel Site: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys belonging to Mr. Walter Dick: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Man., Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Man. Boundaries, Bill *re* Extension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1741 (i).
——— Consent of Legislature, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 936 (i)
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6222, 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 852 (i).
——— Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. J. Roche), 495 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1288 (i).

Man. Lands, Section 32, Town Site, Applications *re* Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1348 (i).

Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).

——— Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).

Manitoba Voters' Lists: *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'

Manitoba and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

——— Reps. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 893 (i).

Manning & Macdonald's Claims *re* Soulanges Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).

Maple Creek Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6639 (iv).

Maps, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).

Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruptions *re* Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2161 (ii).

Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).

——— Regulation of Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 174 (i).

See 'Wireless.'

Marcoun, Mr., Commission *re* Settlement of Claims: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).

Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).

MARINE:

Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).

——— Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).

'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904 to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).

——— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).

Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v). *See* 'Marine Signals.'

Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).

——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Marine Dept.: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).

——— Absence of Mr. Watson: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 10918 (vi).

——— Apptmnt. of Ass't Judge in Exchequer Court: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11311 (vi).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron as Counsel: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6926 (iv).

——— Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8837 (v).

——— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c.: M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8445 (v).

——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9725 (v).

——— Distribution of Evidence: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10789 (vi).

——— Evidence *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).

——— remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).

——— Evidence presented day by day to House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8203 (v).

——— Evidence, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11301 (vi).

——— Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).

——— Letter of Instructions to Mr. Watson laid on the Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 7621 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10741 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6846 (iv).

——— Mr. Perron's Duties: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 10743 (vi).

——— Postponment of by Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).

——— Proceedings in Public, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7321 (iv).

——— Rep. of Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10915 (vi).

See 'Mar. and Fish.,' &c.

'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
——— and Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
——— Maintenance and Supplies (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
——— Number of purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
——— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Gratuities *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).
Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Life-boats in B.C., Purchase of from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses, Classification, &c., Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 12262, 13323 (vii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755 (iii).
Lighthouse-keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Light-keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lighthouses, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N. S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, Reorganization: in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).
——— O.Cs., Cor. *re* Change of System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 852 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 510 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4223 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4747 (iii).
——— Acting Deputy Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11939 (vi).
——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10741 (vi).
——— Dep. Min., Ass't.: in Com. of Sup., 12915 (vii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7938, 7995, 8088: Letter of Dep. Min. Read (Mr. Brodeur) 8088 (iv).
——— Deptl. Investigation by Minister: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
——— remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6636 (iv).
——— Deptl., Misconduct of Official: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 6633 (iv).
——— Deptl. Officers under Suspension, Dates of Aptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6982 (iv).
——— Deptl. Officials, Suspension of: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
——— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8889 (v).
——— Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 6241 (iv).
——— Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2883 (ii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
——— contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
——— Steamers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13062 (vii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
See 'Briar.'
Masters' and Mates' Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collission with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation re: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171, 9715 (iv), 10121 (v).
——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons Registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Life-Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
'Viligant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Mar. Provs., Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Markham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Masters' and Mates' Act Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on order for 2°: Remarks 583 (i). *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier: in Com of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amt. expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7179 (iv).
Meaford Harbour: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Meat and Canned Foods Act Enforcement: in Com. of Sup., 12893 (vii).
——— Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
——— Inspectors, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 172 (i).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1505 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 1690 (i).
Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 4589 (iii).
Meat Inspection Regulations, Speech of Mr. Fisher at Chatham: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Clements) 196 (i).
Meat Inspection Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3042 (ii).
Medicine Hat Buildings, Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 46 (i).
Members introduced 3, 680 (i), 2542 (ii).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emoulment, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. in Geodetic Survey, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1349 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
Mess. from His Ex., Franco-Canadian Treaty: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
——— (Suppl. Estimates, 1908): Read (Mr. Speaker) 12503 (vii).
See 'Estimates,' &c.
Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5650 (iii).
Metal Shingle and Siding Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Methyated Spirits, Supplies to Manufacturers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 820 (i).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen: (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).
Midland and Tiffin, Dredging, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).
'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3235 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
Milford, Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).
MILITIA :
Allowances, Arrears of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662, 5732 (iii); 10286 (v).
Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tel., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).
Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv); 12154 (vii).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
——— Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).
Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).
——— Return *re*: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 5914 (iii), 6465 (iv).
Boot Contract, Attack *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 10739 (vi).
Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).
British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).
Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3842 (ii).
Camps, Holding of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9779, 9835 (v).
Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Customs Dues: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i)
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c. *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).
——— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 *See* 'Naval.'
Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).
Fredericton Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).
Generals, Apptmts. of Names and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5086 (iii).
Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 9712 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. MacLaren) 9779 (v).
Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).
——— Disbandment of, &c: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
——— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
——— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
——— Retraction of Remarks of Min. of Fin.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5784 (iii).
Halifax, Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).
Halifax Militia Supplies, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6405 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).
Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
——— Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10014 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Lévis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
——— Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
London, Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
——— Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i), 8871 (v), 12147 (vii).
——— Supplies, Provisions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
Militia, Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2165 (ii).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioner's Report; Stmnt. (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).
——— Quebec, Hours for Work of Masons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 10790 (vi).
——— Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 4494 (iii).
——— Threats *re* Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Militia,—Memorandum of General Lake: M. to lay on Table (Sir Frederick Borden) 12770 (vii).
——— Pay, Arrears, &c., Reasons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8442 (v).
Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 352 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv)
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools, *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Stations in Canada, Arrangements with G. B., *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
——— List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
Niagara Camp., Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
———Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 9779 (v).
Niagara Falls, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Land Sale, 13540 (vii).
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1292 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Properties: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
——— Provisions and Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 12150 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
——— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
——— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
——— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Rearks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
——— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c.: Remarks, 8386 (v).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Rations, Cost per Day, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown,, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
——— Advances to Co. *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
——— Arsenal Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).
——— Bayonets purchased for, &c., Contracts, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
——— Bayonets, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
——— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O. C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
——— Bayonets, Provisions *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— Bonus, Loans, Services of the Govt., Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
——— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
——— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
——— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, &c., Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4404 (iii).
——— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
——— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 8902-8953; Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090
——— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
——— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
——— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's Denial of Stmnt., 9126, 9330 (v).
——— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
——— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Reports from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
——— Rifles delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).
——— Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
——— Ross Rifle Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).
——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
——— Target Practice, Suspensions by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
——— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
——— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplie: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi), 12152, 13177 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M.C.; on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10896 (vi).
——— 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John, Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants, to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
——— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
——— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
Stoney Creek Battlefield Monument: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stores and Arms for Rural Battalions, Care of: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lalor) 5736 (iii).
Stores, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8181 (iv)
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
——— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
——— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
——— Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5203 (iii).
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv)
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Uniforms and Customs Refunds: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Warlike and other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Winnipeg, Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10869 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Milk Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 64..
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 646 (i).
Mines and Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Perley) 3851 (ii).
——— Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3238 (ii).
Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
See 'Travelling,' &c.
Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
——— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
——— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 933 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).
Mint: *See* 'Public Buildings, Ottawa.'
Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3848 (ii).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv).
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
Moncton Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Payments to E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
Moncton-Truro, Additional Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).
Money-Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1738 (i).
'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).
Montague Moore, &c., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collision with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10121 (v).
'Montcalm,' Str., Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Montreal Circuit Judges, Increase of Salary: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. on B. 206, 12552 (vii).
Montreal Directory, in Library of House: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7423 (iv).
——— Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3319 (ii).
Montreal Excise Officers, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3900 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Amount of Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 8888 (v).
——— Cement Contract, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 7199, 7499 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 2170 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Gervais) 4064; Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 4066; Appeal from Dep. Speaker to Speaker, 4071; Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
——— Settlement of Strike: Remarks (Mr. Verville) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).
——— Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).
Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
——— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last Fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).
Montreal 'Star,' Advertisements in, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108: N. 53) 3464 (ii)
—— Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
—— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
—— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
—— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
—— Rep. of Aud. Gen. J. Fraser: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 2983 (ii).
See 'Toll Gates.'
Monuments to Sir L. H. Lafontaine and Robt. Baldwin: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Monuments to McGee and Brown: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).
Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch, C.P.R., Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 7654 (iv).
Moose Jaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9494 (v).
Mortgages as Securities by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Motions, Unopposed: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8839 (v).
—— Business of the Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Improved Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6239 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 10123 (v).
Museum: *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Muskoday Indian Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 & 219.'
See 'Battlefields.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Naturalization Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
See 'Can. Naturalization.'
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Schools, Establishment of, List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
—— Arrangements with G.B. *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).
'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on Order for Reps.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 850 (i).
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
—— Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Connections *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9283; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9415 (v).
See 'Cold Storage.'
N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt., Ques. (Mr. Porter) 9272 (v).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
N.B. Elections and Govt. Employees: Telegram read (Mr. Foster) 3229 (ii).
—— I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3579 (ii).
—— Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).
N.B. Inland Waters Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).
N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).
N.B. Post Office Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt.: M. (Mr. Foster) to Adjn., 3657 (ii).
N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
N.B. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).
New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Newmarket Canal, Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).
—— Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
See 'Canals—Trent.'

New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 1690 (i).
Newspapers, Amounts paid for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).
Newspapers, Payments to from 1904 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
—— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).
—— Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).
See 'Public Works—Advertising,' 'Tenders,' &c.
New York Central Ry., Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost, Criticism, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6054 (iii).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Niagara Land Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).
Niagara Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 9779 (v).
—— Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283 (i).
Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
—— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).
—— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).
—— Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).
—— Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).
Nipigon Ry. (Branch Lines) Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Nipissing Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay.'
Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Land Patents to: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 8182 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).
—— Financial Relations with Govt.: Remarks on M. for Sup., 770 (i).
—— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2392 (ii).
North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
North Empire Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Northern Crown Bank of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Northern Empire Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).
North Sydney Improvements, I.C. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Leases assigned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 11702 (vi).
N.W.M. Police, Compensations *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
—— Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
—— Salaries and Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 8862 (v).
Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
N.W.T. Act (jurisdiction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
N.W.T. Govt., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10116 (v).
N.W.T. School Grants: in Com. of Sup., 11117 (v).
Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
N.S. Prisons, &c., Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Oaths of Office: See 'B. No. 1.'
Oats, Standards of: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Observatories: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Observatory: *See* 'Astronomical.'
Obstructions in Navigable Streams, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 3156, 3211 (ii).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Owen) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
—— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10016 (v).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10023; (Mr. Speaker) 10024 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Ques. of Order, (Mr. Foster) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10024: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 10031 (v).
Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9220 (v).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i), 2941, 2949, 3147, 3195 (ii), 5763 (iii).
Ocean SS. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Occidental Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Official Cars, Number and Maintenance: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).
Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied to Govt.: Ques. (Br. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 3242 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bennett) 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
Oil Borings, Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 13162 (vii).
Old Age Pensions: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Old Age Pensions: M. for Sel. Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) to wthdrw., 3654 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 7722 (iv).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Olympic Games Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Ont., Judges of: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Ontario North, Division of Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 8294 (v).
Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).
Opium, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 10123 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
Order Paper, Differences between English and French Editions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6740, 6850 (iv).
——— Printing in French: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5407 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, 'Bourinot' quoted, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).
——— Appeal to Speaker from Mr. Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Ordnance Lands, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 218.'
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Original Documents and Returns: *See* 'Documents.'
Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
——— Issue of Pass on I.C.R. Express: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5471, 5656 (iii).
——— Incorrect Answer: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5566 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
——— Archives Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
——— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
——— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5707 (iii).
——— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
——— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Sussex Street: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Ottawa Grounds, Circular of C. S. Ass'cn: Read (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11499 (vi).
Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).
——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 516 (i).
——— O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'

Owen Sound to Meaford Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3038 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Pacific Coast Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
See 'Blunden.'
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
——— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Park Reservations: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11259 (vi).
Parrsborough Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry Service, Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1120 (i).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Passages of Immigrants to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Passenger Ticket Act: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Passes on Steamers to Members, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Patent Medicines: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
Patent Medicines, Committee of Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3899 (ii).
Patent Medicines, Govt. Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 356 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Apptmt. to Special Com., 10689 (vi).
Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Patents of General Chemical Co.: *See* 'B No. 174.'
Patents of Goodwin Car Co.: *See* 'B. No. 60.
Patents of Metal Shingle and Siding Co.: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Patents of Montague Moore, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Patent of Wm. B. Smith: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 672 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6002 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6241 (iv).
Patronage *re* Civil Service: M. (Mr. Foster, to Drop, 6243 (iv).
See 'Civil Service System.'
Paulding, Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 3834 (ii).
Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 3851 (ii).
Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grants: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 11018 (vi).
——— Homesteads leased, sold, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1295 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10403 (vi).
——— Survey of Lands: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c., Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Peat for Fuel Deposits, Development of in Canada: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Peat Industry, Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1122 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan), 3934 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii), 12265 (vii).
Penitentiaries B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
Pension Fund of I.C.R. & P.E.I. Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Perdue, Mr. M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 173 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals (Mr. Turriff) 1927 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
—— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Peterborough Steamboat Landing: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petition: M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Present, 1682 (i).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
—— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464, 7107 (iv).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
Petit Rocher Spur Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7937 (iv).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 7937 (iv).
Petroleum Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Phœnix Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payment to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6920 (iv).
Pianos rented for Speaker's Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, I.C.R., Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
Pictou Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Pilotage and Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 5046 (iii), 13324 (vii).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).
Plains of Abraham, Battle of: *See* 'Nos. 111 & 219.'
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
See 'Militia—Ross Rifle.'
Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
—— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
—— Tenders, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Pelee Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Point St. Charles, Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
See 'Dredging.'
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).

Port Burwell Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146, 12211 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (ii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hillford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Port Hope, Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Port Hope Pier Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
Port Maitland Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
——— Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Port Mulgrave, N.S., Preventing Boats landing Cargoes: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).
Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).
——— Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).
Postal Rates on N.S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).
Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5901 (iii).
Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).
——— Deficiency, &c., Complaints *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).
——— Delays, &c., Complaints *re* Ret.: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Armstrong) 7257 (iv).
Postal Service, H. of C., Delay in delivering: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
Postal Service, Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).
Postal Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).
——— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 6461 (iv).
Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
POST OFFICE:
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
See 'Mail Service,' &c.
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).
Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).
Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).
Calgary, P. O. and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).
Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).
Drop Letter One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).
Egvpte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).
Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).
Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. MacLaren) 184 (i).
Hamilton Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska.' Postal Privileges *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
—— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).
Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).
McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I. Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii).
Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).
Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).
—— Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C.P.R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).
Mail Service in B.C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii)
Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).
Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).
Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7199 (iv).
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).
Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).
Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
—— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
—— Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Montreal Post Office, Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).
N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).
——— Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).
N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
——— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).
Newspaper Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).
——— Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).
See 'Weekly Newspapers.'
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).
Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).
——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).
Point St. Charles Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Postal Arrangements between Can. and U.S.: Re-arrangement of: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).
Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).
——— Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).
Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4761 (iii).
Post Office Dept., Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 93 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii), 8872 (v).
——— Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v), 13152 (vii).
——— Returns, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6405 (iv).
——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Crocket) 6288 (iv).
Post Office Inspectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
——— Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).
Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).
P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).
——— Delays in Distributing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).
Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).
Quebec Terentenary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).
——— Designs for, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
——— New Series, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6397 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).
——— Postage Stamps, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).
Rivard, Mr. S., Emplymt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (v).
Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).
Rural Postmasters, Salary, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 183 (i).
Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).
St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).
St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank Opening, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
St. Irene des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).
St. John's Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
—— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).
—— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).
St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).
St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Mary Finlay, Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).
Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 691 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Scotch Hill East, Establishment of Post Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).
Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).
—— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
See 'Quebec,' &c.
Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).
Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 609 (i).
Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).
Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).
Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Weekly Newspapers, Postal Rates in N.S., Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).
Weekly Newspapers, Postal Regulation *re*, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5201 (iii).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).
—— Interference in Eelctions: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).
Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).
Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).
Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing, Acting Minister of Marine: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7732 (iv).
Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).
Presbyterian College of Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Presbyterian Ministers' Widows and Orphans Fund: *See* 'B. No. 23.'
Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques (Mr. Foster) 360 (i).
Prince Albert Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 359 (i).
P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 1295 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
P.E.I. Harbours and Rivers, Expenditures: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
P.E.I. Ice-breaker, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8444 (v).
—— Date of Signing of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10254 (v).
—— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 365 (i).
P.E.I. Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
—— Lighthouses, Supplies, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 358 (i).
P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishing of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2171 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8696, 9893 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6642 (iv).
—— Bear River Station-master's Dwelling, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1737
P.E.I. Branch Lines: *See* 'B. No. 202.'
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 3242 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
—— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifications, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5086 (iii).
—— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
—— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
—— Harmony-Elmira Branch, Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 12052 (vii).
—— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for Sup., 2740 (ii).
—— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
—— remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 7100 (iv).
—— Mail Service, Delays in Distributing &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com of Sup., 9092 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Montague Branch. Claims of James Maher, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3834 (ii).
—— Montague Branch Extension: M. to dsch. Bill (Mr. Graham) 11405 (vi).
—— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 848 (i).
—— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. A. McLean) 850 (i).
—— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4829 (iii).
—— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3236 (ii).
—— Subsidy, Deductions *re* Hillsborough Bridge: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5079 (iii).
—— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
—— Tenders *re* News Agency: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
—— Time-Table, Protest *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
—— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 568 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with G.B.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).
P.E.I., Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5801 (iii).
P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8515 (v).
P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, Reps., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 4589 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
—— Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 562 (i).
P.E.I., Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2546 (ii).
—— Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 936 (i).
—— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 895 (i).
—— Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1109 (i).
—— Withdrawal of Steamer from Georgetown, Discussion: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1207 (i).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1513 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Ice-Breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4583 (iii).
—— Mail Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 1203 (i).

P.E.I., Progress *re* Construction of Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 5796 (iii).
—— Winter Communication: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 4496 (iii).
P.E.I Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 172 (i).
—— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 843 (i).
Prince Rupert, Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Electric Motor Machines: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
Printing and Lithographing done outside of Canada, Amounts expended: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1732, 1931 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
See 'Lithographing.'
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Printing of Parlt., 5th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Parmelee) 10915 (vi).
Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).
Printing and Stationary Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Printing in 'Sun,' &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 5661 (iii).
Printing, Supt., Apptmt. of a Frenchman: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act *re* N.S.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Prisoner, Released: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers: (Mr. Talbot 4221 (iii).
—— Ques. of *re* Registrar of Grey County (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Privy Council, Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
—— Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Prohibition Vote in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
—— Mess. from Senate: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13587 (vii).
—— Speech from Throne, 13590 (vii).
Protection Tariff, ref. to in Debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 74 (i).
Provincial Elections and Federal Ministers' Speeches: Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 8850 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amount paid before and after Adjustment: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8616 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
—— Dates of last Payments, &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
—— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
—— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Provincial Voters' Lists: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
See 'Man.,' &c.
Public Accounts Com., Evidence *re* Investigation, Freedom of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Bain) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3083; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3085 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
—— Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 4495 (iii).
Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: M. to ref. to Public Accounts Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 311 (i).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2159 (ii); M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc., 9890 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse.: M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).
Public Accounts Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13493 (vii).
—— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3405 (ii).
See 'Business of the House.'
Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
—— Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
—— Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bovce) 2170 (ii).
Public Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Public Lands of Dom., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers., Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Public Works, Labour Hours: *See* 'B. No. 97.'

PUBLIC WORKS:
Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).
Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 59; N. 95) (iii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Anse a la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse a l'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com, of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Architects on Public Works, Payments &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Arthabaskaville Public Buildin: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Baie St. Paul Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223, 12029 (vi).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bay St. Lawrence Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).
Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
Belleville Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4744 (iii).
Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).
Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
—— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
See 'Dredging,' &c.
Brantford Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
—— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).
Buildings, Administrative, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi). 13338 (vii).
Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
Buildings Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
—— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
—— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).
—— Man. and N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).
Buildings in Man. and N.W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Buildings, N.B.: in Com. of Sup. 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (vi), 13331 (vii).
Buildings, Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Buildings and Public Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2170 (ii).
Buildings, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
—— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
—— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
—— Tender *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Cape St. Mary Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Que. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
—— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 12030 (vi).
—— Public Works, Expenditures, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
—— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clerks of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
—— Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii)
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr Monk) 9277 (v).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
—— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City, Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5164 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).
Docks, Piers, &c., Constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773, 10259 (v).
—— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
—— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging Contracts, Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).
—— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).
See 'Midland,' &c.
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).
Dredging at Midland, &c., Advertisements *re* Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).
Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).
Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).
Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).
Dredging at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).
Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii)
East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (iv).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).
Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).
Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Glace Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Goderich Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
—— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (iii).
See 'Wharfs.'
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12110 (vii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).
Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).
Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 13338 (vii).
Halifax, Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (v).
Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Hamilton, Public Works Employees at, Delay in Payment: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10015, 10119 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 133350 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).
—— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
—— Name of Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson, Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., purchased by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Lake Aylmer, Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake Francois Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter Piers: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: in Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lavaltrie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lesser Slave Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2397 (ii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7304 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11695 (vi).
Lunenburg Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McPherson's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River, Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Maple Creek, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).
Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Mar. Provs. Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Markham Public Building : in Com of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
——Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Michipicoton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).
Midland and Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
—— Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).
Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*:Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).
Milford Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).
Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).
'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).
Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
N.B. Inland Water Wharf, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).
New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).
New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).
Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).
Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).
Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).
Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).
North Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Archives Fitting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
——— Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
——— Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
——— Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
——— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
——— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5707 (iii).
——— Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Mackenzie Avenue: in Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
——— Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
——— Mint, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
——— Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
——— list read (Mr. Pugsley) 10998 (vi).
——— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Sussex Street Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
——— Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii)
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
——— Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
——— progress *re* construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on conc., 13568 (vii).
——— Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Owen Sound Public Building, Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Building Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com., of Sup., 11259 (vi).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Petite Descharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
——— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7107 (iv).
——— Stmnt. as to Missing Letters: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 9716 (v).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
——— Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
——— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
——— Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Burwell, Harbour Improvement: in Com .of Sup., 12135 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146 (vii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi)
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hope Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
——— Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
——— Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. François Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
——— Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Prince Albert, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
——— Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
Public Works Dept., Architectural Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
——— Clerical and Temporary Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
——— Ass't Dep. Minister, Apptmt. of: in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 12917 (vii).
——— Engineering Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).
——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 5661 (iii).
——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5730 (iii).
——— Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
——— New Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13061 (vii).
——— Ret.: on Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 6223 (iv).
——— Technical Books of Reference: in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
——— Telegraph Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
——— Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 11119 (vi).
Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures: Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4868, 4886; Neg. (Y. 43, N. 99) 4959 (iii).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Quebec County, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (ii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John : in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivière a la Graisse Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689 (ii).
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Roberval, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11282 (vi) .
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
——— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5999 (iii).
St. Francis River, Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
——— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Paymaster's List: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John, Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Harbour Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
——— Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
——— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
——— Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Laurent Wharf: Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).
St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).
St. Maurice, Dam at Grande Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7433 (iv).
St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Thérèse Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).
Sarnia Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Skinner's Cove, Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
——— Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).
Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567 (i).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
——— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).
Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).
Southampton Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii).
Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).
Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii).
Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).
Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).
Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11701 (vi).
Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
——— Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Tignish Breakwater, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
——— Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Leurgey) 682 (i).
——— Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (iii)
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &.: Ques. (Mr. Madonell) 354 (i).
——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354, 518, (i), 4587 (iii).
——— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Uxbridge Public Building: Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8803 (v).
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Winnipegosis Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winnipeg River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Pulp Wood Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Pulp Wood Export Duty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4774 (iii).
See 'Wood.'
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).
——— Last Deficit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6459 (iv).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3481 (ii).
Quarantine Public Health: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Quarter Sections, 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8176 (iv).
Quebec Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos 111 and 219.'
Que. Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Quebec Bridge Accident, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8173 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Bank Claims, &c.: Corrected Information (Mr. Fielding) 6059 (iii)
——— Change of Plans *re* Height: Ques. (Mr Armstrong) 5202 (iii).
——— Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5793 (iii).
——— Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 605 (i).
——— Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
——— Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
——— G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse and Vehicle Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
——— Material, Customs Duties collected &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5200 (iii).
——— Material on Hand, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1290 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5566 (iii).
——— Names of Jurymen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Commission: in Com. of Sup., 12769 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 30; (Mr. Monk) 535 (i).
——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5914 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10302 (vi).
——— Evidence, &c.: M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. to Special Com., 10401 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3043, 4494 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 6223 (iv).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
Quebec Bridge, Commission's Report, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8608 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Barker) 3901 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Special Com.: M. (Mr. Chisholm) to conc., 13353, Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13363, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (vii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Cliff Walls, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Conty, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi), 12190 (vii).
——— Additional Apptmts.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).
——— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

Que. and N. B. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128'
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (viii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Branch Lines Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure since Confederation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, Signed 'P.M. G.': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 11501 (vi).
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Quebec Reviews, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup. 13176 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter Read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
——— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 129.'
——— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
——— Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
——— Legal Holidays: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
——— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
——— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
——— Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4669 (iii).
——— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
——— Rural Corps, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
——— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8386 (v).
Quebec Tercentary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (v).
——— Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary, Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5209 (iii).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Questions, Answering of, Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 234; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 234 (i).
——— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 350 (i).
Ques. of Privilege, Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader' (Mr. Bergeron) 8604 (v).
——— *re* Doukhobors: (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321
——— Hunter, Mr., and French Canadians (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).
——— Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).
——— *re* Stmnts of Mr. Conmee (Mr. Boyce) 7995 (iv).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 85 and 100.'
Ry. Act, B. 3: Ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 577 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i).
——— B. No. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Johnston) 5211 (iii).
Ry. Act (construction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
——— (demurrage) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
——— (8-hour day) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
——— (employees' liability) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
——— (expropriation) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
——— (fire damages) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
——— (level crossings) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
——— (mileage books) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
——— (ry. commission) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 & 112.'
——— (ry. commission) Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. Graham) rsmg. adjn. debate on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3° (Mr. Aylesworth) 11590; Amt., Neg. (Y. 36, N. 77) 11600; Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602; Amt. (Mr. (Mr. Monk) 11603; Neg. (Y. 36, N. 89) 11608 (vi); Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11614, 11619; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 74) 11631; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11632 (vi).
——— (securities) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
——— (telegraphers, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
——— (trains on time) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
——— (wires, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
——— (working hours) Amt. B. No. 157 (Mr. R. Smith): Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10120 (v)
Railway Commission, Applications *re* Crossing of Tracks, by Water Mains, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 1294 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
——— Increase of. *See* 'B. No 112.'
——— Jurisdiction of: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
——— Legal Expenditures: in Com. of Sup., 10362 (vi).
——— Salaries and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 10385 (vi).
——— Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10256 (v).
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Ry. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Railway Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Applications to Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1109 (i).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
RAILWAYS :
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections. Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
See 'G.T.R..' &c.
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).
Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Missions: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
——— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsidy: in Com of Sup., 13305 (vii).
——— Taxation Cases: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R., &c.'
G.T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——— Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
See 'Brockville,' &c.
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.P. and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Knowles) 6291 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (ii).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W .J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
——— Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 1689 (i).
——— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii), 9271 (v).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896; Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).
Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-06: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
National Transcontinental: *See* 'G.T.P.'
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
New York Central, Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
Railway Arbitrations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10329 (vi).
Railway Bridge Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. on Res., 13309 (vii).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9271 (v).
Railway Connections, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) 434 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
——— Extra Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 10342

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Railway Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v)
——— Vote for: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 10007 (v).
Railways Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10341 (vi).
Railways, Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 10357 (vi).
Railways and Municipalities, Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6987 (iv).
Railways Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Railway Statistics Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1346 (i).
Ry. Subsidies, Applications for, Memorandum: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).
Rv. Subsidies: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12771 (vii).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
White Pass Ry. Co., (Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Rainy River. Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5209 (iii).
Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5258 (iii).
Ranchvale Sub-land Agency, Closing of: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4829 (iii).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Rattenbury & Co., Purchase of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12392 (vii).
Receiver-General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).
Rehm, Frederick C., *et al*, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10331 (vi).
Reinhardt, Mr., Interference in Quebec Provl. Elections: Cor., &c., read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10986 (vi).
See 'Caron.'
Renfrew Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Representation from Mar. Provs.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9891 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 9892 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9892 (v).
Representation in H. of C. for the Mar. Provinces: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Daniel) 9780 (v).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
——— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).
Restraint of Trade, Conspiracy in: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
Returns delayed: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13082 (vii).
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Detention of by Members: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5048 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 2024 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 13081 (vii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 2384 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1018 (i), 3318, 2309 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 4495 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Macdonell) 569 (i), 2885 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8516 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 2738 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 2024 (ii).
Returns ordered, Lost, &c., Placed in Record Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to Complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
———Retention by Members: Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4660 (iii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Returns unopposed: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5914 (iii).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Richard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John's: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).

Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613 (v).
See 'Canals.'
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
——— Timber Reserve, Preservation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).
——— Squatters' Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654 (iii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
See 'Ross Rifle.'
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7727 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivard, Mr. S., Employmt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
———Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraservile) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
——— Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
River St. John, Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4763 (iii).
——— M. for Papers (Mr. Ames) 5210 (iii).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Rolla L. Crain, Amounts paid to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges, Par. in 'Ottawa Citizen' *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
——— Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
——— Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
——— Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
——— Date of Contract, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
——— provisions *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Bonus, Loans, Services of Govt. Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
——— Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (ii).
——— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Consignment to N.W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
——— Delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Com., Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).
——— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4404 (iii).
——— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
Ross Rifle. Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M.for Sup., 8902-8953 (v); Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).
——— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v).
Ross Rifle, Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques, (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
——— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number, delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
——— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
——— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
——— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Report from Public Accounts, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5723 (iii).
——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
——— Target Practice, Suspension by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
——— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
——— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11282 (vi).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).
Royal Commission Return: Inquiry for (Mr Porter) 6288, 7447 (iv).
See 'Commissions'.
Royal Military College Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 12152, 13177 (vii).
——— Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
——— Investigation into Conduct of Cadet Lancaster: on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 1451
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Russian Govt. Payments *re* Compensation to B.C. Sealers: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
——— Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2391 (ii).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Ryan, Mr. G. M., Appt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1690 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
——— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7731 (iv).
Ste. Barbe Floods, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— Damages *re* Floods: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 6987 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246, 5999 (iii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. Francis River Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
St. Francis River, Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).
St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c., Apptmt. of Dr. Savard, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office, Savings Bank, Recommendation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi)
St. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv)
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John and Cumberland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12263 (vii).
St. John, N.B., Cold Storage Co., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3580 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 3690 (ii).
——— Names of Stockholders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1938 (i).
See 'N.B.'
St. John, N.B., Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John Harbour, Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
St. John Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
——— Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
——— Quarantine, Partridge Island Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Steam Sterilizer: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
——— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
——— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. John's, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).
St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Rapids Dam, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Gervais) 2996 (ii).
See 'Deep Waterways,' &c.
St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5035 (iii).
St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).
——— Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).
——— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).
St. Maurice, Dam at Grand Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).
St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).
St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
——— Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7438 (iv).
St. Rosalie Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
——— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3134 (ii).
Saccharine Standards, &c., *re* Sugar Manufacture: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).
Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 183 (i).
See 'Chicoutimi.'
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King, Tug, Employmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).
Salaries of Judges: *See* 'Judges.'
Salmon Licenses granted in B.C., Exclusive Privileges, Penalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
——— in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted, in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr .A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr .Lake) 557 (i).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alta., Assurance Fund: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
Saskatchewan Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6400 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4761 (iii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9280 (v).
——— Land Grants, Patents, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5801 (iii).
——— Sale of Homestead Lands: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Stmnt. Read (Mr. Oliver) 10402 (vi).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
'Sault Express,' Amounts paid to for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 696 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853, 1129 (i).
Sault Ste Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 13470 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9278 (v).
Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 557 (i).
School Lands Exchange: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6644 (iv).
——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6647 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6854 (iv).
School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c., Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3430 (ii).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).
Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).
Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Sec. of State, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i).
Section 14, Southeast Quarter, Applications for: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Herron) 5476 (iii).
Section 32, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 8383 (v).
Securities of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Seed Control Act, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5500 (iii).
Seed Grain in N.W., Distribution to Settlers, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3040 (ii).
Seed Grain, Distribution, Duties of Mr. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3158 (ii).
Seed Grain, Buying and Distribution. Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420 vii).
——— Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 1438 (i).
——— Delegation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1840 (i).
Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg. (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5408 (iii).
——— Distribution to Settlers in N.W.: in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).
See 'B. No. 96.'
Seed Grain to N.W. Settlers: M. to Adjn. (Mr. Sifton) 1349 (i).
——— O.C. *re* Advances: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6634 (iv).
——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6981 (iv).
——— Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 692 (i).
——— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10121 (v).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3690 (ii).
——— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3752 (ii).
——— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 3157 (ii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12391 (vii).
——— Incomplete Answer (Mr. Blain) 12551 (vii).
——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12661 (vii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 13066 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1684 (i).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9714 (v).

Semaphores on Railways, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 239 (i).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Senate Reform: Prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1513 (i).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Senate Salaries and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 10489 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26th: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Sessional Papers and Returns, Number ordered, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 2796 (ii).
——— Number presented, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 2592 (ii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
See 'Clarke City.'
Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com .of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1295 (i)
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
——— Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Shipbuilding in Canada: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 2947 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).
Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7732 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 6919 (iv).
Shipping Master at Quebec, Apptmnt. of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5915; Cor. read (Mr. Sproule) 5916 (iii).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii) .
Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4765 (iii).
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5445; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5460.
Signal Dues at Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Six Nations Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).
Skinner's Cove Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Sleeping Car Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Smith, O., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4765 (iii).
Smith, Wm. B., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom .Fruit Inspector, Salary ,&c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Salary: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 2398 (ii).
——— Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5085 (iii).
Snag Boats on Red River, Construction and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567, 891 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 8295 (v).
——— Investigation by Mr. Gaudet *re* Irregularities, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6988, 7099 (iv).
——— Irregularities, Final Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10794 (vi).
Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5408 (iii)

Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 5477 (iii).
——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet *re* Padding: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7938 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet: laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 8170 (iv).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Sorel Public Works, Investigations *re* Pay Rolls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
——— Charges against Overseer, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
——— Comnr. Boyer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
——— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
Soulanges Canal, Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
——— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).
Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2386 (ii).
——— Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).
S.A. Volunteers' Lands Grants Bill: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3316 (ii), 11938 (vi).
——— Land Grants to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
——— Land Grants: Remarks (Mr Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
——— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
——— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
——— School Teachers, Recognition of Services by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2791 (ii).
South African Volunteers, Bounty to: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Southampton Breakwater: in Com of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7729 (iv).
South Huron By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B No. 16.'
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).
Spain, Commander, Expenditure re Wrecks Investigations: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).
——— Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4405 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 4670
——— Papers *re* Travelling Expenses: Laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
——— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii)
Speakers' Expenses, House of Commons, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
——— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 565 (i).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii).
Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Springhill Increased Accommodation: in Com of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).
Squatters Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 4739 (iii).
Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Standard Mutual Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No 71.'
Standard Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5720 (iii).
'Stanley,' Passenger Accommodation *re* Staterooms: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 687 (i).
Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv)
——— Disappearance of: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).

Statistical Branch, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi).
—— List of Officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi)
Steamboat Inspection Act: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
—— Rep. presented (Mr. Brodeur) 3896 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for Five Years, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 853 (i).
Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 3850 (ii).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. White) 3233 (ii).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor I.C.R., Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Stoney Creek Battleford Monument: in Com of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stoney Lake Damage Claims: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5565 (iii).
Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Students of Technology: *See* 'Govt. Works.'
Subsidiary High Court of A. O. F.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
—— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
See 'Sutherland Rifle Sight,' &c.
Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Sugar Manufacture, Regulations *re* Saccharine Standards: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley': Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7989 (iv).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Blain) 5847, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 90) 5877 (iii).
Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 94, 136, 186.'
Supply—Changes in Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1884 (i).
—— Conc.: M. (Mr. Fielding) 5499, 5915 (iii).
—— M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Obstruction *re*, Charges by Govt: on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
See 'Obstruction.'
SUPPLY:
Committee:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 671 (i).
Census and Statistics, 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Exhibitions, 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Experimental Farms, 12549 (vii).
Fruit and Dairying Industry, 10397 (vi).
Fumigation Stations, 12879 (vii).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibits, 10623
Live Stock Industry, 12894 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 12893 (vii).
Patent Record, 672 (i).
Seed Control, &c., 5500 (iii), 12891 (vii).
Year Book, 677 (i).
Charges of Management:
Dom .Notes, 5562 (iii).
Offices of Assistant Receivers General, 12160 (vii).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 645 (i), 12878 (vii).
Auditor General's Office, 635 (i).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 12917 (vii).
Customs, 637 (i).
Finance, 637 (i), 5562 (iii), 12914 (vii).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 610 (i).
Inland Revenue, 645 (i).
Interior, 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Justice, 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi).
Labour, 12156 (vii).
Marine, 976 (i), 12915 (vii).
Militia and Defence, 611 (i), 8871 (v).
Mines, 646 (i).
Northwest Mounted Police, 8862 (v).
Post Office, 8872 (v).
Printing Bureau, 612 (i).
Privy Council, 610 (i), 12902 (vii).
Public Works, 638, 645 (i), 5698 (iii), 12916 (vii).
Railways and Canals, 10325 (vi), 12755 (vii).
Secretary of State, 611 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 648 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Customs:
Printing, &c., 9577 (v).
Revenue Cruisers, &c., 9578 (v).
Salaries, &c., 9223, 9439 (v).
Salaries, Inspectors of Ports, &c., 9536 (v).
Departments Generally:
Charwomen, 10508 (vi).
Dominion Lands:
Salaries, &c., 10038 (v).
Surveys, &c., 9987 (v).
Dominion Police, 5509 (iii).
Excise:
Methylated Spirits, 820 (i).
Distillery Duty, 814 (i).
Duty collected, Expenses *re*, 817 (i).
Provisional Allowances, 817 (i).
Salaries, &c., 813 (i).
Stamps for Tobacco, 816 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 814 (i).
Fisheries:
Dog Fish, Reduction Works, 13325 (vii).
Protection Service, 13326 (vii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 5777 (iii), 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey:
Boring for Oil, &c., 13162 (vii).
Maps, &c., 12260 (vii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens, 12261 (vii).
Govt. of the Northwest Territories:
General Vote, 10116 (v).
Govt. of the Yukon:
General Vote, 10107 (v).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 9769, 9840 (v).
Contingencies, &c., 9948, 9964 (v).
Deporting Immigrants, 9882 (v).
General Expenses, 5751 (iii), 13169 (vii).
Winnipeg Hospital, &c., 9982 (v).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Salaries, 12752 (vii).
Generally:
Destitute Indians, Relief, 5762 (iii).
Printing and Stationery, 5762 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Salaries, 12736, 13170 (vii).
Sioux, 5762 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec:
General Vote, 12729 (vii).
Inspection of Staples:
Salaries, 12264 (vii).
Justice:
Exchequer Court, 5505 (iii).
Printing and Binding, 5508 (iii).
Supreme Court:
Contingencies, 12917 (vii).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Contingencies, 10502 (vi).
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 10508 (vi).
General Vote, 10490 (vi).
Printing and Binding, 10507 (vi).
Salaries, 10501 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 10503 (vi).
Voters' Lists, 10508 (vi).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Legislation—*Con.*
Library of Parliament:
General Vote, 10503 (vi).
Senate:
General Vote, 10489 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 5039 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12262 (vii).
Dockyards, Maintenance, 5039 (iii).
Lightship at Point Pelee, 13325 (vii).
Limekiln Crossing, 13323 (vii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5039 (iii).
Pilotage, Str. 'Eureka,' 5046 (iii).
Pensions to Pilots, 13324 (vii).
Repairs to Lightships, 5039 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Signal Service, 5045 (iii).
Thunder Bay, Ice Breaking, 5041 (iii).
Wireless Stations, 5045 (iii).
Mail Subsidies:
Can. and Australia, 13152 (vii).
Can. and G. B., 12728 (vii).
Can., Japan and China, 13152 (vii).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Marine Hospitals:
Further Amount, 5782 (iii).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 5662, 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13176, 13540 (vii).
Battlefields, Monuments, 13177 (vii).
Customs Dues, 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).
Dominion Arsenal, 12154 (vii).
Gratuity to Caretaker J. Donovan, 13177 (vii).
Gratuity to Mrs. C. D. Murray, 13177 (vii).
Military Properties, Construction, &c., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Cliff Repairs, 12148 (vii).
Ordnance, &c., 12505 (vii).
Pay and Allowances, 12147 (vii).
Provisions, 5662 (iii), 12150 (vii).
Rifle Associations, Grants, 12152 (vii).
Royal Military College, 12152, 13177 (vii).
Salaries and Wages, 12147 (vii).
Warlike Stores, 12149 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Can. Bank of Commerce, Yukon Services, 13167 (vii).
Chinese Riots, Vancouver, 13155 (vii).
Royal Commission, 13156 (vii).
Civil Service Commission, 13168 (vii).
Cotton Industry, Quebec, Commission, 13156 (vii).
Grant to National Gymnastic Society, 13167 (vii).
Jamaica Earthquake, 5784 iii).
Japanese Riots, B.C., 5783 (iii).
Labour Dept., 12261 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries, Investigation, 13169 (vii).
Mounted Police, Compensation, 8870 (v).
Olympic Games, Can. Representatives, 13167 (vii).
Oriental Labour Question, 13156 (vii).
Park Reservations, 5755 (iii).
Prince Fushimi's Visit, 5783 (iii).
Seed Grain Relief, 2770 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 8863 (v).
Ocean and River Service:
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Strait, 1885, 1895 (i), 2941 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, Ice-breakers, &c., 1033, 1060 (i), 5763 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Wreck Investigations, 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 12918 (vii).
General Vote, 5509, 5522 (iii), 12265 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 12918 (vii).
Pensions:
Rebellion of 1885, *re*, 8870 (v).
Post Office:
Durston, Robt., Apptmt., 5561 (iii).
Mail Service, 5561 (iii).
Miscellaneous, 5562 (iii).
North Bay Office, 13152 (vii).
Salaries and Allowances, 9092 (v).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Archives, 5700 (iii).
Astronomical Observatory, 1450, 1485 (i).
Eastern Building, 1504 (i).
New Buildings, 1504 (i), 5701 (iii).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 1486 (i).
Royal Mint, 1451, 1470 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Manitoba:
St. Andrew's Rapids, 5701 (iii).
Ontario:
Port Arthur, &c., Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Quebec:
Lake St. Peter Piers, 4752 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Sorel Property, 4751 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 5035 (iii).
Dredging Plant, 4754 (iii).
Transportation Facilities:
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, 12145, 13326 (vii).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 12146 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 12145 (vii).
Marine Dept.:
Gratuity to mother of late J. Carbonneau, 13321 (vii).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue:
Graving Docks, Maintenance, 5731 (iii).
Land and Cable Lines, Lower St. Lawrence, 5731 (iii).
Telegraph Lines:
Ashcroft-Dawson, 5731 (iii).
Cape Beale Lines, 5731 (iii).
Operating Expenses, 13178 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Chilliwack, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Cranbrook, Public Building, 10864 (vi).
Cumberland, Public Building, 10864 (vi).
Fernie, Public Building, 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
Grand Forks, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Greenwood, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith, Public Building, 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Quesnel, Public Building, 10867 (vi).
Revelstoke, Public Building, 13339 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse, 13339 (vii).
——— Public Building, 10868 (vi).
Vernon, Public Building, 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Victoria, Immigration Building, 10874 (vi).
——— Post Office, 10883 (vi).
Williams Head, Quarantine Station, 10883 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 10886 (vi).
Experimental Farms, 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii).
General Vote, 10886 (vi).
Manitoba:
Brandon, Drill Hall, 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building, 8519 (v).
Elmwood, Public Building, 13335 (vii).
Emerson, Public Building, 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Neepawa, Public Building, 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Selkirk, Public Building, 8547 (v).
St. Boniface, Public Building, 8566 (v).
Souris, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Examining Warehouse, 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building, 8573 (v).
Winnipeg, Military Buildings, Hospital, 10955 (vi).
——— Fort Osborne Barracks, 10969 (vi), 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Post Office, Land and Building, 8575 (v).
Winnipeg, Postal Station 'B,' 8576 (v).
New Brunswick:
Fairville, Public Building, 13323 (vii).
Fredericton, Military Buildings, 13323 (vii).
Grand Falls, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Hillsborough, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Moncton, Armoury, 13328 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick—*Con.*
St. John, 5703 (iii), 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 7187 (iv).
Nova Scotia:
Antigonish, Public Building, 7110 (iv).
Bridgewater, Public Building, 7135 (iv).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 7139 (iv).
Halifax, Dom. Buildings, Repairs, 7140 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7142 (iv).
——— Immigrant Detention Building, 7143 (iv).
——— Military Quarters, 7143 (iv).
——— New Building, 7144 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station, 7171 (iv).
Inverness, Public Building, 7172 (iv).
Lunenburg, Public Building, 13326 (vii).
Parrsborough, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Shelburne, Public Building, 7173 (iv).
Westville, Public Building, 7179 (iv).
Wolfville, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Yarmouth, Public Building, 7180 (iv).
Ontario:
Arnprior, Public Building, 7454 (iv).
Belleville Armoury, 7454, 7678 (iv).
Brantford, Public Buildings, 7455 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7467 (iv).
Glencoe, Public Building, 7473 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph Armoury, 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Hamilton Drill Hall, 7692 (iv).
——— Post Office, 7696 (iv).
Harriston, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Kincardine, Public Building, 7698 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 10907 (vi).
——— New Gun Shed, 7700, 7814 (iv).
——— New Guard-house, 7701, 7814 (iv).
——— New Hospital, 7702, 7814 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, 7702 7819 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, Stables, 10907 (vi).
——— New Magazine, 10907 (vi).
Leamington, Public Building, 7701, 7815 (v), 13331 (vii).
Listowel, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
London, Military Buildings, 7705 (iv).
Markham, Public Building, 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Mount Forest, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Mitchell, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
North Bay, Public Building, 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Ottawa, Departmental Buildings, Sky-lights, 7816 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa Post Office, 5705 (iii).
——— Printing Bureau, 7817 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building, 7817 (iv).
Parkhill, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
Renfrew, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 7826 (iv).
Sarnia, 7829 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Seaforth, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Simcoe, Public Building, 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sudbury, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Tilsonburg, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Uxbridge, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Waterloo, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Walkerville, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Welland, Public Building, 7830 (iv).
Whitby, Public Building, 7833 (iv).
Prince Edward Island:
Georgetown, 7182 (iv).
Quebec:
Arthabaskaville, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Chicoutimi, Post Office, 7279 (iv).
Cookshire, Post Office, 7281 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7286 (iv).
Dundee, Custom House, 7286 (iv).
Farnham, Post Office, 7287 (iv).
Grand Mere, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Grosse Isle, Improvements, 7289 (iv).
Grosse Isle, Disinfecting Apparatus, 7290 (iv).
Joliette, Armoury, 13329 (vii).
Knowlton, Public Building, 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building, 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lake Megantic, Public Building, 7294 (iv).
Lévis, Public Building, 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Longueuil, Public Buiding, 7304 (iv).
Magog, Public Building, 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Marieville, Public Building, 7306 (iv).
Megantic, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Montreal, Barracks, 7407 (iv).
——— General Post Office, 7410 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, 'B,' 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, Point St. Charles, 5703 (iii), 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
——— Eastern Postal Station, 7419 (iv).
——— New Examining Warehouse, 7423 (iv).
Nicolet, Public Building, 7428 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Plessisville, Public Building, 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Quebec Citadel, Drill Shed, 7430 (iv).
——— Governor General's Quarters, 7431 (iv).
——— Drill Hall, 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital, 7433 (iv).
——— Military Building, 7434 (iv).
Quebec East, Public Building, 7438 (iv).
Roberval, Public Building, 13330 (vii). (vii).
St, Henri, Post Office, 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe, Public Building, 7440 (iv).
St. Johns, Military Buildings, 7440 (iv).
——— Public Buildings, 7444 (iv).
St. Therese, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Shawenegan, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Sherbrooke, Drill Hall, 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Three Rivers, New Building, 13330 (vii).
Westmount, Public Buildings, 13330 (vii).
Rents, Repairs, &c.:
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, 10981 (vi).
Electric Light, &c., 11011 (vi).
Elevator Attendants, 11011 (vi).
Furniture, 11007 (vi).
Grounds, 11012 (vi).
Heating, &c., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
Immigration Buildings, 11008 (vi).
Major's Hill Park, 11015 (vi).
Post Office, 11007 (vi).
Quarantine Stations, 11008 (vi).
Rideau Hall, 11005 (vi).
Telephones, 5706 (iii), 11012 (vi).
Ventilation, Lighting, &c., 5707 (iii), 10981 (vi).
Yukon Buildings, 11005 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Barracks for Permanent Corps (Strathcona Horse), 10975 (vi).
Battleford, Public Building, 8576 (v).
Calgary, Public Building, 8578 (v).
Edmonton, Public Building, 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan, Land Office, 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Humboldt, Public Building, 8582 (v).
Lethbridge, Armoury, 13336 (vii).
Maple Creek, Public Building, 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 8601 (v).
Moose Jaw, Armoury, 13337 (vii)
——— Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Prince Albert, 8601 (v), 13337 (vii).
Regina, Post Office, 8602 (v).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Saskatchewan and Alberta—*Con.*
Strathcona, Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Wetaskiwin, Public Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Yorkton, Public Building, 8603 (v).
Yukon Territory:
Commissioner's Residence, 10883 (vi).
P. O. Building, 13339 (vii).
Dredging:
Mar. Provs., New Plant, 12142 (vii).
Ont. and Quebec, 13351 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Spillumcheen River, 13351 (vii).
Thompson River, 13351 (vii).
Manitoba:
Grand Marais Harbour, 12140 (vii).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake, 12141 (vii).
Mar. Provs.:
General Vote, Creosoted Timber, 12028 (vi).
New Brunswick:
Beaver Harbour, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Buctouche, Channel, 11679 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Caraquet, Wharf, &c., 11685 (vi).
Dorchester Wharf, Addition, 13344 (vii).
Dover, Wharf, 11692 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11693 (vi).
Harvey Bank, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Leonardsville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lorneville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lower Newcastle, Wharf, 11695 (vii).
Madawaska River, Extension of Dyke, 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Miscou, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Moncton, Wharf, 11696 (vi).
New Mills, Wharf, 13345 (vii).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers, &c., 11698 (vi).
River St. John, including tributaries, 11698 (vi).
River St. John, Wharfs in Tide Water, 12000 (vi), 13345 (vii).
St. Andrews, Harbour Improvements, 12011 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements, 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
Shippegan, Harbour, 12027 (vi).
Tracadie, Protection Works, 13349 (vii)
Nova Scotia:
Annapolis Harbour Improvements, 11207 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf, 11219 (vi).
Barachois, Training Pier, 11223 (vi).
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour, 12224 (vi).
Big Lorraine Harbour, 11224 (vi).
Breton Cove, 11224 (vi).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater, 11224
Cariboo Island, Causeway, 11224 (vi).
Charlo's Cove, Breakwater, 11225 (vi).
Church Point, 11225 (vi).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) 11225 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Digby, Harbour, 11226 (vi).
Fort Lawrence Wharf—Extension of head block, additional trestle approach, &c., General Vote, 13341 (vii).
Glace Bay, 11228 (vi).
Hall's Harbour, 11228 (vi).
Lake Ainslie, Boat Channel, 11228 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11229 (vi).
Margaree River, Shear Dams, &c., 11229 (vi).
Middle River (Lower) 11229 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Wharf, 11257 (vi).
Oyster Pond, 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove, Improvements, 11258 (vi).
Parrsboro', Harbour Improvements, 11259 (vi).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 11260 (vi).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel, 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, 11268 (vi).
Port Joli West, Herring Rocks. Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Port Royal, Madame Island, Wharf 11278 (vi).
Portuguese Cove, Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Pugwash, Wharf, 11279 (vi).
Round Hill, Wharf, 11282 (vi).
Scotch Cove Breakwater, 11290 (vi).
Skinner's Cove, Dredging Channel, &c., 11290 (vi).
Sydney Harbour, Wharf, 11230 (vi).
Tancook Island, 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay, Wharf, 11290 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour, Improvements, 11291 (vi).
Ontario :
Beaverton, Harbour Improvements, 12090 (vii).
Belle River, Dredging, 12090 (vii).
Blanche River, Improvement, 12090 vii).
Blind River, Dredging, &c., 12091 (vii).
Bronte Dredging, 5703 (iii).
Bronte Harbour, Repairs, 12091 (vii).
Burlington Channel Piers, 12092 (vi).
Chûte à Blondeau, Wharf, 12092 (vii).
Cobourg, Dredging, &c., 12095 (vii).
Colborne, Wharf, 12095 (vi).
Collingwood Harbour, Improvements, 12096 (vii).
Goderich Harbour, Improvements, 12101, 13350 (vii).
Gore's Landing, Wharf, 12101 (vii).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12101 (vii).
Juniper Island, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Lakefield, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Little Current, 13350 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, 12103 (vii).
Magnetawan River, 13350 (vii).
Meaford Harbour, Improvements, 12103 (vii).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Michipicoten, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Midland and Tiffin Harbours, 5709 (iii), 12103 (vii).
Montreal River, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Petawawa, 12133 (vii).
Peterborough, Steamboat Landing, 12133 (vii).
Point Edward, Dredging, 5713 (iii).
Port Burwell, Improvement to Harbour, 12135 (vii).
Port Hope, Repairs, 12135 (vii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements, 12136 (vii).
Rainy River, Improvements at Long Sault Rapid, 12136 (vii).
Roach's Point, Wharf, 12136 (vii).
Rondeau, Harbour Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Rossport, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Severn River, 12137 (vii).
Southampton, Repairs to Chantry Island Breakwaters, 12137 (vii).
Stanley Island, Wharf, 5720 (iii).
Tobermory, Harbour, 13351 (vii).
Toronto Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Winnipeg River, Improvements, 12133 (vii).
Prince Edward Island :
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11292 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11292 (vi).
New London, 11292 (vi).
Rustico Harbour, Breakwater, 11293 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point, Strengthening Breakwater, &c., 13341 (vii).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13343 (vii).
Quebec:
Anse à la Barbe, Breakwater, 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Ilot, Landing Pier, 12029 (vi).
Baie St. Paul, 12029 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Training Piers, &c., 12029 (vi).
Batiscan, Dredging, 12029 (vi).
Berthier, Wharf, 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chateauguay, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Harbour, Improvements, 12030 (vi).
Clarke City, Wharf Improvements, 12031 (vi).
East Templeton, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Escoumains, Pier, 12031 (vi).
Father Point, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Grand Méchin, Breakwater, 12031 (vi).
Grand Rivière (Gaspé), Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12031 (vi).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf, 12032 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Lake Megantic, Piers, 12032 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers, Repairs, &c., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Francis (Beauce) Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Lavaltrie, Wharf, 12033 (vi).
Les Eboulements, Repairs, 12033 (vi).
Lotbiniere and Portneuf Counties, Government Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, &c., 12033 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter, 12034 (vi).
Matane Breakwater, &c., 12034 (vi).
Montmagny, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Harbour, 12034 (vi).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, 12034 (vi).
Piché Point (Lake Temiskaming) Pile Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Point aux Trembles, Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Wharf Improvements, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Dredging Approach, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Ashouapmouchouan, Training Dykes, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Batiscan, Dredging Channel, 12036 (vi).
River Bonaventure, Training Pier, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (en haut) Dredging, &c., 12036 (vi).
River du Lièvre, Lock and Dam, 12037 (vi).
River Maskinonge, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Ouelle, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Ice Piers, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Improvements, 12038 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Lawrence, Ice Piers at River St. Jacques, 12041 (vi).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 12040 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Channel between Grandes Piles and La Tuque, 12041 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dam at Grandes Piles, 12041 (vi).
River Yamaska, Lock, &c., 12041 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Addition to Wharf, 12041 (vi).
St. Anne des Monts, 12041 (vi).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Ignace de Loyola, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Laurent, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Omer, Landing Pier, 12042 (vi).
St. Pierre les Becquets, Pile Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Siméon, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Wharf, 13349 (vii).
Varennes, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Lesser Slave River, 5719 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Old Man's River, 12142 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Architectural Branch, Salaries, 11096 (vi).
Cement Testing Laboratory, 11078 (vi).
Deep Waterways Commission, 11101 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. Thos. O'Leary, 5730 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Salaries, 11093 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 11119 (vi).
International Commission, Red River of the North, 11118 (vi).
Monuments to late Sir L. H. Lafontaine, R. Baldwin, 11118 (vi).
Monuments at Brantford *re* Telephone Invention, 11118 (vi).
Surveys, &c., 11071 (vi).
Technical Books, 11100 (vi).
Telegraph Service, Salaries, 11097 (vi).
Temporary Assistance, &c., 11099 (vi).
Roads and Bridges:
Shellmouth Bridge, 12143 (vii).
Telegraph Lines:
General Operating Expenses—Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 12143 (vii).
Maritime Provs.:
Generally, 5730 (iii).
Quarantine:
Salaries, Public Health, &c., 5504 (iii).
Railways and Canals—
Canals—
Carillon:
Dam, 12768 (vii).
Chambly:
Macadamizing Towpath, 12226 (vii).
Cornwall:
Gate Lifter, 12226 (vii).
Repairs to Bank, 12768 (vii).
Galops:
Generally, 5671 (iii).
Generally, 5696 (iii).
Sunday Work, 13174 (vii).
Lachine:
J. Richard, Loss of Horse, 13174 (vii).
Leak at Lock No. 1, 5672 (iii).
Slope Walls, 5663 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Lachine—*Con.*
Staff, 5696 (iii).
Walls, 12226 (vii).
Murray:
Houses, 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Roller, 12225 (vii).
Rideau:
Generally, 5689 (iii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
Sault St. Marie:
Construction, 12223 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office, 12225 (vii).
Soulanges:
Improvements, 12225 (vii).
Manning and Macdonald's Claim, 5668 (iii).
Trent:
Construction, 12225 (vii).
Dam at Buckhorn, 12227 (vii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
New Lock, &c., Lindsay, 12227 (vii).
Properties, Damages *re* Flooding, 12768 (vii).
Welland:
Dredge Slide in Deep Cut, 5673 (iii).
Electric Lighting, 12195 (vii).
Port Colborne, Improvements, 12211 (vii).
Port Maitland, Entrance, 5673 (iii).
Queenston, St. Bridge, &c., 12207 (vii).
Surveys, 12207 (vii).
To Purchase Boat, 5691 (iii).
Widen Canal, 12210 (vii).
Railways:
Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, 12704 (vii).
Intercolonial Railway:
Additional Line, Moncton to Truro, Survey, 12760 (vii).
Amherst Improvements, 12233 (vii).
Antigonish, Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Campbellton, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Chatham, Improvements, 12757 (vii).
Double Tracking, 12236 (vii).
Fredericton, Improvements, 12758 (vii).
General Vote, 5693 (iii), 10126 (v).
Halifax Accommodation, 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
Increased Accommodation, &c., 12259 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Machinery for Shops, 12257 (vii).
Moncton Shops, &c., 12250 (vii).
Mulgrave, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
New Glasgow, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
North Sydney, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
Petit Rocher, Spur Track, 12759 (vii).
Pictou, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Rolling Stock, 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
St. Cyrille and Drummondville, 12756 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*
St. John, Accommodation, 12257 (vii).
Ste. Rosalie, Improvements, 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville, Improvements, 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Accommodation, 12233 (vii).
Stellarton, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Strengthening Bridges, 12259 (vii).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, 12229, 12759 (vii).
Truro, Accommodation, 12231 (vii).
National Transcontinental Ry.:
Surveys and Construction, 12238, 12728 (vii).
Prince Edward Island Railway:
Hillsborough Bridge, 12762 (vii).
Surveys of Branch Lines, 12764 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitrations and Awards, 10329 (vi).
Compensation to C.P.R. *re* Right of Way, 5561 (iii).
Extra Clerks, &c., 10342 (vi).
G. T. P. Ry., Inspections, 10390 (vi).
International Congress, Subscription, 10377 (vii).
Legal Expenses, 10357 (vi).
Miscellaneous Works, 10328 (vi).
Ry. Commission, 10361, 10385 (vi).
Ry. Statistics, 10328 (vi).
Remuneration to A. Brunet, 10378 (vi).
Staff and Repairs, 10304 (vi).
Statistical Offices, 10317 (vi).
Surveys, &c., Canals, 10338 (vi).
To provide for Quebec Bridge Plans, 12769 (vii).
Scientific Institutions:
Astronomical Observatory, 9737 (v).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Hydrographic Surveys, 13169 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Supt. of Insurance:
General Vote, 12160 (vii).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 12264 (vii).
Concurrence:
Assay Office, Vancouver, 13573 (vii).
Geological Survey, Explorations, &c., 13574 (vii).
J. G. Artz, Salary, 13578 (vii).
Mines Branch, Investigation of Ore Deposits, &c., 13569 (vii).
Sessional Clerks, 13577 (vii).
South Lake, N.S., Opening Channel, 13568 (vii).
Telephone Invention, Monument *re*, 13567 (vii).
Supreme Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Supreme Court of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Supreme Court, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
—— Registrar's Official Uniform: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Owen) 5507 (iii).

Surveys of Dom. Lands: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle, Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii). *See* 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Sutherland Rifle Sight Co. Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5206 (iii).
—— Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
—— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
—— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Sydney Cement, Quality, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. C. Ross) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
—— Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines, Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).
Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr Stanfield) 11701 (vi).
Technical Books of Reference, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry: Prop. Res. (Mr. Gutherie) 2856 (ii).
—— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12660 (vii).
Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 12657 (vii).
Telegraph Branch, P. W. Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
Telegraph Cos.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telegraph Lines, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
—— Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
—— Operating and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).
Telegraphs and Telephones, and Man. Boundaries, Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3042 (ii).
Telegraph, Yukon, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup,. 13178 (vii).
——ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Telephone Invention, Monument at Brantford: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Telephone Rates: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 690 (i).
Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233 (i).
See 'Finance,' &c.
Tenders, List of Papers *re* Advertisements: 'Read (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).
Tenders, Opening of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Haggart) 2738 (ii).
Tenders for Public Works, &c.: *See* 'Advertisements.'
Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadian Commission: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4770 (iii).
Tercentenary at Quebec: *See* 'Battlefields,' 'Quebec,' &c.
Territories Real Property Act, Payments *re* Land to Alberta and Saskatchewan: prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7094 (iv).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number Cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).
Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 13085 (vii).
Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
'Thin Red Line': *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).

Three Rivers, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Thunder Bay, Ice-breaking, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5041 (iii).
Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup., 3215 (iii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 682 (i).
—— Breakwater Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tiffin Harbour Dredging: in Com .of Sup., 5709 (iii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v). *See* 'Midland,' &c.
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Timber Berths awarded between June, 1904, and July 15th, 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crawford) 3851 (ii).
Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Petition by Original Grantees: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2546 (ii).
Timber Berths: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4833 (iii).
Timber Berth, East Sask., Conditions of Ownership: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3839 (ii).
Timber Berths in Man. and N.W. Ters. under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 852
Timber Berths Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. McCraney) 4247 (iii).
—— Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. McCraney) 4589 (iii).
—— Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. White) 850 (i).
—— Nos. 1046, &c., Original Applications: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4247 (iii).
—— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 850 (i).
—— Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 852 (i).
—— No. 1100, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364 (i).
—— No. 1168, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 363 (i).
—— Nos. 1220-1272: on Order for Ret., Amt. (Mr. Lake) 849 (i).
—— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders: Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster (Mr. Turriff) 11303; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 11304; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11304 (vi).
Timber Berths, Original Documents: M. for Papers (Mr. Lake) 2855 (i).
—— Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2856 (ii). *See* 'Documents.'
—— Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2983 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 3318 (ii).
Timber Berths, Par. in Toronto 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 5077 (iii).
—— Tenders, &c., Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. White) 2983 (ii).
Timber Berths, &c.: *See* 'Documents, Original.'
Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2168 (ii).
Timber Lands, Sale to Messrs. Rutherford, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1293 (i).
—— Sale or Lease, subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 8697 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3242 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3038 (ii).
Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 359 (i).
—— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 236 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1739 (i).
Timber Licenses in Manitoba and N. W. Ters., Renewal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 691 (i).
—— during 1896-7: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2396 (ii).
—— Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1127 (i).
—— Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
—— Denial *re* Application (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Talbot) 3578 (ii).
Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., Com. of Investigation *re*: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2269, 2310, 2466, 2595; Amt. neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).
Timber Limits, Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2386 (ii).
Timber Limits: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3580 (ii).
Timber Marking Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Timber Permits to Settlers, *re* Cutting in Twp. 39, Range 11: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11495

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 179 (i).
Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (Amt.) 8778; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).
Timber Sales, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Burrows) *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).
Tobacco Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 566 (i).
Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 4402 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 178 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers, in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Tobacco Prohibition, Res. from Moral Reform Associations: Remarks (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Rev. Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Resolutions: in Com. on Ways and Means, 6118 (iii).
Tobacco Stamps, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Tobacco Stamps for Imports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 816 (i).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tobique Manufacturing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 8.'
Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
See 'Montreal Turnpike,' &c.
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354 (i).
—— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
—— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354,518 (i).
—— Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4587 (iii).
—— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10916 (vi).
Townsend, Arthur James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'
Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works, &c., *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1125 (i).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Trade and Commerce, Agents' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
—— Chinese Act: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i), (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5199 (iii).
Trade and Nav. Returns: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Trans.-Canada Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (vii).
Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
See 'G.T.P.,' &c.
Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
—— Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145, 13326 (vii).
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Travellers Life Assurance Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Travelling Expenses, Minister of Marine at Colonial Conference: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 985; (Mr. Foster) 998 (i).
—— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
See 'Colonial Conference.'
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada: Notice of Motion (Mr. Thompson) 3172 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of: Remarks (Mr .Owen) 609 (i).
Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
—— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
—— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
—— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com .of Sup., 10310 (vi).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
—— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
—— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
—— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
—— Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
—— Holland River Dredging Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
—— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
—— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
—— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
—— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Trueman, Mr., and N.B. Cold Storage Co.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9343 (v).
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Truro Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to the Senate: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).
Two-Cent-a-Mile Rate: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Under-Secretaries of State, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).
U.S., Treaties with: *See* 'Anglo-American,' &c.
U.S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7502 (iv).
U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5338 (iii).
—— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5788 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 5800 (iii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (viii).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 569 (i).
Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).
Valleyfield Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr Bergeron) 7996 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vancouver Bank: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Vancouver Bank incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 779 (i).
Vancouver Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Vancouver, New Westminster and Yukon Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Vaudreuil County, Dredging. Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vautelet, Mr., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6406, 7730 (iv).
Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa".
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
—— Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8893 (v).
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
'Victor' Tug, Repairs to by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9774 (v).
'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks: (Mr. Bergeron) 13066 (vii).
Walker, Andrew, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt. in Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3230 (ii).
—— Contracts with Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3843 (ii).
—— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3842 (ii).
—— Payments to by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5085 (iii).
—— Purchase of Cement for Heath Point Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
Warlike and Other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Water Carriage of Goods: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13416 (vii).
Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Water Mains across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Water Power Privileges in Alberta, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8378 (v).
Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
See 'Cassels.'
Waugh and Perrin, Immigration Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Ways and Means—The Budget—Financial Statement, 5137 (iii).
—— For Debate: *See* 'Budget.'
Ways and Means: M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— in Com on Tobacco Resolutions, 6118 (iii).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78 & 93.'
Weather Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
—— Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
—— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
—— Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
—— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
—— Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
—— Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
—— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
—— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
—— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.: *See* 'B. No. 55.'
West Indian Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1860 (i).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 24.'
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v)

Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
Whaling Licenses, B.C., Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9276 (v).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
——— Harbours Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L .Borden) 1130 (i).
——— and Revenues Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution of in Thetford Mines: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9894 (v).
See 'Yukon.'
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11496 (vi).
White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Wheat Frozen in Shipping from Man., &c.: M. to adjn. House (Mr. Blain) 825 (i).
Wheat Shipments, Feed, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 893 (i).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Foster) for copies of Memorials, &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Banks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
See 'Grain,' 'Finance,' &c.
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
See 'Yukon.'
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (ii).
Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11498 (vi).
Wilson Cordage Co., Cor., Accounts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Winding-Up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 95, 102, 144.'
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1131 (i).
——— Expiration of Franchise: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1940 (i).
Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
Winnipeg Bank: *See* 'B .No. 19.'
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
——— Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10969 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Winnipeg River, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 9982 (v).
Winnipegosis Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216
See 'P.E.I.'
Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Wireless Stations, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
See 'Marconi.'
Wires Across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Women's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 568 (i).
Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7449 (iv).
See 'P

Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com .of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster C. L. Smith, Interference in Elections: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).
Woollen Industry, Deputations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13082 (vii).
——— Legislation *re* Relief: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12772 (vii).
——— Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7504 (iv).
——— Reply to Manufacturers' Ass'on. by Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
——— Specific Duty: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 6988 (iv).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr .Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Wrecks, Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 3221 (ii).
Writs of Elections: *See* 'B .No. 66.'
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
——— Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
Yarmouth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 677 (i).
Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
York, Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
Yukon Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
YUKON:
Bank of Commerce Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Buildings, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Clements, Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
——— O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 5801 (iii).
YUKON—*Con.*
Commissioner's Residence, Dawson: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 10301 (v).
Charges against Administrators, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1690 (i), 2170 (ii).
Charges of Dr. Pringle *re* Immorality, &c., (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instruction *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
——— Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12050 (vii).
——— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10111 (v).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Ret., 1691 (i). *See* 'Wiley,' &c.
Corruption Charges in Public Officials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
——— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5785 (iii).
Elections Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
Expenditures, Total Amount: Remarks *re* Question (Mr .Foster) 1128 (i).
Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 1132 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 6464 (iv). *See* 'Revenue.'
Finnie, Mr. O. S., Investigation *re* Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 4316 (iii).
Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commissioners *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 894 (i).
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
Gold Commissioner's Office, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
Gold Cos., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7725 (iv).
Govt. Officials, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (v).
Judges' Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11123 (vi).
Liquor Permits, Agents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 5048 (iii).
Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. F. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5999 (iii).

YUKON—*Con.*
Mail Service: Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).
Mail Service during Winter: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 5136 (iii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Money Transmission, Rates *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2979 (ii).
Morality Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
—— inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, (vi).
—— Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689, 11016 (vi).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, 11122 (vi).
Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4245, 4588 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 4589 (iii).
Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 698 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*
Revenue and Expenditure from March 31st to June 30, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114, 1346 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N.W.M.P. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
—— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Gobt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Land, Names, &c.: M .for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2796 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
See 'Congdon.'
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).